



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Rukungiri Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 778)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	72%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	30%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	73%
Educational Performance Measures	67%
Health Performance Measures	69%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded investments including one (01) infrastructure project in FY2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000</li> </ul> <p>The solar street lights project was site visited during the assessment and the existence and functionality of the lights was confirmed.</p> <p><b>The solar street lights installed using DDEG funds were functional.</b></p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>Overall, the performance of RMLG in its LLG assessment was 63% in FY2021/2022 and 81% in FY2022/2023, meaning an increase of 18%. <b>This increase was greater than 5%.</b></p>	3

N23\_Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.

- If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3
- If 80-99%: Score 2
- If below 80%: 0

Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded capital investment projects in FY2022/2023.

- 📌 Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000
- 📌 Capacity building UGX6,104,000
- 📌 Assessment of HLG and LLG UGX10,000,000
- 📌 Physical planning PDP UGX10,000,000
- 📌 Data collection UGX8,100,000
- 📌 Monitoring UGX2,747,000

The solar street lights were completed and were functional at the time of the assessment. The physical development plan was done for Rwarubura Cell in Rwakabengo Ward in Southern Division and the work done was seen during this assessment. Data was collected for the Parish Development Model beneficiaries in 12 Wards of the MLG, though it was part funded by PDM. Data on household details was collected to help judge eligibility.

The 4th Quarter performance report shows that DDEG FY2022/2023 budget was UGX138,959,000 and what was released by the end of Q4 was UGX138,959,000.

The DDEG investment projects planned by RMLG for FY2022/2023 were implemented and the planned stages completed.

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0.	<p>Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded investment projects in FY2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Capacity building UGX6,104,000</li> <li>🏗️ Assessment of HLG and LLG UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Physical planning PDP UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Data collection UGX8,100,000</li> <li>🏗️ Monitoring UGX2,747,000</li> </ul> <p>The projects were all eligible under DDEG guidelines (DDEG Program Operations Manual, Section 2.6 - Eligible Expenditures/Investment Menu, Table 2 - Activities which can be funded by the municipalities/districts under MDG and LDG, Pages 11-13)</p> <p>However, the proportionality of the infrastructure project (UGX30,000,000) to the total DDEG project budget (UGX66,951,000) did not make 70% as required under the guidelines. It was 44.8%, which was less than the required 70%.</p> <p>The allocation of the budget to the different investments under DDEG did not meet the requirement.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	<p>There is evidence that the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY (2022/23) are within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The Annual Work Plan and Budget for the FY (2022/23) indicated one project funded under the DDEG and the implemented infrastructure project had contract amounts according to contract documents as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Supply and installation of 3No. solar powered street lights-RUKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00004.</b> The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 44,257,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 44,257,500/=. The Variation was at 0.0011% <math>\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}</math>.</li> </ol>	2
---	--	---	--	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing	<b>The staffing was not in place as per minimum standards and staff list</b> - obtained from HRM Division (attendance registers, appraisal reports, TPC minutes)	0
---	--	--	--	---

Measure

standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

In Rukungiri Municipal LG , there was inadequate staffing in place as per minimum standards and staff list at LLGs as per the three sampled LLGs of Southern Division, Western Division, and Eastern Division.

At Southern Division with staff strength of 14 out of a staff establishment ceiling of 24, the staff included:

1. Kobutungu Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk
2. Kanyesigye Enid, Senior Community Development Officer
3. Mugisha Francis, Treasurer
4. Kanyagyeyo Laban, Assistant Agricultural Officer
5. Omuntu Zadock, Principal Town Agent
6. Kwetegyeka Jimmy, Principal Town Agent
7. Akankunda Annet, Principal Town Agent
8. Muhwezi Joam, Principal Town Agent
9. Kamugabirwe Miachael, Law Enforcement Assistant
10. Kiconco Shallon, Health Assistant
11. Musimenta Melia, Health Assistant
12. Byaruhanga Moses, Assistant Treasurer
13. Musinguzi Fred, Office Attendant
14. Natukunda Eva, Pool Stenographer

Some of the staff that were substantively deployed at Western Division, with a staff strength of 15 against a staff establishment ceiling of 24, were:

1. Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk
2. Mugisha Francis, Treasurer
3. Mbabazi Juliet, Assistant Town Clerk
4. Tusingwire Christine, Assistant Treasurer
5. Bananukire Lawrence, Community Development officer
6. Natukunda Mary, health Assistant
7. Macuumu Leonard, law Enforcement Officer
8. Asimwe Bruce, Office Attendant
9. Arinaitwe Earnest, Pool Stenographer
10. Kiiza Asan, Principal Town Agent
11. Mujurizi Cosma, Principal Town Agent
12. Turyagyenda Frank, Principal Town Agent
13. Musimenta Happiness, Principal Town Agent
14. Byaruhanga Julius, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
15. Biafura Francis, Porter

At Eastern Division, with a staff strength of 14 out of a staff establishment of 24, some of the staff substantively deployed were:

1. Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Town Clerk
2. Jong Twabs Vicent, Assistant Town Clerk
3. Sunday Kenneth, Community Development Officer
4. Ainembabazi Elizabeth, Treasurer
5. Mugisha Herbert, Senior Accounts Assistant
6. Ndyabahika Edward, Health Assistant
7. Kukunda Annet, Principal Town Agent
8. Mutungi Moses, Principal Town Agent
9. Ampaire Eunice, Principal Town Agent
10. Karungi Edicus, Law Enforcement Officer
11. Twongyeirwe Innocent, Office Attendant
12. Twesigye Kereth, Principal Town Agent
13. Tugume Denes, Assistant Veterinary Officer
14. Mubangizi Donozio, Askari

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded investments including one (01) infrastructure project in FY2022/2023. For the one (01) DDEG infrastructure project of FY2022/2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000</li> </ul> <p>The solar street lights project was site visited during the assessment and it was established that the actual level of completion was as reported.</p>	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>	<p>There was <b>evidence that the Rukungiri MLG conducted</b> a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise. The assessment team sampled two LLGs and found that the LG undertook credible assessment. All two sampled Local Level Governments (LLGs) exhibited a deviation within the recommended range of +/- 10%, as outlined below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Western Division:</b>The district internal assessment awarded a score of 78%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 74%. This indicates a deviation of only -4%</li> <li>2. <b>Southern Division:</b>The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 82%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 91%. This indicates a deviation of only +9%.</li> </ol>	4
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the Municipality had developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p>	0

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	<b>There was no evidence</b> to show that the Municipality had implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY.	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the LG had consolidated and submitted staffing requirements for the coming FY to MoPS by September 30th of current FY with copy to MDAs and MoFPED.  The submission was made in a letter dated September 27, 2023 ref.: CR/RMC/156/1 from the Town Clerk to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service titled "Submission of Recruitment Plan for FY 2024/2025 for Rukungiri Municipal Council Vote 729" copied to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development and the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Local Government and received at the Ministry of Public Service on September 29, 2023 by Harriet.	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the Municipality had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI).  Attendance was tracked using a Daily Attendance Register and analyzed in excel and reports submitted to the Town Clerk for action. E.g. A report dated July 11, 2023 titled "Daily Attendance Report for June 2023" showed the staff who were absent or reported for duty beyond 8.30 am for more than five days in the month of June 2023. The list included Ainembabazi Elizabeth who was absent for 5 days, Bagorogoza Augustine was absent for 8 days, and Biafra Francis was absent for 7 days.	<b>2</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:

HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous

FY: Score 1 or else 0

**There was no evidence** that HODs had been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY. The files reviewed showed that the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines. Some of the files included:

1. The Senior Environment Officer, Kushaba Laban Katende was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on **July 08, 2023.**
2. The Senior Agricultural Officer, Kukundakwe Mildred was on official study leave granted by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 032/2023 w.e.f February 01, 2023 for two years.
3. The Principal Commercial Officer, Tayebwa Grace was appraised at her former station, Kamwenge District and the file has not been transferred.
4. The Senior Procurement Officer, Tushabe Emily was appraised by Mugabiirwe Cosmas, Senior Human Resources Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
5. The Assistant Procurement Officer, Natukunda Brighton was appraised by Tushabe Emily, Procurement Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
6. The Senior Human Resource Officer (Administration), Mugabiirwe Cosmas was appraised by Nakiintu Sharifah, Town Clerk on **July 03, 2023.**
7. The Senior Physical Planner, Kenganzi Vastine was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**
8. The Senior Accountant, Mugisha Amos was appraised by Nakiintu Sharifah, Town Clerk on **July 10, 2023.**
9. The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), Mutungi W. K Katirimba **was not appraised.**



Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

**There was evidence** that the LG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time

The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was constituted in a letter of appointment by the Town Clerk to Chairperson and Members dated June 27, 2022 ref.: CR/RMC/155/5 titled "Appointment as Member of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee for FY 2022/2023"

The Committee was comprised of the following:

1. Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk as Chairperson
2. Mugabirwe Cosmas, Senior Human Resource Officer as Secretary
3. Baguma Richard, Ag. Senior Internal Auditor as Member
4. Dr. Ahabwe Davis, Medical Officer of Health as Member
5. Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Town Clerk as Member
6. Agaba Allan, Statistician as Member
7. Katabazi Alfred Mutuuza, Principal Education Officer as Member

In the minutes of a meeting held on December 20, 2022 the Committee under Minute No. 6/R&S/22/23 handled the case of Ndyamuhachi Roland, Town Agent in Kigaga Ward in Southern Division, accused of alcoholism, poor performance and non attendance to duty. On the Committee recommendation, the officer was transferred to the Centre and put under the mentorship of the Deputy Town Clerk. The officer is still on medical leave and has been undergoing alcohol addiction management at Mbarara Regional Referral Hospital.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

Score 1 or else 0

**There was evidence** that the LG had established a Consultative Committee to handle staff grievances.

The Committee was constituted through a letter from the Town Clerk appointing Chairperson and Members, dated June 24, 2022 ref.: CR/RMC/155/5 titled "Appointment as Member of the Consultative Committee for FY 202/2023 - 2024/2025" and was comprised of the following:

1. Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk as Chairperson
2. Mugabiirwe Cosmas, Senior Human Resource Officer as Secretary
3. Nasazi Hilda, Ag. Principal Community Development Officer as Member
4. Mwesigwa Patience, Inspector of Schools as Member
5. Kyobutungu Provia, Assistant Nursing Officer Psychiatry as Member
6. Kushaba Laban Katende, Senior Environment Officer as Member
7. Turyahabwe Edith, Education Officer as Member and UNATU Representative
8. Twamuboine Benson, Deputy Headteacher as Member and UNATU Representative
9. Owomugisha Leviticus, Education Officer as Member and UPSTU Representative
10. Mirembe Caroline, Education Officer as Member and UPSTU Representative
11. Tushemereirwe Gertrude, Assistant Nursing Officer as Member and UNMU Representative

Payroll management  
Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

**There was no evidence** that 100% of staff recruited during the previous FY accessed the payroll not later than 2 months after appointment. Some of the files reviewed showed that new staff accessed the salary payroll as follows:

1. Atusinguza Nuwantungire, Human Resource Officer assumed duty on 5/3/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, 46 days later.
2. Akampumuza Patience, Theatre Assistant assumed duty on 4/6/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 5/22/2023, 46 days later.
3. Aryampa Phionah, Enrolled Nurse assumed duty on 4/6/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, **73 days later.**
4. Atwijukyire Elizabeth, Porter assumed duty on 5/3/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 5/22/2023, 19 days later.
5. Mutungi Henry Simon, Porter assumed duty on 5/3/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 5/22/2023, 19 days later.
6. Ndagano Mercy, Education Officer assumed duty on 4/5/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, **74 days later.**
7. Asiiimwe Yvonne, Education Officer assumed duty on 1/23/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, **146 days later.**
8. Ayebazibwe Julian, Education Officer assumed duty on 1/31/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, **139 days later.**
9. Atuhire Mary Irene, Assistant Education Officer assumed duty on 3/7/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 5/22/2023, **75 days later.**
10. Katushabe Mercy, Education Officer assumed duty on 1/20/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 5/2/2023, **102 days later.**
11. Nasasira Eziborn, Education Officer assumed duty on 4/6/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/19/2023, **73 days later.**

Pension Payroll  
management  
Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

Score 1.

**There was no evidence** that 100% of staff retired during the previous FY accessed the pension payroll not later than 2 months after retirement. The files reviewed showed that staff retired accessed the pension payroll as follows:

1. Kyarimpa Joseline, Enrolled Nurse was retired on 8/15/2022 and accessed the pension payroll on 10/18/2022, **63 days later.**
2. Tumusiime Yeronimu, Askari was retired on 4/1/2023 and accessed the pension payroll on 5/22/2023, 51 days later.
3. Byamugisha Kenneth, Education Assistant II was retired on 12/21/2022 and accessed the pension payroll on 5/2/2023, **131 days later.**
4. Kengoma Edith, Headteacher was retired on 12/26/2022 and accessed the pension payroll on 2/17/2023, 51 days later.
5. Kweyamba Alice, Deputy Headteacher was retired on 9/13/2022 and accessed the pension payroll on 10/18/2022, 35 days later.

## Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10

N23\_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

Annual FY2022/2023 Rukungiri Municipality DDEG budget for LLGs was UGX71,644,000. What was transferred to 3 Divisions (Western, Southern and Eastern) during the FY according to the financial report was UGX71,643,882, which approximates to the amount budgeted, composed as follows:

Quarter one 0

Quarter two UGX23,881,474

Quarter three UGX47,762,408

Total UGX71,643,882

This means **all the funds (100%) were transferred to LLGs in accordance with the requirements of FY2022/2023 budget.**

2

10

N23\_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

b. If the LG did timely warranting/verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).

