



LGMSD 2022/23

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	81%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	75%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>Kisoro MLG implemented one (01) infrastructure DDEG funded project in FY2022/2023.</p> <p>Phased construction of the Council Hall block UGX33,244,980.</p> <p>The project which is phased and ongoing, was site visited and the works carried out were confirmed.</p> <p>The Council Hall was found in a functional state.</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"> • By more than 5%, score 3 • 1 to 5% increase, score 2 • If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>Overall, the performance of KMLG in its LLG assessment was 88% in FY2021/2022 and 94% in FY2022/2023, meaning an increase of 6%. This increase was greater than 5%.</p>	3

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>Kisoro MLG implemented one (01) DDEG funded capital investment project in FY2022/2023.</p> <p>Phased construction of the Council Hall block UGX33,244,980.</p> <p>The LG's 4th quarter Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 shows that DDEG total amount budgeted including investment projects was UGX 101,613,000 and what was spent was UGX 101,613,000 which made 100%.</p> <p>The completion certificate for the construction phase under consideration in the Council Hall project was seen and reviewed.</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Kisoro MLG implemented one (01) DDEG funded project in FY2022/2023.</p> <p>Phased construction of Council Hall extension UGX33,244,980</p> <p>The LG's 4th Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 shows that DDEG was spent 100% by the end of the year. The total amount budgeted was UGX101,613,000 and what was spent was UGX101,613,000 which made 100%. This figure includes funds sent to LLGs.</p> <p>The projects were all eligible under DDEG guidelines (Table 7 - Positive List/Investment Menu, page 7 and 8).</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Annual Work Plan and Budget for the FY 2022/2023 indicated one infrastructure project funded under the DDEG and it had amounts according to contract documents as follows:</p> <p>1) Extension/Renovation of the Council Hall - KMC/782/WRKS/2022-23/00007. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 33,651,476/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 33,395,463/=.</p> <p>The Variation was at 0.76% $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$</p> <p>The Variations; $[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$ were thus within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

In Kisoro Municipal LG, there was inadequate staffing in place as per minimum standards and staff list at LLGs as per the three Divisions of Northern, Southern, and Central Division.

At Northern Division out of a staff establishment ceiling of 14, the only staff available included:

1. Senior Assistant Town Clerk: Busingye Gloria
2. Assistant Town Clerk: Arinitwe Eunice
3. Treasurer: Ntirenganya Richard
4. Assistant Treasurer: Irankunda Eunice
5. Town Agent: Ndikumana Agnes
6. Town Agent: Nyirakwiringira Merab
7. Office Attendant: Muhawe Shallon
8. Community Development Officer: Mwiza Odeth
9. Askari: Akankwasa Banard

Staff deployed at Southern Division, against a staff establishment ceiling of 14, were:

1. Senior Assistant Town Clerk: Mugisha Godfrey
2. Assistant Town Clerk: Irankunda Mary
3. Treasurer: Muhame Daniel
4. Senior Assistant Accountant: Mahoro Martha
5. Town Agent: Ngabirano Edson
6. Town Agent: Kabera Charity
7. Town Agent: Gahoza Victor
8. Office Attendant: Hashimimana Vian
9. Community Development Officer: Niyiguha Shallon
10. Askari: Niringiyimana Innocent

At Central Division, out of a staff establishment of 14, staffs deployed were:

1. Senior Assistant Town Clerk: Nfitundinda Angello
2. Assistant Town Clerk: Namulema Lailah Lugasa
3. Treasurer: Hakiza Benon
4. Town Agent: Habumugisha Julius
5. Town Agent: Mukabagire Kedrace
6. Community Development Officer: Nkomejimana Andrew
7. Secretary: Nyirabizimenyera Rosemary
8. Askari: Ngabirano Vian

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"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. 	<p>For the one (01) DDEG infrastructure project of FY2022/2023:</p> <p>Phased construction of the Council Hall block UGX33,244,980.</p> <p>According to the verification done on the site visit, the actual level of completion as verified during site visit was found to be consistent with what was in the report.</p>	2
<p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>				
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>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Kisoro MLG conducted 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"> 1. Southern Division:The district internal assessment awarded a score of 92%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 90%. This indicates a deviation of only -2%. 2. Central Division: The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 94%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 92%. This indicates a deviation of only -2%. 	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>There was no evidence 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	There was no evidence that the Municipality had implemented performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	0
---	---	--	---	----------