Score: 2 or else score 0

For RMLG, the DDEG funds were warranted and transferred to LLGs during FY2022/2023 as follows:

For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the TC warranted on 1st August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 1st August 2022 (24 days).

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 13th October 2022 (13 days).

For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 10th February 2022 and the disbursements made on 10th February 2023 (12 days).

**In all the three quarters, the warranting/verification of DDEG grants was effected beyond the 5 days' time limit. This was besides the first quarter disbursement not being sent in time.**

0

N23\_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:

Score 2 or else score 0

**There was no evidence** that the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter.

The DDEG was released in the second quarter and third quarter. The second quarter release was warranted on September 30, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Southern Division on October 13, 2022, 10 days later.

The third quarter release was warranted on December 29, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Southern Division on February 02, 2023, 26 days later.

Second quarter release warranted on September 30, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Eastern Division on October 13, 2022, 10 days later.

Third quarter release was warranted on December 29, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Eastern Division on February 02, 2023, 26 days later.

Second quarter release was warranted on September 30, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Western Division on October 13, 2022, 10 days later.

Third quarter release was warranted on December 29, 2022 and disbursement communicated to Western Division on February 02, 2023, 26 days later.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0

Four reports were provided as evidence of supervision and mentoring activities in LLGs during FY2022/2023.

For Quarter one: A report dated 12/10/2022 on subject "FIRST QUARTER LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022/2023". The monitoring activity which was conducted by the Planner, Internal Auditor, SHRO, Municipal Engineer and Principal Medical Officer focused on mentoring LLGs on four areas - 30% local revenue performance, budget performance, attendance to duty and revenue enhancement. The activity was implemented in the three months of quarter one in the three Divisions of the municipality.

For Quarter two: A report dated 13/01/2023 on subject "SECOND QUARTER LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022/2023". The monitoring activity which was conducted by the Planner, Internal Auditor, SHRO, Municipal Engineer and Principal Medical Officer in the dates of 18th October - Eastern Division, 19th October - Western Division and 20th October - Southern Division. The activity was focused on checking on the preparedness of the Divisions for the infrastructural projects of FY2022/2023 in the MLG. These projects included UDDEG Construction of a

toilet facility at Kyatoko P/S, Construction of Division administration block, Fencing of Karangaro HCII with chain link and Upgrade of Kitimba HCII to HCIII.

For Quarter three: A report dated 22/02/2023 on subject "THIRD QUARTER LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022/2023". The monitoring activity which was conducted by the Planner, Internal Auditor, SHRO, Municipal Engineer and Principal Medical Officer in the dates of 13th January - Eastern Division, 14th January - Western Division and 15th January - Southern Division.. The activity was focused on. Issues where LLGs were mentored included among others report submissions to the Planning Unit, Internal mock assessment, data collection, compilation and internal quality assurance of the LLGPA reports, internal assessment of the performance assessment results, presentation and submission of the LLGPA results and use of LLGPA results to allocate part of UDDEG.

For Quarter four: A report dated 28/04/2023 on subject "FOURTH QUARTER LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022/2023". The monitoring activity which was conducted by the Planner, Internal Auditor, SHRO, Municipal Engineer and Principal Medical Officer focused for the Eastern Division on implementation of capital projects and improvement in revenue collection. For the Western Division the focus was on also on capital projects and revenue collection. For the Southern Division it was focused on implementation of capital projects with specific focus on resource centre construction phase 4 and the 5 stance latrine at Kitazugurukwa P/S. Another key area was local revenue whereby the Division was able to collect 98% of its projected revenue.

**RMLG sufficiently carried out mentoring/monitoring/ supervision activities on the LLGs during FY2022/2023.**

11

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:

Score 2 or else score 0

Four (04) sets of minutes were provided as evidence of presentation of monitoring /supervision reports for the four quarters to, and their discussion in TPC meetings. In addition, attendance registers of these meetings were provided and reviewed.

TPC minutes for a meeting on 17/10/2022 discussed quarter one mentoring and supervision report (Minute No. 19/TPC/2022/23 - PRESENTATION OF THE LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT). The report was presented by the Statistician and key issues included the failure by the LG to pay Divisions their 30%, poor revenue performance across Divisions, poor attendance on duty and inadequate revenue mobilisation strategies. The discussions yielded recommendations including intense revenue mobilisation exercises.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 30/01/2023 discussed quarter two monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. 31/TPC/2022/2023 - QUARTER TWO LLG MONITORING/MENTORING REPORT). The Statistician presented Q2 monitoring/mentoring report which included highlights such as delayed procurement of capital projects in the Divisions, failure to kick start some earmarked projects due to poor revenue inflows, lack of adequate security measures at facilities such as health centres and lack of electricity connection for some of the cost centres.

TPC minutes for a meeting on 20/04/2023 discussed quarter three supervision report (Minute No. 51/RMC/TPC/2022/23 - PRESENTATION OF Q3 MONITORING REPORT). The Statistician presented Q3 monitoring/mentoring report which included highlights such as the preparation for the OPM assessment, Divisions to do mock assessments in preparation for the activity and Divisions encouraged to disseminate manuals to cost centres. Several Division mock assessments were decided to help in preparation for the main assessment.

TPC minutes for a meeting on 25/08/2023 discussed quarter four mentoring and supervision report (Minute No. 06/TPC/2023/2024 - PRESENTATION OF Q4 MONITORING REPORT). The Statistician presented the report and the discussion was focused on failure of contractors to fully implement works as laid down in contract documents, continued construction of ground boreholes when the NWSC is in the municipality. The Planner was tasked with aiding LLGs come up with realistic budgets and the Engineer with intensifying monitoring of capital projects in Divisions.

**There was evidence that the TPC sat and handled monitoring and supervision reports of the MLG during FY2022/2023.**

## Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:  Score 2 or else score 0  <b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b>	The LG had an excel based electronic assets register, formatted as required by the LG Accounting Manual. A manual copy of the register was also availed for this assessment.  The LG's assets were engraved though a few especially recently acquired assets were not.  Fourteen (14) assets were sampled during this assessment including Council land and buildings; computers, equipment, furniture, motor vehicles and road equipment and they were found adequately recorded in the register.  <b>The LG had an asset register, which was updated and its details and content did satisfy the requirements.</b>	2
12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:  Score 1 or else 0	RMLG Board of Survey report for the year 2021/2022 was availed and contained three (03) recommendations:  1. Board off all unserviceable items including 2 computers, 1 laptop, 1 typewriter, 173 iron sheets and ridges, metalling gutters, 10 wooden fascia boards and 54 timber planks, 6 wooden windows, 20 old metalling wheelbarrows, 4 rolling chairs, 1 photocopying machine and 10 medium sized trees estimated at UGX60,000 each.  2. Council to identify a spacious municipal store to accommodate the items  3. Council to ensure that there is a budget for maintenance of assets and vehicles  As on the date of this assessment on 04/12/2023, no asset disposal had taken place in the previous or current FY. Therefore the recommendations have not been acted upon.  <b>The LG did not comply with the requirement.</b>	0



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG has a 6 member Physical Planning Committee. According to the documents provided/ seen, evidence of meetings was provided for this assessment as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting - Meeting held on 22/09/2022 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 13/07/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting - Meeting held on 22/12/2022 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 13/07/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting - Meeting held on 04/01/2023 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 13/07/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting - Meeting held on 20/04/2023 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 13/07/2023.</p> <p><b>The requirement of quarterly physical planning committee meetings and submission of four (04) sets of minutes of the year to MoLHUD was satisfied.</b></p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded investments including one (01) infrastructure project in FY2022/2023.</p> <p>■ Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000</p> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Derived from the LG Development Plan</li> <li>-Consistent with sector guidelines &amp; DDEG objectives</li> <li>-Financially feasible</li> <li>-Having costed project profiles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence of desk appraisal for the one (01) RMLG DDEG project for FY2022/2023 was availed/ seen</b></p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG implemented five (05) DDEG funded investments including one (01) infrastructure project in FY2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>📌 Installation of solar street lights at selected spots UGX30,000,000</li> <li>📌 Renovation of Municipal HQ offices UGX19,000,000</li> </ul> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence was provided concerning field appraisal for the one (01) DDEG infrastructural projects of FY2022/2023.</b></p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG 5 year Development Plan 2020/2021-2024/2025 contained project profiles for the projects of the MLG (ANNEX 1 - PROJECT PROFILES – Pages 187-278). The profiles cover different aspects of the MLG including health centre construction, Infrastructure in divisions, Construction of Primary schools, construction/ rehabilitation of roads and construction of office blocks, etc., for the 5 years.</p> <p>Although the DLG Development Plan had costed project profiles covering different areas of the LG, there was no evidence that during planning for FY2023/2024 the project profiles for the current FY were developed and discussed by the TPC and the discussions accordingly minuted.</p> <p><b>No evidence as provided/seen to the effect that project profiles for the current FY were discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/2024.</b></p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening for environmental and social risks for the construction of a major theatre at Rukungiri HC IV was carried out on 28/8/23, signed and stamped by SEO and PCDO, however desk and field appraisals were not prepared.</li> </ul>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY (2023/24) to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan dated 2/8/2023 with Ref. No. CR/MRC/105. These include:  1. Renovation of Staff House at Nyakibale B P/S in Eastern Division; Budgeted Cost is UGX 66,000,000/= 2. Installation of HEP in Government Premises; Budgeted Cost is UGX 6,000,000/= 3. Construction of a 2-stance Lined Pit Latrine at Western Division Offices; Budgeted Cost is UGX 16,000,000/=	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. The procurement plan that incorporated all DDEG projects to be implemented in FY 2023/24 was approved as detailed below:  <b>Approval of the procurement and disposal plan of FY 2023/24 (comprising of all DDEG projects)</b> – approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 89/MCC/2022/2023 in a meeting held on 8/5/2023.  The DDEG projects incorporated in the procurement plan for the current FY (2023/24) are listed below:  1. Renovation of Staff House at Nyakibale B P/S in Eastern Division; 2. Installation of HEP in Government Premises; 3. Construction of a 2-stance Lined Pit Latrine at Western Division Offices;	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	There was NO evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council had properly established the Project Implementation team(s) as per guidelines.  Through memo dated 19/7/2022, there was a joint appointment from CAO to the: Senior Environment Officer, Labour Officer and PCDO. However, there were no appointments from CAO to the: Project, Manager, Contract Manager and Clerk of Works.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer.</p> <p>There was only one DDEG project implemented in the FY (2022/23) as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Supply and Installation of 3No. solar powered street lights-</b> The lights were successfully installed and are functional.</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY (2022/23).</p> <p>The technical team comprised of the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO that jointly inspected the environment and social aspects. However, there was no joint inspection report by the ME present during the time of assessment.</p> <p>The following project was sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Supply and installation of 3No. solar powered street lights-</b> A joint inspection was done by the Senior Environment Officer and the PCDO on 20/2/2023 and an Environment and Social screening report was prepared and signed. An Environment and Social monitoring report dated 28/3/2023 was prepared and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO.</li> </ol>	0

13

Procurement, contract management/execution  
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors timely for example;

1. **Completion of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV-RKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006.** The contract was signed on 16/3/2023. The Town Clerk approved the contractor's claim after verification of the works and an inspection report dated 25/5/2023 after inspection of the completed works. Practical project completion was on 6/6/2023 and the certificate of payment was then initiated on 6/6/2023. An environment and social certificate was also attached to the payment certificate and signed by the Principal Environment Officer and PCDO.
2. **Construction of 4 stance VIP Latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS- RUK/WRKS/2022/2023/00003.** The contract was signed on 21/3/2023. The Town Clerk approved the contractor's claim after verification of the works and an inspection report dated 28/6/2023 after inspection of the completed works. Practical project completion was on 28/6/2023 and the certificate of payment was then initiated on 28/6/2023. An environment and social certificate was also attached to the payment certificate and signed by the Principal Environment Officer and PCDO.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Complete procurement files in place for the all projects/contracts; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or minutes. These included</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Completion of minor theater at Rukungiri HCIV-RKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006;</b> The procurement file was found complete with the following details; Initiated by MHO on 4/1/2023; Contracts committee approved method of procurement, bidding documents and the costs, evaluation committee members and shortlisted companies were approved. It was pinned on notice board on 1/2/2023; Invitation letters for bid completion were sent on 1/2/2023; Issuance and receipt of bid documents up to 14/2/2023; Evaluation committee members sat on 14/2/2023, report dated 15/2/2023 recommending Isheba Contractors Ltd to be awarded the tender at UGX 46,696,588/=; Report submitted to the CC on 2/3/2023; Approved report and best evaluated bidder were prepared and displayed on the notice board on 3/3 to 16/3/2023; Letter of bid acceptance was prepared on 16/3/2023; Acceptance letter was issued by the bidder on 16/3/2023; Contract agreement was signed on 16/3/2023.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS- RUK/WRKS/2022/2023/00003;</b> The procurement file was found complete with the following details; Procurement request was initiated on 22/12/2022 by the Education user department; The CC sat on 6/01/2023 and approved the procurement method, the bidding document, cost of bidding documents and the evaluation committee members; The tender was advertised in the New Vision on 26/01/2023; Issuing and receiving bid documents by 17/2/2023; Bids opened on 17/2/2023; Invitation for evaluation committee meeting on 21/2/2023; Bid evaluation report recommended Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Ltd to be awarded the contract; Report submitted to contracts committee on 2/3/2023 for approval; Best evaluated bidder pinned on notice board on 3/3/2023 and removed on 16/3/2023; Letter of bid acceptance issued to the best evaluated bidder on 16/03/2023; Acceptance by bidder dated 21/3/2023 and contract signed on 21/3/2023.</li> </ol>
---	--	--

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the District/Municipality had i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In a letter Ref CR/RMC/159/3, dated 28/8/2023, the Town Clerk Mr, Robert Nuwamanya, appointed Mr Karenzi Paul as the focal point person of grievance committee redress for Rukungiri Municipality. copied to RDC, Chairman LC V, Mayor, all heads of departments. In another letter of Ref No CR/RMC159/4, dated 23/12/2022, the CAO appointed the a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) of the following members</li> <li>1. Mr Karenzi Paul SATC West Division Chairperon</li> <li>2. Mr. Tibigambwa Dickson DCDO member</li> <li>3. Mr. Wensi Justus SEO member</li> <li>4. Mr. Byamukama Vincent SAEO member</li> <li>5. Ms. Tushabe Emily DPO member</li> </ol>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> LG had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices</p> <p>The LG had a log book in place where complaints were recorded, with columns; i.e. date, name of the complainant, sex, contact, nature of grievance, title of officer recording the grievance, action taken, date for resolving the grievance and feedback. a public display showing the grievance handling mechanism was displayed dated 19/7/22</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> that the Municipality had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress</p>	0
		<p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>		

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG Development Plan III and Annual Workplan and budget 2023/2024 encompass aspects of environment, social and climate change interventions as most are cross cutting and embedded throughout the plans. Specific examples of the sections where environment, social and climate change interventions are highlighted include:</p> <p>In the RMLG DDP, there are interventions incorporated on Pages 116-121: Adapted Programme 3 – Water, Climate Change and Environmental Management.</p> <p>Social Interventions: Page 146-149: Adapted Program 2 – Community Mobilisation and Mindset Change – Table.</p> <p>Goal 13 (page 70) – Climate action: “Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts by regulating emissions and promoting development in renewable energy”</p> <p>Approved budget FY2023/2024:</p> <p>For FY2023/2024, there is an approved budget for Natural Resources, Environment, Climate Change, Land and Water of UGX58,000,000 (page 37).</p> <p>Program 06 – Natural resources, environment, climate change, land and water</p> <p>Sub Programme 01 – Environment and natural resources management.</p> <p>Community mobilisation and mindset change budget caters for social issues - FY2023/2024 budget UGX32,646,000 (page 38).</p> <p>Environment and social safeguards.</p> <p><b>Environmental, social and climate change interventions were integrated into RMLG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets.</b></p>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p><b>Evidence was provided/seen concerning dissemination to LLGs of the enhanced DDEG guidelines</b> (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management.</p> <p>The DDEG guidelines copies were disseminated by distributing them to LLG staff and this was evidenced by the LLG staff signing for the copies. Two sheets were provided as evidence of the dissemination, one dated 15/04/2022 and another 10/03/2023 with signatures of the three Senior Assistant Town Clerks, Education and Health MLG heads of department acknowledging receipt.</p>



15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY  1. A costed ESMP for the supply and installation of 3 No solar powered street lights <b>Proc Ref No RUKU/778/WRKS/21-22/00004</b> was prepared on 22/2/23, signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO. This ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents under item 10 for environmental mitigation measures at cost of Ugx 250,000	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There <b>was no evidence</b> for examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable since the project used the gazetted road reserve	<b>1</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports  1. Support supervision and monitoring for the supply and installation of 3No solar powered street lights was carried out on 21/3/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 21/3/23, the project the started on 20/2/23 and ended 20/2/23	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects  1. E&S compliance Certification forms for the supply and installation of 3No solar powered street lights was carried out on 29/3/23, payments were made on 29/3/23	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	According to KMGL FY2022/2023 financial report, the LG runs the following bank accounts:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>📄 Treasury single account</li> <li>📄 General Fund account</li> <li>📄 YLP recovery account</li> <li>📄 UWEP recovery account</li> <li>📄 RMC property tax account</li> <li>📄 Rukungiri MC Imprest account</li> </ul> <p>The responsibility of reconciliation of the TSA is said to have been taken back to MoFPED.</p> <p>As on the date of this assessment on 05/12/2023, all the other bank accounts were reconciled to 30/11/2023.</p> <p><b>The MLG's bank accounts were reconciled as required under this manual.</b></p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p><b>The four quarterly reports of FY 2022/2023 were produced</b> by the RMLG Internal Audit department.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 31/10/2022, Quarter 2 dated 31/01/2023, Quarter 3 dated 28/04/2023 and Quarter 4 dated 31/07/2023.</p> <p>There was evidence that the reports were submitted to the Speaker, TC, RDC, Mayor, MoLG, LGPAC and Auditor General through dated acknowledgement signatures of the recipients on a copy of the reports and the audit submission memos.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The four RMLG quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/2023 did contain a section for follow-up on the status of implementation of prior audit findings/ recommendations.</p> <p>The Internal Audit or followed up by highlighting the status of previous queries in all the four quarterly reports. The reports were delivered to the recipients including the LGPAC on 31/10/2022, quarter two on 31/01/2023, quarter three on 28/04/2023 and quarter four on 31/07/2023. Internal audit prior period findings were followed up through the reports when they were presented in PAC.</p> <p><b>We conclude that the LG has made effort to have a documented mechanism for follow-up of previous internal audit findings.</b></p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RMLG records show that the four quarterly internal audit reports of FY2022/2023 were received by TC, Council and DPAC through witness of the acknowledgement signatures of the recipients on audit submission memos.</p> <p>According to the PAC reports availed/seen, the four quarterly internal audit reports were all discussed by the DPAC.</p> <p>PAC report dated 02/02/2023 (Ref. RUK: LGPAC/225/01/IA) shows evidence of discussion of Quarter one internal audit report.</p> <p>PAC report dated 27/02/2023 (Ref. RUK: LGPAC/225/02/IA) shows evidence of discussion of Quarter two internal audit report.</p> <p>PAC report dated 02/02/2023 (Ref. RUK: LGPAC/225/03/IA) shows evidence of discussion of Quarter three internal audit report.</p> <p><b>Internal audit reports of RMLG were presented to the LGPAC and PAC sufficiently discussed and took actions on them.</b></p>	1

## Local Revenues

18	LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.	Rukungiri MLG OSR budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX786,380,383. What was realised according to the financial report was UGX787,380,383.  <b>This was 100.1% of what was budgeted and falls within the +/-10% range.</b>	<b>2</b>
19	The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.	a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY  • If more than 10 %: score 2.  • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.  • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.	According to the financial reports, Rukungiri MLG OSR performance for FY 2021/2022 was UGX668,983,017. Performance for FY 2022/2023 was UGX787,380,383. This was an increase in revenue, which was UGX118,397,366 i.e. 17.6%.  There was an increase of 17.6% in OSR performance between FY2021/2022 and FY2022/2023.  <b>The increase was &gt;10%.</b>	<b>2</b>
20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	During the year ended 2022/2023, what was collected by RMLG as OSR was UGX787,380,383.  What was remitted to the 3 divisions (Southern, Western and Eastern) during the FY was UGX525,306,480 itemized as follows:  Western Division UGX223,613,770  Southern Division UGX123,557,865  Eastern Division UGX178,134,845  TOTAL UGX525,306,480  This made 66.7%. This was above the 50% threshold.  <b>The MLG did comply with the 50% OSR remittance requirement to LLGs.</b>	<b>2</b>

## Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Procurement Plan and the Awarded Contracts were duly published/displayed on the Rukungiri Municipal Council Procurement Notice board for Public View.</p> <p>Examples of Projects are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proc. RUK/WRKS/2022/2023/00003;</b> <b>Ref.</b> Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Ltd; for the construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS; Display date was 3/3/2023 and Removal date was on 16/3/2023.</li> <li>2. <b>Proc. RUK778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006;</b> <b>Ref.</b> Isheba contractors Ltd; for the Completion of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV; Display date was 3/3/2023 and Removal date was on 16/3/2023.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">•</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG's performance assessment results for FY2021/2022 were disseminated by displaying them on the MLG noticeboard.</p> <p>During this assessment, the results were found on the MLG noticeboard which could be easily accessed by the staff and the general public.</p> <p>The results were also disseminated through an extended TPC which sat on 24/04/2023 attended by 23 members from the MLG and the Divisions, as per minute (52/RMC/TPC/2022/23 - PRESENTATION OF OPM ASSESSMENT RESULTS). In this meeting the Statistician presented the summary report of the OPM assessment conducted in December 2022 and the scores for the different functions in the MLG. It was observed that priority should be put on recruitment since it determines minimum conditions.</p> <p><b>The requirement of publishing the performance assessment results of the previous year was satisfied.</b></p>	2

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>A report dated 17/02/2023 was provided as evidence for the Baraza. The meeting took place in Eastern Division with a focus on "Community Meeting to Discuss on Accomplishments and Receive Community Issues for Planning and Budgeting". The meeting took place in the Wards of Eastern Division on 17/02/2023 in the Wards of Rwentondo, Kyatuko, Kagashe, Northern B. The total estimated number of attendance was as: Northern B - 60 people, Rwentondo - 41 people Kagashe - 42 people.</p> <p>Key issues of the engagement included: Government programs such as UWEP groups, YLP groups, PWDs in development, SEGUP (Special Enterprise Grant in Older Persons), PDM, Roads construction and repair, Government allocations to schools and progress in performance status of different schools, Health facilities and drug distribution and workers. Also discussed were child abuse and protection, local revenue, GBV and insecurity.</p> <p>All heads of departments were involved. Audience was given to the local community to ask questions.</p> <p>Barazas were also held in Western from 9th March 2023 and ended on 30th March 2023. For the Southern Division baraza was held with the State Minister from OPM in Rukungiri stadium on 20th February 2023.</p> <p><b>The MC held a baraza, interacted with the public, received feedback and updated on performance in FY2022/2023.</b></p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Information on RMLG i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal was publicised by displaying it on the notice board.</p> <p>On the date of this assessment on 23/11/2023, the notice board was checked and displayed on it were schedules on RMLG approved revenue rates 2022/2023 for the different categories of activities, the procedures for collection and the procedures for appeal in case any individual is dissatisfied with the process.</p> <p><b>The LG met the requirement.</b></p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

The MLG (TC) did not prepare a report on actions taken on IGG recommendations of the previous financial year FY2022/2023.

The MLG did not avail an IGG file because information was said to be kept variously in people's files and other places, but it was acknowledged that there were IGG issues including follow-ups on personnel who are on current IGG related interdictions, among others.

**The LG did not prepare a report on the implementation status of IGG issues in the LG and the report was discussed by Council.**

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2020 and 2022 and calculated the percentage improvement in performance as indicated below:</p> <p>☞ 1,108 out of 1,132 (97.8%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:482, Div2:557 &amp; Div3:69=1,108). This excludes absentees (1,138-6=1,132).</p> <p>☞ 1,154 out 1,180 (97.7%) pupils who sat PLE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:529, Div2:549 &amp; Div3:76=1,180). This excludes absentees (1,194-14=1,180)</p> <p>Thus, a percentage decrease between years of -0.1% (No improvement), the score is 0.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2020 and 2022 for USE schools and calculated the percentage improvement in performance as indicated below.</p> <p>☞ 177 out of 307 (57.6%) students who sat UCE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:20, Div2:86 &amp; Div3:71=177). This excludes absentees (0)</p> <p>☞ 133 out 236 (56.3%) students who sat UCE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:17, Div2:51 &amp; Div3:65=133). This excludes absentees (0)</p> <p>Thus, a performance decrease of -1.3%, between the years (No improvement), the score is 0.</p>	0



2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>The performance of RMLG in its LLG Education assessment was 70% in FY2021/2022 and 73% in FY2022/2023, meaning an increase of 3%. This increase was between 1 and 5%.</p>	1
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant was used on eligible capital invest activities as per the planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for LGs for the education sector FY 2023-2024 ( ) page (17).</p> <p>The review of the 2022-2023_ Rukuungiri MC-Q4 Report- Vote _924 (page 19), indicated that Ugx.107,207,000 was budgeted of which Ugx.102,000,000 was spent on capital investments representing 95.3% of budget performance.</p> <p>Specific details below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 4-stance VIP latrine with urinal at Kitazigurukwa PS, 4-stance VIP latrine with urinal at Ruruku PS, and 2-Stance latrine at Kagunda Seed school and procurement of 75 (3-seater twin desks at a total of Ugx.102,000,000.</li> </ul> <p>The expenditure was compliant with sector guidelines which require that at least 95% of the development grant should be spent on capital investments. The score is 2.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0	RMLG Education had one (01) certified project in FY2022/2023 and it was used to check certification and timeliness of effecting payments for infrastructural projects.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Payment to Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Ltd for construction of 4 stance latrines with urinals at Kitaziguruka P/S, Ruruku P/S and Kagunga Seed School (UGX68,534,903) - Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 06/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023.	
			<b>Certification for the Education infrastructural project was done as per the requirements.</b>	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	There is evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		From the DE and DEO's offices, there was only one works contract in the previous FY (2022/23) sampled as listed below; and the Engineer's estimate (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Price are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages; $[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$ :	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Ruruku P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS-RUK/WRKS/2022/2023/00003.</b> The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 88,851,500/= and the Contract Sum/Price (B) was 72,980,851/=. The Variation was at 17.86%.</li> </ol>	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	Rukungiri Municipal Council did not have a project on the construction of the seed secondary school and therefore the requirement of the indicator (that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY). Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% score 2</li> <li>Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>		

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	There was evidence that the LG had recruited primary school teachers to fill <b>55.76%</b> of the staff establishment structure.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	The staff establishment structure for primary school teachers obtained from HRM indicated a ceiling of <b>373</b> positions for primary school teachers of which <b>208</b> were filled computing to a percentage of <b>55.76%</b> .	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The education department had consolidated schools' asset registers for FY 2021/22 dated 12 July 2021 and FY2022/2023 dated 14 July 2022 covering all the 15 UPE schools and USE schools (2).	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The review of the consolidated asset register for FY 2021/22 and 2022/23 indicated that none of the 15 UPE schools met all the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines; requirement for permanent accommodation for at least four (4) teachers, classroom: pupil ratio of 53, Latrine stance: pupil ratio of 1:40 and desk: pupil ratio of 1:3.</p> <p>On the other hand none of the two (2) USE schools met minimum service delivery standards. The score is 0.</p>	

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.	a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.	The primary teacher deployment list 2023 obtained from PEO's office dated 14 November 2023 had a total of (202) teachers in post covering all the (15) UPE schools in Rukungiri Municipal Council.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Verification was done in the three (3) sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment list from the PEO's office.</p> <p>□ The number of teachers (11) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (11) in Kahororo primary school, Western Division.</p>	
			The names of teachers verified:	
			1. Kabaireho John	
			2. Arinaitwe Frankline	
			3. Musinguzi Naphtal	
			4. Tumwijukye Demiano	
			5. Matsiko Onesmus	

6. Kobusingye Mary
7. Asiiimwe Patience
8. Atwongyeirwe Betty
9. Owembabazi Peal
10. Akankunda Ruth
11. Abasiimire Jolly

□ The number of teachers (31) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (31) in Nyakibale Boarding primary school, Eastern Division.

The names of teachers verified:

1. Mugisha Bruno
2. Muhwezi B Lawrence
3. Bashasha Dinah
4. Byaruhanga Bernard
5. Arieitwe Vincent
6. Nagba Molline
7. Natukunda Annet
8. Asiiimwe Boaz
9. Twongyeirwe Annah
10. Tumuhimbise Adrian
11. Tumwekwatse Abel
12. Twikirize Annet
13. Turyatemba J Bosco
14. Muhwezi Wycliffee
15. Tumwesigye Robert
16. Owembabazi Provia
17. Natukunda Jane
18. Tumubeine Proudence
19. Mussiime Shallon
20. Tumuramyie Alex
21. Akankunda Elizabeth
22. Tugume Andrew
23. Takamanya Justus
24. Akatusasira Isabella
25. Ahimbisa Praise
26. Biryabarema Justus
27. Ainembabazi Ronnet

28. Twinamatsiko Abel
29. Ahimbisibwe Martial
30. Atuhaire Patinece
31. Byamukama Joseph

□ The number of teachers (12) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (12) in Rukungiri Primary school, Southern Division

The names of teachers verified:

1. Kiconco Siragi
2. Mugasho Prince
3. Katwesigye Denis
4. Ashaba Ruth
5. Tushemereirwe Gertrude
6. Ahimbisibwe Scovia
7. Naukunda Florah
8. Bakironda Patrick
9. Kanyehamye Bonday
10. Nyebaza Sania
11. Anyesiga Happy Aminah
12. Tusingwire Amiidah

It was verified that the total number of teachers as indicated on the PEO's teacher deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff lists in all the three (3) sampled UPE schools as indicated above. Therefore, the information on deployment list for teachers was 100% accurate. The score is 2.

Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

There was no evidence that the information on the LG education departmental consolidated schools' asset register for FY 2022/23 and school asset registers of the sampled 03 UPE schools was in place as per the consolidated asset register. Specific details as indicted below:

☐ Kahororo PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (07) classrooms, (04) latrine stances, (159) desks and teacher accommodation (00), while the school asset register had (08) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (162) desks and teacher accommodation (00). Information was not consistent.

☐ Nyakibale Boarding PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (17) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (320) desks and teacher accommodation (04), while the school asset register had (17) classrooms, (32) latrine stances, (340) desks and teacher accommodation (10). Information was not consistent

☐ Rukungiri PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (09) classrooms, (03) latrine stances, (84) desks and teacher accommodation (00), while the school asset register had (09) classrooms, (12) latrine stances, (84) desks and teacher accommodation (00). Information was not consistent.

Based on the above, information was not 100% accurate; the score is 0.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4
- Between 80 - 99% score: 2
- Below 80% score 0

There was evidence of compliance to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.

All the 15 (100%) UPE schools submitted annual school reports and budgets to PEO by 30 January 2023. The review of submitted annual school reports on file revealed that all reports were compiled as per the reporting formats for annual school reports and budgets provided in the sector guidelines (Budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools, pages 21-25).

The review of the sampled annual school reports on file showed that the annual school reports and budgets were duly signed by head teachers and chairpersons of school management committees (SMCs) and submitted by 30 January 2023; Kahororo PS-3/1/23, Kashozi PS-4/1/23, Kyatoko PS-10/1/23, Kiyaga PS-16/1/23, Rukondo PS-4/1/23, Kakondoma PS-19/12/22, Katwekamme PS-5/1/23, Rukungiri PS-13/1/23 and Town Council PS-5/123 among others,

Information obtained from the three (3) sampled UPE schools confirmed that;

☐ Kahororo PS submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 3 January 2023

☐ Nyakibale PS: Submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 18 January 2023

☐ Rukungiri PS: Submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 13 January 2023

As indicated above, all the three sampled UPE schools had copies of duly signed annual school reports and budgets on file hence compliant with the requirement of the indicator in the LGMSD manual (September 2020)

The score is 4.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30- 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

There was evidence that education department supported all the 15 (100%) UPE schools to prepare and implement the school improvement plans (SIPs) in line with inspection recommendations.

The review of school files in PEO's office revealed that all the 15 UPE schools submitted their SIPs as part of the annual school reports and budgets for calendar year 2022.

We noted a report on training of head teachers on development of school improvement plans (SIPs) dated 14 February 2022. The training was attended by all the head teachers of the 15 UPE schools. The content of the training included the purpose of SIP, the process of developing the SIP, components of SIP, roles of different stakeholders in the development of SIP and the reporting format of SIP as provided in the sector guidelines.

Verification done in all the three (3) sampled UPE schools revealed that copies of SIPs were displayed on the school notice boards as indicated below:

- Kaharoro PS had a SIP 2023 displayed on school notice board. Planned activities highlighted included scheming and lesson planning, developing learning aids, support supervision, class work assessments/exercises, tests and homework

- Nyakibale Boarding PS: had a SIP for 2023 displayed on school notice board. Performance of pupils in academics was to be addressed by implementing the following activities; regular workshops of teachers to build capacity, regular preparation of schemes and lesson plans and support supervision

- Rukungiri PS: There was evidence of a SIP 2023 displayed on school notice board. Issues to be addressed included teaching and learning, and assessment of pupils. Planned activities included schemes of work done and improved, supervision of teaching/learning, and lesson preparation.

Therefore, the submission of annual school reports with enclosed copies of SIPs stood at 100% hence the score is 4



6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the list of schools from LG performance contract and the EMIS data of schools from MoES. We established that the list of government aided primary schools (15) captured in 2022-2023 Approved Performance contract_729_RUKUNGIRI MC was consistent with the number of schools (15) in excel data sheet (EMIS) for FY 2022/23.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MC budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (09) teachers per school in all the (15) Government aided primary schools as per wage provision. The 2023-2024_Aproved budget estimates Vote: 729_Rukungiri_MC had a total salary budget of UGX1,498,933,000 for (202) primary teachers in all the 15 UPE schools. Eight out of the fifteen UPE schools had substantive head teachers.</p> <p>We noted that, Town Council PS had the lowest number of teachers (09) with total enrolment of (251) pupils. While Nyakibale Boarding PS had the highest number of teachers (31) with total enrolment of 1,259 pupils. The score is 4.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,

Score 3 else score: 0

The primary schools staff deployment list 2023 obtained from the PEO's office and reviewed, indicated that a total of (202) teachers were deployed in (15) UPE schools as per sector guidelines e.g. all the (15) UPE schools had a minimum of (09) teachers per school.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the teacher deployment list 2023 / school staff lists.

☐ The number of teachers (11) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (11) in Kahororo primary school, Western Division.

☐ The number of teachers (31) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (31) in Nyakibale Boarding primary school, Eastern Division.

☐ The number of teachers (12) on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (12) in Rukungiri Primary school, Southern Division

We established that the number of teachers on the PEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on school staff lists in all the (3) sampled UPE schools. This was further confirmed by checking the teachers' attendance books. The score is 3.

3

7

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,

score: 1 else, score: 0

There was evidence that teacher deployment data had been displayed on school notice boards in all the 03 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

☐ Kahororo PS (Western Division) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (11) teachers i.e. Male (5) and Female (6)

☐ Nyakibale Boarding PS (Eastern Division) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (31) teachers i.e. Male (18) and Female (13)

☐ Rukungiri PS (Southern Division) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (12) teachers i.e. Male (5) and Female (7). The score is 1.

1

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

**There was no evidence** that all primary school teachers had been appraised in accordance with the guidelines as all the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines.

Some of the files reviewed included the following:

1. Kiconco Siragi, headteacher Rukungiri Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Kobutungi Evas, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
2. Baheirwe Lydia, headteacher Kitazigurukwa Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Kobutungi Evas, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
3. Kyokusiima Patience, headteacher Kiyaga Primary School in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
4. Tindibwegyi Samson Brown, headteacher Katwekamwe Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
5. Tumushangye Bernard, headteacher Kinyasano Boarding Primary School in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
6. Natweta Edith, headteacher Kahororo Primary School in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
7. Musinguzi Naphtal, headteacher Town Council Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
8. Arinaitwe Silver, headteacher Ruruku Primary School in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
9. Ahumuza Samuel Beesimbire, headteacher Kyatoko Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
10. Byarugaba Henry, headteacher Nyakilabe Lower Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Kobutungi Evas, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
11. Mugisha Bruno, headteacher Nyakilabe Boarding Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
12. Kyomuhendo Peace, headteacher Nyabihinga Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
13. Atwerembeire Peter Clever, headteacher Kashozi Primary School in Eastern Division was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**
14. Twamubweine Benson, headteacher Rukondo Primary School in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Secretary on **February 27, 2023.**

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that all secondary school teachers had been appraised by the deputy Town Clerk or Chairperson of the Board as no appraisal files were presented for review.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that all LG staff in the Education department had been appraised against their performance plans in accordance with the guidelines as all the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines. The files reviewed indicated the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Principal Education Officer, Katabazi Alfred Mutuza was appraised by Nakintu Sharifar, Town Clerk on <b>July 13, 2023.</b></li> <li>2. The Senior Inspector of Schools, Musiimenta Juliet was appraised by Katabazi Alfred Mutuza, Principal Education Officer on <b>July 20, 2023.</b></li> <li>3. The Inspector of Schools, Mwesigwa Patience was appraised by Katabazi Alfred Mutuza, Principal Education Officer on <b>July 20, 2023.</b></li> </ol>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the education departmental capacity building plan FY 2022/23. The plan was signed by PEO and dated 28 June 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Key training areas included among others</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Financial management and accountability</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring, inspection and counselling</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Community involvement in education (CIE)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Roles and responsibilities of SMC and BOG</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Resource mobilisation in schools to supplement government in providing safe schools</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Pedagogical training (CPD) on effective teaching and learning to have better grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Head teachers role as first school inspectors</li> </ul>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p>	<p>We noted from the PEO, that the education department was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data in PBS for 2022_2023 Approved Performance Contract 729_Rukungiri MC which was submitted to MoFPED.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/ revisions of school lists and enrolment data submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Rukungiri MC.</p>	
			<p>The score is 2</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the approved budget estimates FY 2022-2023- Vote: 729-Rukungiri MC and established that Ugx.18,936,00 was budgeted for Inspection and monitoring functions in line with MoES guidelines -page 17.</p>	
			<p>The score is 2.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG timeliness of warranting schools' capitation grants for the school (calendar) year in FY2022/2023 and FY2023/2024 was tested in the three terms as follows:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>Term1 (which was quarter 3 FY2022/2023) cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 10th February 2023 and the disbursements made on 10th February 2023 (12 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 2 (which was quarter 4 FY2022/2023), MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2023 and the TC warranted on 26th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 27th April 2023 (20 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 3 (which was quarter 1 FY2023/2024), the MoFPED circular is dated 6th July 2023, the TC warranted on 17th July 2023 and the funds were transferred on 26th July 2023 (11 days).</p>	
			<p><b>In all the three cases, the 5 days' time limit for warranting was not met.</b></p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation</p>	<p>There was no evidence that PEO had communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED as indicated below:</p>	0

funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0

QTR3 Expenditure limits FY 2022/23 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 29 December 2022. The display of capitation releases amounting to Ugx.127,444,764 for Term I 2023 on LG notice board was not dated hence unable to certain whether it was done within three working days of release from MoFPED.

Information on invoicing of capitation grant to schools was not availed at the time of the assessment.

QTR4 Expenditure limits FY 2022/23 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 6 April 2023. The display of capitation releases amounting to Ugx.127,444,769 for Term II 2023 on LG notice board was not dated hence unable to certain whether it was done within three working days of release from MoFPED.

Information on invoicing of capitation grant to schools was not availed at the time of the assessment.

QTR 1 Expenditure limits FY 2023/24 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 6 July 2023. There was no evidence of display on the LG notice board capitation releases for Term III 2023.

Verification done in the sampled (3) UPE schools revealed that there was evidence of display of capitation releases on school notice boards in all the 3 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

Kahororo PS: The display contained capitation releases for;

□ Q3 of FY 2022/23 (term I 2023), Ugx.2,513,833 dated 3 February 2023

□ Q4 of FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.2,573,833 dated 26 May 2023

□ Q1 of FY 2023/24 (term III 2023), Ugx.2,998,200 dated 3 August 2023

Nyakibale Boarding PS: The display indicated UPE funds releases for;

□ Q3 FY2022/3 (term I 2023), Ugx. 6,210,667 dated 7 February 2023

□ Q4 FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.6,210,667 dated 25 May 2023

□ Q1 FY 2023/4 (term III 2023), Ugx.7,650,800 dated 3 August 2023

Rukungiri PS: The display indicated UPE funds releases for;

□ Q3 FY2022/3 (term I 2023), Ugx. 2,277,000 dated 3 February 2023

□ Q4 FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.2,277,000 dated 5 May 2023

□ Q1 FY 2023/4 (term III 2023), Ugx.2,359,600 dated 3 August 2023

The PEO's communication/publicization of capitation releases was not dated and hence unable to establish whether it was done within the three working days of release from MoFPED for all the three quarters as indicated above. The score is 0.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the education department prepared the inspection annual work plan for FY 2022/23 dated 28 July 2022. The work plan was submitted to DES on 21 June 2023 .</p> <p>Key activities included evaluation of head teachers' attendance regarding maintenance of school infrastructure, school support supervision and monitoring of BRMS for schools and institutions, monitor head teachers, teachers and pupils' attendance rate for effective learning and teaching, carryout school inspection and monitoring, monitor community involvement in education and holding community radio programmes among others</p> <p>Minutes of planning meetings for support supervision to schools dated 16 September 2022 for term III 2022, 3 February 2023 for term 1 2023 and 26 May 2023 for term II 2023 were on file. During the meetings, studying the tool to be used and allocation of schools to inspectors were discussed under the following minutes (Min.22/2022), Min.06/2023 and Min.11/2023) respectively.</p> <p>The score is 2.</p>	<b>2</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of three (3) school inspection reports as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ School Inspection Report Term III of 2022 dated 16 December 2022. Conducted from October to December 2022 by two inspectors. The total of 104 education institutions was inspected including all the 15 UPE schools representing 100%.</li> <li>☐ E-Primary School Inspection report for Term I of 2023, dated 31 May 2023. The inspection covered all the 15 UPE schools representing 100%.</li> <li>☐ E-Primary school inspection report for Term II of 2023 dated 5 September 2023. A total of 15 UPE schools were inspected representing 100%.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above, the percentage of UPE schools inspected stood at 100%, the score are 2.</p>	<b>2</b>

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that all the three inspection reports were presented and discussed during departmental staff meetings. Specific details below:

☐ Minutes of departmental meeting held on 3 February 2023. The meeting discussed the inspection findings for Term III 2022 under Min.3/2022. Key issues included Lack of Sis in some schools (Kashozi PS & Kaknkoma PS), school disciplinary committees' not functional, incomplete lesson plans, and classroom environment not conducive in some schools (Kashozi, Nyabihinga, Kyatoko, Town council and Rukungiri). Intensification of follow ups on implementation of inspection recommendations and getting feedbacks from head teachers were recommended.

☐ Minutes of departmental meeting held on 26 May 2023. The meeting discussed the inspection findings for Term I 2023 under Min.09/2023. Inadequate supervision of teachers and lack of displayed annual budgets and expenditures on the notice boards were reported and discussed.

☐ We noted that during the head teachers' meeting with education department officials held on 7 March 2023, inspection findings were disseminated. Issues presented and discussed included some methods used to improve academics are bring other vices-night preps leading to defilement of learners along the way home, use of phones by learners, coaching increasing early girl pregnancy. It was recommended that teachers should act as role model, and monitoring of the use of mobile phones in schools.

Verification was done at school level through the review of inspection files in the (3) sampled UPE schools, and established that:

☐ Kahororo PS in Western Division; had evidence of (2) feedback inspection report dated 14 April 2023 and 8 August 2023 conducted by inspectors of schools.

☐ Nyakibale PS in Eastern Division; had evidence of (4) feedback inspection reports on file dated 22/January 2023, 15 March 2023, 31 July 2023 and 8 August 2023. Conducted by the two municipal inspectors of schools.

☐ Rukungiri PS in Southern Division; had evidence of (4) feedback inspection reports on file dated 14 November 2023, 21 July 2023, 10 March 2023 and 16 November 2022. Conducted by the two municipal inspectors of schools.

As above, there was evidence that all the 3 inspection reports for Term III 2022, Term 1 2023 and Term II 2023 were presented and discussed at departmental level. The score is 2.



Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0

There was evidence of submission of three (3) inspection reports to DES as indicated below:

☐ School inspection report for Term 3 of 2022 was submitted to DES on 9 December 2022 (stamped received)

☐ The E-School inspection report for Term 1 of 2023 was submitted online on 31 May 2023 at 12:29:55 by Inspector of schools

☐ The E-School inspection report for Term 2 of 2023 was submitted on-line on 5 September 2023

Verification was done through the review of inspection files in the (3) sampled UPE schools and established that copies of the inspection reports from the previous three terms were left behind as required in all the (3) sampled schools as indicated below;

☐ Kahororo PS in Western Division; had evidence of (2) feedback inspection report dated 14 April 2023 and 8 August 2023 conducted by inspectors of schools.

☐ Nyakibale PS in Eastern Division; had evidence of (4) feedback inspection reports on file dated 22/January 2023, 15 March 2023, 31 July 2023 and 8 August 2023. Conducted by the two municipal inspectors of schools.

☐ Rukungiri PS in Southern Division; had evidence of (4) feedback inspection reports on file dated 14 November 2023, 21 July 2023, 10 March 2023 and 16 November 2022. Conducted by the two municipal inspectors of schools.

As indicated above, all the (3) inspection reports were submitted to DES, the score is 2.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0

Education, Health, CBS and Production issues at RMLG are handled by the Social Services Committee of Council. Here below are some examples of committee meetings where Education specific issues were presented and discussed in FY2022/2023.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 28/07/2022 per minute number (RMC/SS1/2/2022-2023 – PRESENTATION OF DEPARTMENTAL WORKPLANS FOR Q2 FY2022/2023) A lot of discussion in this committee centred on sports, particularly the upcoming School National Ball Games Championship. There was no budget for this vote and members fundraised for Rukungiri MC schools participation.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee this sat on 15/11/2022 per minute number (RMC/SS1/11/2022-2023 – REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTS). The performance of the LG for 1st quarter was presented and discussed and also the staff structure which showed that only 7 head teachers were duly appointed. The end of the term for the schools had been brought forward by MoES to 25/11/2022.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 09/03/2023 per minute number (RMC/SS1/11/2022-2023 – DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS) A report on the progress of the latrines being constructed was read. Head teachers had been trained in the TELA system to help in managing attendance. Children with special needs had challenges with the curriculum and none had passed PLE and this was an issue to be addressed. 26 schools had submitted their newly elected school management committees.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 24/05/2023 per minute number (RMC/SS1/17/2022-2023 – DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS) The Education workplan and budget for FY2023/2024 were presented totalling UGX5,005,642,333. The 4th quarter budget performance report was also presented and discussed.

**RMLG Education issues were during FY2022/2023 adequately handled by the Council through its Executive Standing Committee.**

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ PTA General meeting held on 22 July 2022 at Rukungiri PS and attended by 114 stakeholders. Issues highlighted included challenge of accommodation for teachers, parents advised to use good language while advising their children, parents encouraged not to neglect their childrens' education and to come on board and actively participate in the teaching and learning of their children including provision of meals, scholastic materials and school uniform, counselling of children to understand their challenges, consuming excessive alcohol and parents who refuse to take their children to school will face the law among others</li> <li>□ PTA General meeting held on 24 August 2023 at Kinyasnao PS and attended by over 700 stakeholders. During the meeting, PEO advised parents to invest in education of their children and urged them to pray for their children to be responsible citizens in future- under Min.10/2023 (b).</li> <li>□ PTA General meeting held on 21October 2022 at Nakibale Lower PS. During the meeting, PEO asked parents to make sure that they educate their children and support milk feeding programme at schools- under Min.2/2022 .</li> <li>□ PTA General meeting held on 22 November 2022 at Kyatoko PS. During the meeting, PEO encouraged parents to support their children financially and try their level best to keep children at school until they complete their education cycle, and advocated the SMC and school administration to take responsibility of maintenance of school infrastructure available to prevent them from collapsing- under Min.13/2022 (a).</li> </ul> <p>The score is 2.</p>
----	---	---	--

## Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

The information on the LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2022/23 and school asset registers of the sampled 3 UPE schools was verified.

We noted that the education department prepared and submitted an asset register in the prescribed format (Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for the Education and Sports Sub-Program FY 2023-2024- page 57).

The verification process carried out in the three sampled UPE schools showed that the LG had no accurate and up-to date asset register as indicated below:

☐ Kahororo PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (07) classrooms, (04) latrine stances, (159) desks and teacher accommodation (00), while the school asset register had (08) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (162) desks and teacher accommodation (00). Information was not consistent

☐ Nyakibale Boarding PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (17) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (320) desks and teacher accommodation (04), while the school asset register had (17) classrooms, (32) latrine stances, (340) desks and teacher accommodation (10). Information was not consistent

☐ Rukungiri PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (09) classrooms, (03) latrine stances, (84) desks and teacher accommodation (00), while the school asset register had (09) classrooms, (12) latrine stances, (84) desks and teacher accommodation (00). Information was not consistent.

Based on the above, the asset register was not up to date in all the 3 sampled UPE schools. The score is 0.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>For FY 2022/2023, the RMLG Education department had one (01) infrastructural project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Construction of pit latrines at Kitazugurukwa P/S, Ruruku P/S and Kagunga S.S.S UGX72,980,000</li> </ul> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Derived from the LG Development Plan</li> <li>-Consistent with sector guidelines &amp; DDEG objectives</li> <li>-Financially feasible</li> <li>-Having costed project profiles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence of desk appraisal for the one (01) RMLG Education Department project for FY2022/2023 was availed/ seen.</b></p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>For FY 2022/2023, the RMLG Education department had five (05) DDEG investment projects including one (01) infrastructural project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Construction of pit latrines at Kitazugurukwa P/S, Ruruku P/S and Kagunga S.S.S UGX72,980,000</li> </ul> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of the field appraisal for the one (01) RMLG Education Department infrastructural project for FY2020/21 was availed/ seen.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no budget for a seed secondary school at Rukungiri Education department therefore it was not incorporated into the procurement plan for the current FY (2023/24). However, as per the approved Work Plan for FY 2023-24, the following Education infrastructure project was incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of school infrastructure at Makobore high school.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is NO evidence that School infrastructure Projects were approved by the Contracts Committee (C.C) before commencement of Works. The sample project is listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under Contracts Committee meeting held on 6/1/2023, the Construction of 4 stance VIP Latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS was approved. However, there was no Minute No. captured during the assessment.</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PIT for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines.</p> <p>Through the memo dated 19/7/2022, The CAO appointed a PIT that comprised of: a Senior Environmental Officer, PCDO and Senior Labor Officer. However, there was no Clerk of Works, Project Manager and Contract Manager appointed on the PIT by the CAO.</p> <p>The following Project was sampled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS.</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>Rukungiri District Local Government did not have a project on the construction of the seed secondary school hence the requirement of the indicator (that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES) could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Rukungiri District Local Government did not have a project on the construction of the seed secondary school hence the requirement of the indicator (that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY) could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is NO evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted.</p> <p>A site inspection was done by the engineer and an inspection report prepared on 28/6/2023. There were Environmental screening and monitoring reports after inspections dated 10/5/2023. However, there were no records of joint inspections done by the technical team during the assessment.</p> <p>There was one education infrastructure project (implemented in the previous FY) that was sampled as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS.</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>RMLG Education had one (01) certified project in FY2022/2023 and it was used to check certification and timeliness of effecting payments for infrastructural projects.</p> <p>Payment to Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Ltd for construction of 4 stance latrines with urinals at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and Kagunga Seed School (UGX68,534,903) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 06/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023 (22 days).</p> <p><b>In the one (01) certified project payment that RMLG Education had, payments were effected beyond the 14 days' time limit</b></p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council Education Department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit on 18/04/2022.</p> <p>The following project was included among other Works/Supplies;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 4 stance VIP latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kagunga SS</li> </ol>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The sampled project is listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of 4 stance VIP Latrines at Kitaziguruka P/S, Rukuru P/S and Construction of 2 Stance VIP Latrines at Kagunga SS-</b> RUK/WRKS/2022/2023/00003; Contract agreement signed on 21/3/2023; Procurement request was initiated on 22/Dec/2022 by the user department; The contracts committee sat on 6/01/2023 and approved the procurement method, the bidding document, cost of bidding documents and the evaluation committee members; The tender was advertised in the New Vision of 26/1/2023; Issuing and receiving bid documents by 17/2/2023; Bids opened on 17/2/2023; Invitation for evaluation committee meeting on 21/2/2023.; Bid evaluation report recommended Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Ltd to be awarded the contract; Report submitted to contracts committee on 2/3/2023 for approval; Best evaluated bidder pinned on notice board on 3/3/2023 and removed on 16/3/2023; Letter of bid acceptance issued to the best evaluated bidder on 16/3/2023; Acceptance by bidder dated 21/3/2023.</li> </ol>	1
----	--	---	---	---

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that grievances were recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</p> <p>A complaint about narrow pit at Ruruku P/s was recorded on 24/4/23 for the construction of a 4 stance VIP latrine, to compensate for the depth since the place is rocky, the issue was investigated and chairperson informed the contractor in writing about the action taken.</p>	3
----	--	---	--	---



15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of environment guidelines for schools as per the letter addressed to all head teachers by the Senior Environment officer -Rukungiri MC dated 7 July 2022.</p> <p>The environment guidelines for schools highlighted formation of environment clubs in schools, ensure tree planting activities, ensure proper water drainage system in schools, carryout environmental labelling e.g. keep off the grass and ensure school gardening practices</p> <p>We noted copies of the school environment guidelines on file in all the 3 sampled UPE schools (Kahororo PS, Nyakibale PS and Rukungiri PS). The score is 3.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents</p> <p>1. A costed ESMP for the construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal at Kitazigurukwa P/s 4-stance VIP latrine with latrine with urinal at Ruruku P/s and 2-stance Vlp latrine at Kagunga seed school, was prepared on 28/3/2023, stamped and signed by both SEO and DCDO, this ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents of <b>Proc No RUKU778/WRKS/22-23/00003</b> in item F for environmental mitigation measures at cost of Ugx 500,000</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certificate of title for Kagunga seed S.S on plot 251, block 23 at Byara, dated 16/6/23, signed and stamped by register titles on 16/6/23.</li> <li>• <b>However the municipal didn't have proof of land ownership for the three sampled projects, threfore the LG can't score i.e. construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal at Kitazigurukwa P/s 4-stance VIP latrine with latrine with urinal at Ruruku P/s, construction of a 4 stance VIP latrine at Ruruku P/s and construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Kakagunga seed S.S</b></li> </ul>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There <b>was evidence</b> that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction of a 4 stance VIP latrine at Ruruku P/s carried out on 18/4/23, signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 18/4/23, 16/5/23, the project started on 21/3/23 and ended on 21/6/23.</li> <li>2. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction of a 4 stance VIP latrine at Kitazigurukwa P/s carried out on 30/3/23, signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 30/3/23, 19/4/23, the project started on 21/3/23 and ended on 21/6/23.</li> <li>3. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Kakagunga seed S.S carried out on 18/4/23, signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 18/4/23, 10/5/23, the project started on 21/3/23 and ended on 21/6/23.</li> </ol>	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There <b>was evidence</b> that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E&amp;S certifications for the construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal at Kitazigurukwa P/s 4-stance VIP latrine with latrine with urinal at Ruruku P/s and 2-stance Vlp latrine at Kagunga seed school was prepared on 6/6/23 signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO.</li> </ol>	1

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm whether</b> Rukungiri MLG registered an increased utilization of healthcare services, with a specific focus on total deliveries. The computation of healthcare services utilization was guided by the instructions provided during the orientation of Health Specialists, which indicated that the computation should be based on all the HCIIIs and HCIVs.</p> <p>Rukungiri MLG has five health facilities conducting deliveries in the FY 2022/2023. The assessment team reviewed the annual reports (HMIS 107) for these health facilities for FY 2021/2022 and compared them with FY 2022/2023. The findings are as follows:</p> <p>The total number of deliveries for FY 2021/2022 was 1,932, and for FY 2022/2023, it was 2,187, representing an overall increase of 13.2%.</p> <p><i>As a result, Rukungiri MLG did not achieve the recommended 20% increase in the utilization of healthcare services, as required by the performance measure.</i></p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The performance of RMLG in its LLG FY2022/2023 Health assessment was 100%, making it fall within the 70% and above range.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	Rukungiri MLG did receive the Health Development Grant for FY2022/2023 and spent it on these two project:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remodeling of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV UGX46,696,000  Rukungiri MLG Health Development Grant budget for FY2022/2023 was UGX50,000,000 and the expenditure in the FY was UGX47,061,000.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<p><b>These activities were eligible</b> under the Health Development Grant guidelines. They didn't involve purchase of land, procurement of vehicles etc.</p>			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	For Rukungiri MLG Health had one (01) certified project payment in FY2022/2023 and it was availed and tested to check for certification before payments.  Payment to Isheba Contractors Ltd for modification of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV (UGX43,601,877) – Requisition dated 25/04/2023, certified by Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO and Town Clerk on 24/05/2023 and payment on 13/06/2023.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<p><b>Certification for the RMLG Health infrastructural project was done in accordance with the requirements.</b></p>			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There is evidence that the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineer's estimates  From the DE and DHO, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages; [(A - B)/A]*100%:	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Completion of Minor Theatre at Rukungiri Health Centre IV-RUKU/WRKS/2022/2023/00006.</b> The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 46,796,145/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 46,696,588/=. The Variation was at 0.21%.</li> </ol>			

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was No HC II to HC III upgrade for Rukungiri DLG and therefore the requirement of the indicator could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p> <p>Other health infrastructure projects implemented include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Completion of minor theatre at Rukungiri Health centre IV-RUKU/WRKS/2022/2023/00006.</b></li> </ol>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG recruited staff for Rukungiri HC IV, Kitimba HC IIIs and Rwakabengo HC III, in accordance with the staffing structure. The staffing structure provided by the Principal Health Office (PHO) indicated that HC IVs were required to have <b>48 staff</b>, while HC IIIs were required to have <b>19 health workers</b>.</p> <p>According to the approved budget for FY 2023/2024, the allocated conditional sector grant for wages was UGX 1,960,156,000. This funding covered the wages of 69 staff members, whereas the staffing norms for the existing HC IV and HC IIIs indicate a requirement for 86 staff members. Consequently, 80.2% of the health worker positions in the available HC IV and HC IIIs have been filled.</p>	1
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was No HC II to HC III upgrade for Rukungiri Municipal Council therefore the requirement of the indicator (that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs) could not be assessed. Therefore, the Municipal Council earns the maximum score.</p>	2

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** information given by Rukungiri MLG on position of health workers filled accurate as evidenced by the findings from three (3) sampled facilities. The assessment team reviewed the staff list for FY 2023/2024 and compared it with the staff lists found at the sampled facilities. The details of the findings were as follows.

2

1. **Rukungiri HC IV:** 39 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the PHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the PHO and the list found at the facility.
2. **Kitimba HC III:** 15 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the PHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the PHO and the list found at the facility.
3. **Rwakabengo HC III:** 15 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the PHO. There was no observed deviation staff between the list obtained from the PHO and the list found at the facility.

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** information on health facilities constructed and functional was accurate. The list obtained from the PHO included that the department undertook the remodeling of the mini theatre at Rukungiri HC IV. The assessment team reviewed the annual PBS report (Quarter 4) submitted by Town clerk (Robert Nuwamanya) on 17-10-2023 and established that information on their status and functionality was accurate

2

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:

- Score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** health facilities in Rukungiri MLG prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the PHO by March 31st of the FY 2022/2023 as per as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector.

The assessment team sampled Annual Workplans & budgets for three health facilities and established their submissions where as follows.

1. **Rukungiri HCIV:** Prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the PHO on 29th March 2022. The budget and workplan was also endorsed by the facility in charge (Mugisha Patrick) and Ahimbisibwe Edward the HUMC chairperson on the same day. The total amount on this budget was UGX 56,932,000.
2. **Kitimba HC III:** Prepared and submitted Annual Workplan & budget to the PHO on 15th March 2022. The Annual Workplan and budget, with a total annual amount of UGX 6,928,898, was prepared and endorsed by the facility in charge, Kamaremba Justin, on March 20, 2022.
3. **Rwakabengo HC III:** Prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the PHO on 25th March 2022. The facility Annual Workplan & budget was prepared and endorsed by the facility in charge (Florance Katunguka) and Muhwezi Edson (HUMC chairperson on the same day.

*The review of the submitted Annual Workplans and budgets for FY 2022/2023 indicates that they are in conformity with the LG Planning Guidelines for the Health Sector.*

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :

- Score 2 or else 0

There **was no evidence to confirm whether** health facilities of Rukungiri MLG prepared and submitted to the PHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2022/2023 by July 15th of the as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. The assessment team randomly sampled three health (**Rukungiri HCIV, Kitimba HC III and Rwakabengo HC III**) and established that these facilities did not prepare and submit to the PHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2022/2023. By the end of the second day of the assessment exercise in the local government, these findings were not shared with the assessment team.

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

- Score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** health facilities in Rukungiri MLG had developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports. The assessment team established that the performance improvement plan for the sampled health facilities were submitted as detailed below.

1. **Rukungiri HC IV:** The assessment team established that the monitoring and assessment report submitted to the PMO on 13th January 2023 noted that there were animals and domestic birds in the facility compound. The facility PIP submitted to the PMO on 1st July 2023 noted that there was need to stop animals in the facility compound.
2. **Kitimba HC III:** The monitoring and assessment report submitted to the PMO on 30th March 2023 noted that only forty (40) mothers were accessing ANC services per month. The facility's PIP indicated there was need to undertake community sensitization to improve MCH services.
3. **Rwakabengo HC III:** The monitoring and assessment report showed that there were quality improvement plans done. The PIP noted that the facility was to undertake monthly quality improvement (QI) meetings led by the QI focal point person.

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,

- score 2 or else score 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** the health facilities in Rukungiri MLG submitted monthly and quarterly HMIS reports in a timely manner, meeting the requirement of submission within 7 days following the end of each month and quarter. The assessment team noted that all monthly HMIS reports were submitted timely within 7 days following the end of each month.

The assessment team noted that quarterly HMIS reports for the three sampled health facilities were submitted timely on the following days;

1. **Rwakabengo HC III:** Submission made on 7th October 2022, 5th January 2023, 6th April 2023 and 5th July 2023.
2. **Rukungiri HC IV:** Submission made on 6th October 2022, 6th January 2023, 6th April 2023 and 5th July 2023
3. **Kitimba HC III:** Submission made on 6th October 2022, 6th January 2023, 7th April 2023 and 5th July 2023



6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RMLG Planning Unit did have a system for capturing dates of submission of Health department reports for integration into the overall MLG quarterly report. The submission dates were as below:</p> <p>Quarter one report submitted on 07/10/2022</p> <p>Quarter two report submitted on 10/01/2023</p> <p>Quarter three report submitted on 06/04/2022</p> <p>Quarter four report submitted on 11/07/2022</p> <p><b>All the four quarterly report submissions were made before the deadline of one month after end of the quarter.</b></p>	1

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team established that the Rukungiri MLG MHT had developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the weakest performing health facilities submitted to the PMO on 15th July 2022. The Performance improvement plan among other prioritised remodeling of the mini theatre Rukungiri HC IV.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> the health department of Rukungiri MLG Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facility. The assessment team established that the site was for the remodeling of the mini theatre was handed to the contractor on 13th April 2023 and works commissioned on 2th August 2023.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

- a) Evidence that the LG has:
- i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** Rukungiri MLG Health Department budgeted for healthcare workers in accordance with staffing norms and guidelines. The approved staff structure, obtained from the PHO's office, indicates an approved structure of 96 healthcare workers.

A review of the approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024 revealed that the allocated conditional Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) for Rukungiri MLG was UGX 1,960,156,000 intended to cover the wage of 96 healthcare workers in post out of the required 112 according to the staffing norm (85.7%). The assessment team determined that there was no surplus in the conditional wage grant allocated for FY 2023/2024. The assessment team also found that the second budget call circular (2nd BCC) regarding the finalization of the budget Estimates for the financial year 2023/2024, as indicated in item 43 (Page 11 of 23), stated: "Therefore, no vote will be authorized to recruit new staff except on a replacement basis, with evidence that the position(s) to be recruited have provisions in the budget for FY 2023/2024.

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

- a) Evidence that the LG has:
- ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** the Rukungiri MLG Health Department deployed healthcare workers in accordance with staffing guidelines, which require that all health facilities have at least 75% of the staff required according to the staffing norms. The assessment team reviewed the deployment lists for FY 2023/2024 and observed that all the four health facilities met the requirement of having at least 75% of the required staff deployed in accordance with staffing norms. The details of staff deployment are provided below.

1. **Rukungiri HC IV:** 39 out of the required 48 health workers deployed at the facility (81.2%)
2. **Karangaro HC II:** 7 out of the required 9 health workers deployed at the facility (77.7%)
3. **Kitimba HC III:** 15 out of the required 9 health workers deployed at the facility (78.9%)
4. **Katwekamwe HC II:** 7 out of the required 9 health workers deployed at the facility (77.8%)
5. **Marumba HC II:** 7 out of the required 9 health workers deployed at the facility (77.8%)
6. **Rwakabengo HC III:** 15 out of the required 9 health workers deployed at the facility (78.9%)

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0

The **was evidence to confirm that** health workers in Rukungiri MLG were working in health facilities where they are deployed. The assessment team reviewed the deployment list for FY 2023/2024 and compared them with the logs in the attendance book at the randomly sampled health facilities and established that the two were in agreement. The assessment team sampled three health facilities (Rukungiri HCIV, Kitimba HC III and Rwakabengo HC III) and established that was no variance between the deployment list obtained from DHO's and logs in the staff attendance books found at the health facilities as summarized below.

1. **Rukungiri HC IV:** 39 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the MHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the MHO.
2. **Kitimba HC III:** 15 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the MHO. Staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the MHO.
3. **Rwakabengo HC III:** 13 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the MHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the MHO.

3

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0

There **was evidence to confirm** that Rukungiri MLG publicized the deployment of health workers through various means, including posting on facility notice boards. The assessment team visited three sampled health facilities and observed that staff lists for FY 2023/2024 were available on the notice boards at Rukungiri HCIV, Kitimba HC III and Rwakabengo HC III.

2

Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

**There was no evidence** that the MMOHs had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans in accordance with the guidelines, and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. All the files reviewed indicated that the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines.

Some of the files reviewed indicated the following:

1. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer In-Charge Rukungiri HC IV found in Eastern Division was appraised by Dr. Ahabwe Davis, Principal Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
2. Akampurira Sight, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Marumba HC II found in Southern Division was appraised by Kobutungu Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**
3. Manirafasha Edvinah, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Katwekamwe HC II found in Eastern Division was appraised by Ahebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**
4. Muhwezi Edson, Senior Clinical Officer In-Charge Rwakabengo HC II found in Southern Division was appraised by Kobutungu Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**
5. Katushabe Moreen, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Karangaro HC II found in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**
6. Kamarembo Jackline, Nursing Officer In-Charge Kitimba HC III found in Western Division was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on **July 20, 2023.**

Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

**There was no evidence** that the Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans according to guidelines during the previous FY, as most of the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines.

Some of the files reviewed indicated the following:

1. Mujawimana Evas, Enrolled Psychiatric Nurse posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Kyobutungi Provia, Assistant Nursing Officer Psychiatry on **July 20, 2023.**
2. Katusiime Annettie Mugyenyi, Assistant Nursing Officer Midwifery posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Dr. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
3. Tweshengyereze Immaculate, Enrolled Midwife posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Dr. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
4. Tushemereirwe Serinah, Clinical Officer posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Dr. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
5. Ayebare Ronah, Enrolled Nurse posted to Rwakabengo HC III was appraised by Muhwezi Edson, Senior Clinical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
6. Katushabe Caroline, Enrolled Nurse posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Kyobutungi Provia, Assistant Nursing Officer Psychiatry on **July 20, 2023.**
7. Kyobutungi Provia, Assistant Nursing Officer Psychiatry posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Dr. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
8. Komujuni Jackline, Enrolled Midwife posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Dr. Mugisha Patrick, Medical Officer on **July 20, 2023.**
9. Twongyeirwe Boaz, Laboratory Assistant posted to Rukungiri HC IV was appraised by Agaba John Paul, Laboratory Technician on **July 20, 2023.**

Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

**There was no evidence** that the Municipal Medical Officer of Health had taken corrective action based on the appraisals.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> to confirm whether health workers received training through Continuous Professional Development in accordance with the training plans. The assessment team observed that, there continuous medical education (CME) were inconsistently held at the sampled health facilities (Rukungiri HCIV, Kitimba HC III and Rwakabengo HC III). The assessment team was availed with a list of staff that had been granted leave of absence to attend school but not the required training plans to guide the CPDs. By the end of day two of the assessment exercise, no other form of evidence was shared with the assessment team.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm whether Rukungiri</b> Municipal local government documented training activities in the training or CPD database. The assessment team did not access the evidence inform of training database or CPD database to conform that CPD training activities were documented.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFN receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> the Town Clerk of Rukungiri MLG confirmed the list of health facilities (Government of Uganda and Private-Not-For-Profit) receiving Primary Health Care Non-Wage Recurrent (PHC NWR) grants and notified the Ministry of Health (MOH) in writing by September 30th if any health facility had been listed incorrectly or was omitted from the FY 2023/2024 list.</p> <p>The assessment team observed that the Ag.PMO had submitted to the Ministry of Health (MOH) a list of health facilities (both Government of Uganda and Private-Not-For-Profit) receiving Primary Health Care Non-Wage Recurrent (PHC NWR) grants via email on September 17, 2023, at 2:29 pm. A review of the email details revealed that the submission was sent to Hillary Irinatwe at hillaryruk@gmail.com, with a copy to Dr. Sarah Byakika, both of whom are staff in the planning department of MOH.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG FY2022/2023 budget - PHC NWR grant for Lower Level Health Facilities was UGX276,411,000.</p> <p>Total allocation in the MHO's budget for management and monitoring activities in the same year was UGX62,917,000 which 22.7% of the total. This was above the 15% minimum.</p>	2
9	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The disbursements of all funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine. For RMLG, PHC NWR grants were transferred to facilities as follows:</p> <p>For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the TC warranted on 1st August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 1st August 2022 (25 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 13th October 2022 (13 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 10th February 2022 and the disbursements made on 10th February 2023 (12 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the TC warranted on 26th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 27th April 2023 (20 days).</p> <p><b>In all the four quarters, the warranting/verification of PHC NWR grants was effected beyond the 5 days' time limit.</b></p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			



N23\_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0

The disbursements of funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine.

For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the TC warranted on 1st August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 1st August 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 1 was dated 27/07/2022 (19 days).

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 13th October 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 2 was dated 12/10/2022 (12 days).

For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 10th February 2022 and the disbursements made on 10th February 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 3 was dated 11/01/2023 (13 days).

For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the TC warranted on 26th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 27th April 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 4 was dated 27/04/2023 (21 days).

In all the four quarters, the invoicing and communication of funds on the funds releases was done beyond the 5 working days' time limit.

N23\_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0

There **was no evidence to confirm whether** Rukungiri MLG LG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards. The ag. PMO explained that these are done at facility level. Findings from the sampled health facilities during the visit noted that what health facilities had posted on their notice boards did not bear dates but only indicated amounts received in each quarter. By the end of day two of the assessment exercise, no other form of evidence was shared with the assessment team.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> the Rukungiri MLG Health Department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings held during FY 2022/23 on the following days;14th October 2022, 5th January 2023, 12th April 2023 and 5th July 2023. For instance, upon reviewing the minutes of the MHT Quarterly Performance Review Meeting submitted to the MHO on April 14, 2023, it was noted that the department prioritized completing the procurement of a computer laptop and a patient monitor. Subsequently, the assessment examined payment voucher No. 476836 EFT and 4763836, totaling UGX 4,990,000, dated May 9, 2023, as well as Voucher No. 5294882 EFT and 5294882. It was observed that the department had successfully acquired a laptop, and the patient monitor.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm</b> whether the Rukungiri MLG Health Department's quarterly performance review meetings included all health facility in-charges and implementing partners, DHMTs, and key LG departments. The review of the attendance list for the quarterly performance review meetings held on 14th October 2022, 5th January 2023,12th April 2023 and 5th July 2023 established that key LG departments e.g., WASH, Community Development, Education department were not in attendance.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG conducted supervision visits to 100% of the Kigezi North HC IV and Rukungiri HC IV. The assessment team reviewed the support supervision reports submitted to the MHO on the following days; 14th October 2022,13th January 2023, 30th March 2023, and 30th June 2023 and established that both the above health facilities were supervised in all the four Quarters for FY 2022/2023 by the municipal health team.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG ensured that Health Health Sub-District (HSD) conducted support supervision of lower-level health facilities during FY 2022/2023. The assessment team sought to ascertain whether three health facilities; namely Karangaro HC II, Marumba HC II and Rwakabengo HCIII. The assessment team reviewed the HSD support supervision reports submitted to MHO on 31st September 2022, 22nd December 2022,30th March 2023 and 30th June 2023 and established that these sampled health facilities were fully supervised by the HSD team.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Rukungiri MLG used results/reports from the discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the FY 2022/2023</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>At Kitimba HC III</b>, the support supervision visits by the MHT on October 31, 2022, noted that the in-charge was directed to request the municipality engineer to visit the facility and take measurements for the facility fence. The assessment team observed that the facility was fully fenced at the time of the assessment.</li> <li>2. <b>At Rwakabengo HC III</b>, the support supervision visit by the MHT on January 6, 2023, recommended that the in-charge activate the Quality Improvement (QI) committee at the facility. The assessment team reviewed the QI committee meeting minutes dated September 20, 2023, indicating that the committee had indeed been made functional.</li> <li>3. <b>AT Rukungiri HC IV</b>, The Support supervision visits by the MHT dated August 11, 2023, recommended ensuring that the HUMC was reconstituted upon its expiry date. The assessment team reviewed the minutes for the HUMC meeting held on August 16, 2023, and confirmed that the committee was now active and operational. The minutes revealed the presence of eight members on the committee, with Mr. Ahimbisibwe Edward serving as the chairperson.</li> </ol>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm whether</b> Rukungiri MLG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies during the FY 2022/2023. The MHO explained that health facilities receive support for the management of medicines and health supplies during integrated support supervision by the municipal health team. However, a review of the support supervision reports dated October 14, 2022, January 13, 2023, March 30, 2023, and June 30, 2023, did not confirm the accuracy of this statement.</p> <p><i>By the end of day two of the assessment exercise, no evidence had been shared with the assessment team inform of support supervision or feedback to health facility incharges on medicines management supervision recommendation.</i></p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MHO health office budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX62,917,000. Out of this a total of UGX33,464,000 was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities.</p> <p><b>This was a proportion of 53.1%, which was above the 30% minimum.</b></p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm</b> that the Rukungiri MLG led health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization activities as per the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for DHTs during the fiscal year 2022/2023. For example, the assessment team reviewed the quarterly progress report dated October 5, 2022, and confirmed that the department had conducted various health promotion activities, including workplace inspections at all Municipal division offices, health facilities, carpentry workshops, and bakeries.</p> <p>Furthermore, the department organized radio talk shows on Country FM to raise awareness in the community on a range of health issues. Subsequently, the quarterly progress report dated April 4, 2023, indicated that, among other things, the department provided PrEP and PEP services in all municipal divisions of Rukungiri Municipality.</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm</b> whether Rukungiri MLG followed-up actions taken by the Rukungiri MLG MHT regarding health promotion and disease prevention issues is documented in their minutes and reports. By the end of the second day of the assessment exercise, no evidence had been provided to the assessment team to support awarding a score for this performance measure.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG health department had an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. comprehensive assets register was located in the PHO's office. The register was last updated on June 30, 2023, and includes details such as asset number, initial cost, description of the assets, date of purchase, location, and current condition. The Acting MHO clarified that no new assets or equipment had been received since June 2023.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG Health Department implemented one (01) infrastructural projects in FY2022/2023:</p> <p>■ Remodeling of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV UGX46,696,000</p> <p>Evidence of desk appraisal for the one (01) RMLG FY2022/2023 Health department project was provided and reviewed during the assessment.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG Health Department implemented one (01) infrastructural projects in FY2022/2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Remodeling of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV UGX46,696,000</li> </ul>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p><b>Evidence of field appraisal for the one project of FY2022/2023 was provided/seen.</b></p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screening for environmental and social risks for the modification of a minor theater at Rukungiri HC IV was carried out on 16/3/2023, signed and stamped by both the SEO and PCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for a detailed study, therefore a costed ESMP was prepared at a cost of Ugx 200,000</li> <li>2. Screening for environmental and social risks for the construction of a major theater at Rukungiri HC IV was carried out on 28/8/2023, signed and stamped by both the SEO and PCDO.</li> </ol>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council health department timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU on 28/3/2023 by the MHO for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plans; The following Projects were visible;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of minor theater at Rukungiri HCIV.</li> </ol>	1
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>				

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the Municipal Council Health department submitted Procurement Requisition Forms - LG PP Forms to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2023/24).</p> <p>LG PP form 1 for the following project was submitted, forwarded (Confirmation of Need) by the MHO and confirmation of funding by CAO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LG PP form 1 for the Construction of General Maternity Ward at Rukungiri HC IV- Estimated cost is UGX 400,000,000/=</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the Health infrastructure Projects for the previous FY (2022/2023) were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. The sampled project is listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Completion of minor theater at Rukungiri HCIV-</b> RKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006 approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 16/1/2023 under Min. No. 72/a/MCC/1022/2023.</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the Health construction projects within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines.</p> <p>Through the memo dated 19/7/2022, The CAO appointed a PIT that comprised of: a Senior Environmental Officer, PCDO and Senior Labor Officer. However, there was no Clerk of Works, Project Manager and Contract Manager appointed on the PIT by the CAO.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Rukungiri Municipal Council did not have any HC II to HC III upgrade and therefore the requirement of the indicator (the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH) could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO HC II to HC III Upgrade at Rukungiri Municipal Council and therefore the requirement of the indicator (the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project) could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO HC II to HC III Upgrade at Rukungiri Municipal Council and therefore the requirement of the indicator (that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee) could not be assessed. Therefore, the LG earns the maximum score.</p>	1



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is NO Evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction</p> <p>Joint technical supervisions of the construction of health infrastructure projects (by the Engineer's team - including the Environment Officer and DCDO among other officers) were conducted only once during the entire course of the project (with regards to Critical stages). There was no evidence that site instruction books were used during the course of the projects at any of the Health facilities.</p> <p>The following projects were reported;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Completion of a minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV-RKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006;</b> with inspection report dated 24/5/2023 and Environment and social safeguard monitoring report dated 13/6/2023.</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For Rukungiri MLG Health one (01) project payment in FY2022/2023 was made and it was tested to check for certification and the timeliness of payments to vendors.</p> <p>Payment to Isheba Contractors Ltd for modification of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV (UGX43,601,877) - Requisition dated 25/04/2023, certified by Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO and Town Clerk on 24/05/2023 and payment on 13/06/2023 (18 days).</p> <p><b>In the one (01) Health infrastructural project payment was effected beyond the 14 days' time limit.</b></p>	0

13

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0

There is Evidence that Rukungiri Municipal Council has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA. Complete procurement files for the health infrastructure contracts with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee and contract documents were present during assessment.

The file for the following project was sampled accordingly;

**1. Completion of minor theatre at Rukungiri HCIV-**

RKU778/WRKS/2022/2023/00006 was found complete with the following details; Initiated by MHO on 4/12/2023; Confirmation of funding on 11/1/2023; Contracts committee approved method of procurement, bidding documents and the costs, evaluation committee members and shortlisted companies were approved. Pinned on notice board on 1/2/2023; Invitation letters for bid completion 1/2/2023; Issuance and receipt of bid documents up to 14/2/2023; Evaluation committee members sat on 14/2/2023, report dated 15/12/2023 recommending Isheba Contractors Ltd to be awarded the tender at UGX 46,696,588/=; Report submitted to the construction committee on 2/3/2023; Approved report and best evaluated bidder were prepared and displayed on the notice board on 3/3 to 16/3/2023; Letter of bid acceptance was prepared on 16/3/2023; Acceptance letter was issued by the bidder on 16/3/2023; Contract agreement signed on 16/3/2023; Site launching by MHO 13/04/2023.

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0

There **was no evidence** that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework

0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG Health Department had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management to health facilities. The assessment observed that a memo on medical waste management memo was issued to health facilities on April 15, 2023. The memo highlighted, among other things, the requirement for all waste to be segregated according to the standard color-coded bins available at the health unit for proper disposal. Additionally, the assessment identified charts on medical waste segregation displayed in the maternity ward at the three sampled health facilities of ; Rukungiri HC IV, Kitimba HC III, Rwakabengo HC III</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG had a functional system/central infrastructure in with equipment for medical waste management and had a dedicated/operational budget. The assessment team established that the municipality has supported by Green labal services Ltd to collect and dispose the medical waste from health facilities. Medical waste collection forms were also found at the sampled health facilities particularly at Rukungiri HCIV and Kitimba HC III.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> Rukungiri MLG has conducted training and created awareness in healthcare waste management. The assessment reviewed a training report submitted to the PHO on August 14, 2022, which indicated that the department conducted a training session with health workers on the management of medical waste.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A costed ESMP for the modification of a minor theater at Rukungiri HC IV was prepared on 30/3/2023, signed and stamped by both the SEO and PCDO. this ESMP of <b>Proc No RUKU778/WRKS/22-23/00005</b> was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents under item H for environmental concerns at tune of Ugx 200,000</li> </ol>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support supervision and monitoring for modification of of a minor theater at Rukungiri HC IV, was carried out on 20/4/23, signed and stamped by SEO and PCDO, monthly monitoring reports were provided for review dated, 20/4/23, 11/5/23, the project started on 16/3/23 and ended on 15/6/23</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environment and Social Certification forms for the modification of of a minor theater at Rukungiri HC IV was prepared on 24/5/23 signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO, payments were made on 8/6/23</li> </ol>	2

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;  • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.  o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2  o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>

2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates  o If within +/-20% score 2  o If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.  o If 100% projects completed: score 2  o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1  o If projects completed are below 80%: 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning  o If there is an increase: score 2  o If no increase: score 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).  o If increase is more than 1% score 2  o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1  o If there is no increase : score 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
<b>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</b>				
4	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>				
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>				
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
<i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i>				
<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>				

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>				

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------



8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	--	---	--	---

### Investment Management

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	---	--	--	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible: Score 4 or else score 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	---	---	--	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	---	--	--	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	---	---	--	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
----	---	--	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This indicator is Not applicable since there is no water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/2023) at Rukungiri Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2: 0</p>	<p>This indicator is Not applicable since there is no water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/2023) at Rukungiri Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2: 0</p>	<p>This indicator is Not applicable since there is no water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/2023) at Rukungiri Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	This indicator is Not applicable since there is no water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/2023) at Rukungiri Municipal Council.	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts  o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2  o If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 2, If not score 0	This indicator is Not applicable since there is no water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/2023) at Rukungiri Municipal Council.	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:  Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable because the Municipality doesn't implement Microscale irrigation program</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
---	---	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
---	---	---	---	---

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
---	---	--	--	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
---	--	--	--	---



6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

### **Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:  i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	neither a training plan nor training reports were provided	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Neither training report nor training database was provided	0

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because a municipality does not implement Microscale Irrigation program	0

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0



14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	0

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the MLG	<b>0</b>

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Principal Finance Officer was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Senior Planner was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Principal Engineer was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Kushaba Laban Katende appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 143/2020. Kushaba Laban Katende was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 08, 2023.	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>The customized and approved structure of Rukungiri Municipal LG provided for the position of Senior Agricultural Officer. There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Agricultural Officer was substantively filled by Kukundakwe Mildred appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/161/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 71/2020. Kukundakwe Mildred was on official study leave granted by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 032/2023 w.e.f February 01, 2023 for two years.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Principal Community Development Officer was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Principal Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Tayebwa Grace appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 16, 2023 ref.: CR/RMC/161/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 029/2023. Tayebwa Grace was appraised at her former station, Kamwenge District and the file had not been transferred.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Tushabe Emily appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 19, 2013 ref.: CR/RMC/156/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 28/2013. Tushabe Emily was appraised by Mugabiirwe Cosmas, Senior Human Resources Officer on July 20, 2023.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Assistant Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Natukunda Brighton appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated April 10, 2019 ref.: CR/RMC/156/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 74/2019. Natukunda Brighton was appraised by Tushabe Emily, Procurement Officer on July 20, 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Human Resource Officer (Administration) was substantively filled by Mugabirwe Cosmas appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 26, 2022 ref.: as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 089/2022. Mugabirwe Cosmas was appraised by Nakiintu Sharifah, Town Clerk on July 03, 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Kushaba Laban Katende appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 143/2020. Kushaba Laban Katende was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 08, 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Physical Planner was substantively filled by Kenganzi Vastine appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 143/2020. Kenganzi Vastine was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Mugisha Amos appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated November 16, 2018 ref.: CR/RMC as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 109/2018. Mugisha Amos was appraised by Nakiintu Sharifah, Town Clerk on July 10, 2023.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence t</b>hat the position of Senior Internal Auditor was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Mutungi W. K Katirimba appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated November 16, 2016 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 89/2016 (1). Mutungi W. K Katirimba was not appraised.</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that Rukungiri Municipal LG had substantively appointed a Senior Assistant Town Clerk in all its three Divisions. The officers appointed were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kobutungi Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 26, 2022 ref.: as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 087/2022 and posted to Southern Division. Kobutungi Evas was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</li> <li>2. Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 12, 2017 ref.: CR/RMC/156/3 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 52/2017 and posted to Western Division. Karenzi Paul was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</li> <li>3. Aheebwa Clara , Senior Assistant Town Clerk appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 09, 2022 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 046/2022 and posted to Eastern Division. Aheebwa Clara was appraised by Tagobya Prosper, Deputy Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</li> </ol>	5

New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

**There was evidence** that Rukungiri Municipal LG had substantively appointed a Community Development Officer in all its three Divisions. The officers appointed were as follows:

1. Bananukire Lawrence, Community Development Officer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 76/2020 and posted to Western Division. Bananukire Lawrence was appraised by Karenzi Paul, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.
2. Sunday Kenneth, Community Development Officer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 31, 2021 ref.: CR/RMC/159/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 089/2021 and posted to Eastern Division. Sunday Kenneth was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.
3. Kanyesigye Ketty Enid, Senior Community Development Officer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated September 18, 2018 ref.: CR/RMC/156/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 93/2018 and posted to Southern Division. Kanyesigye Ketty Enid was appraised by Kobutungu Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Rukungiri Municipal LG had substantively appointed a Treasurer in all its three Divisions. The officers appointed were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ainembabazi Elizabeth, Treasurer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated December 20, 2021 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 204/2021 and posted to Eastern Division. Ainembabazi Elizabeth was appraised by Aheebwa Clara, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</li> <li>2. Bagorogoza Augustine, Treasurer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated January 09, 2001 ref.: RTC/P/3 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 402/2000 and posted to Southern Division. Bagorogoza Augustine was appraised by Kobutungu Evas, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on July 20, 2023.</li> <li>3. Mugisha Francis, Treasurer appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 02, 2020 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 78/2020 and posted to Western Division. Mugisha Francis was appraised by Mbabazi Juliet, Assistant Town Clerk on July 26, 2023.</li> </ol>	5
---	---	--	---	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>For RMLG Natural Resources what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX58,541,674. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX57,418,850. <b>The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 98%, which was less than 100%.</b></p>	0
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>For RMLG Community Based Services what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX33,846,939. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX29,010,189. <b>The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 85.7%, which was way less than 100%.</b></p>	0



4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the project implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY  1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the supply and installation of 3 NO solar street lights was carried out on 20/2/2023, signed and stamped by both the SEO (Mr. Kushaba Laban Katende) and DCDO (Mr. Tibigambwa Dicson)	4
Maximum score is 12				
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0	The <b>project implemented using the DDEG</b> (i.e. screening for the supply and installation of 3 NO solar street lights was carried out on 20/2/2023) implemented by the district in the previous FY, was screened by SEO and DCDO, however after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMPs was prepared.	4
Maximum score is 12				
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had a Costed ESMPs for the project implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)  1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out on 20/2/2023, signed and stamped by both the SEO (Mr. Kushaba Laban Katende) and DCDO (Mr. Tibigambwa Dickson) for the supply and installation of 3NO solar street lights <b>Proc ref No. RUKU778/WRKS/21-22/00004</b> , After screening the project didn't qualify for a detailed study, therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 22/2/23 at a tune of Ugx 250,000 signed and stamped by both the SEO and DCDO.	4
Maximum score is 12				

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri MLG had an unqualified audit opinion for its FY2022/2023 final accounts.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As per the submissions at the IAG office and the records at Rukungiri MLG, a report on the implementation status of OAG recommendations for FY2021/2022 was submitted to the office of the Internal Auditor General on 14/04/2023. The report had actions taken on 9 OAG recommendations.</p> <p>The submission on the IAG recommendation was made beyond the previous FY February end deadline.</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the MLG, Rukungiri MLG Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) was submitted on 19/07/2023.</p> <p>The submission was before the mandatory August 31st deadline.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the MLG, Rukungiri MLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) was submitted on 28/08/2023.</p> <p>The submission was before the mandatory August 31st deadline.</p>	4

Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,  
score 4 or else 0.

According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the MLG, Rukungiri MLG Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) were submitted as follows:

Quarter 1 report on 04/01/2023

Quarter 2 report on 19/02/2023

Quarter 3 report on 27/04/2023

Quarter 4 report on 28/08/2023

All the quarterly performance reports for FY2022/2023 were submitted before the mandatory August 31 deadline.

Education Minimum  
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Principal Education Officer was substantively filled by Katabazi Alfred Mutuza appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 15, 2022 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 022/2022. Katabazi Alfred Mutuza was appraised by Nakintu Sharifar, Town Clerk on July 13, 2023.	<b>30</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the LG had substantively filled all positions of Inspector of Schools.  The approved structure of Rukungiri Municipal LG provided for a Senior Inspector of Schools and an Inspector of Schools. Review of files indicated the LG had filled these positions as follows:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Senior Inspector of Schools had been substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.</li><li>2. <b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Mwesigwa Patience appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated September 07, 2022 ref.: CR/RMC/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 106/2022. Mwesigwa Patience was appraised by Katabazi Alfred Mutuza, Principal Education Officer on July 20, 2023.</li></ol>	<b>0</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education projects for the previous FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of two stance VIP latrine at Kagunga seed S.S was carried out on 17/3/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and DCDO</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of four stance VIP latrine at KitazigurukaP/s was carried out on 17/3/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and DCDO</li> <li>3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of four stance VIP latrine at Ruruku P/s was carried out on 17/3/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and DCDO</li> </ol>	<b>15</b>
---	---	---	--	-----------

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>Education projects i.e.</b> ( construction of two stance VIP latrine at Kagunga seed S.S was carried out on 17/3/2023, construction of four stance VIP latrine at Kitaziguruka P/s was carried out on 17/3/2023, construction of four stance VIP latrine at Ruruku P/s was carried out on 17/3/2023), that were implemented by the district in the previous FY, were screened by SEO and DCDO, however after screening all projects didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.</p>	<b>15</b>
---	---	---	--	-----------

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.		

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Medical Officer of Health Services was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Principal Health Inspector was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	<b>There was no evidence</b> that the position of Health Educator was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Health projects for the current FY</p> <p>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a major theater at Rukungiri HC IV, was carried on 28/8/23, signed stamped by both PCDO and SEO.</p>	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>Health projects i.e.</b> (screening for the construction of a major theater at Rukungiri HC IV, was carried on 28/8/23), that was implemented by the district in the current FY, was screened by SEO and DCDO, however after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.</p>	15



**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG:  Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	<b>0</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
---	--	--	--	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable. The Municipality is served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0