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	There was no evidence that the LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the Ministry of Public Service by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. The letter presented for review during assessment was dated September 12, 2023 "RE: Recruitment Plan 2023/2024" stamped received at the Ministry of Public Service on September 19, 2023. This submission was for the wrong financial year.	0
---	--	---	---	----------

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

There **was evidence** that the HRM department in Kisoro Municipal Council conducted tracking of attendance to duty using a Daily Attendance Register where staff signed in on arrival. The days attended were then summarized in an excel sheet for analysis and a report generated and submitted to the Town Clerk for action.

The report for the month of March from Northern Division submitted to the Town Clerk dated April 11, 2023, "RE: SUBMISSION OF MARCH STAFF ATTENDANCE ANALYSIS REPORT" signed by Busingye Gloria, Senior Assistant Town Clerk indicated among others that:

1. Busingye Gloria, Senior Assistant Town Clerk attended for 11 out of 22 days computing to 52%
2. Ntirenganya Richard, Treasurer attended for 20 out of 22 days computing to 90%
3. Muhawe Shallon, Office Attendant attended for 22 out of 22 days computing to 100%

The report for the month of June from HRM department submitted to the Town Clerk dated July 03, 2023, "REPORT ON STAFF ATTENDANCE TO DUTY FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 2023" signed by Bankundiye Zerida, Human Resource Officer indicated among others that:

1. Mukamusoni Beatrice, Senior Human Resource Officer attended for 16 out of 21 days computing to a percentage of 76%
2. Semahoro Aloysius, Senior Engineer attended for 16 out of 21 days computing to 76%
3. Ahimbisibwe Gertrude, Senior Procurement Officer attended for 14 out of 21 days computing to 66%

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

Review of scorecards for HODs indicated that they **were not** appraised as per guidelines issued by Ministry of Public Service during the previous FY because some of the appraisals were **completed beyond** the prescribed timeline of not later than **June 30**.

1. The Principal Finance Officer, Niringiye Godson was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 06, 2023.
2. The Senior Planner, Mutoni Justine was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.
3. The Principal Engineer, Semahoro Alloysius was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **August 09, 2023**.
4. The Senior Environment Officer, Nizeyimana Anaklet was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.
5. The Principal Community Development Officer, Birungi B. Front was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **July 27, 2023**.
6. The Senior Commercial Officer, Mfitumukiza Aaron was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **July 02, 2023**.
7. The Senior Procurement Officer, Ahimbisibwe Gertrude was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **July 05, 2023**.
8. The Senior Human Resource Officer (Administration), Mukamusoni Beatrice was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **July 14, 2023**.
9. The Senior Physical Planner, Mbabazi Kenneth Collins was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **September 06, 2023**.
10. The Senior Accountant, Bagaragaza Alex was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.
11. The Senior Internal Auditor, Kamari Emmanuel was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on **July 03, 2023**.

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Review of some of the minutes of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee show that Kisoro Municipal Council implemented administrative rewards and sanctions. In the minutes of the meeting of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee sitting on June 05, 2023 submitted to the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 07, 2023 "RE: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS COMMITTEE MEETING" signed by the Senior Human Resource Officer, Mukamusoni Beatrice, under Min. 3/2023 handled the case of Habumugisa Hosea accused of using Government property (vehicle) in his private business, interdicted and required to respond within 14 days. The Committee following a review of his response and apology in Min. 4/2023 resolved and recommended to the Town Clerk lifting of his suspension since he was a first offender, was contrite and had apologized in the given time.</p> <p>Other cases handled were that of Mbabazi Lillian from Education department who had not been working as evidenced by failure to use the biometric reporting gadget; the case of Florida Kangeyo who was accused of not working and claiming to be sick all the time; and the case of Mujoyawimana Annah who had not been working for over a year and a half claiming to be sick and unable to attend to duty.</p> <p>The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was formally constituted in a letter appointing members of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee dated June 21, 2022 "RE: Appointment of Rewards and Sanctions Committee" signed by the Town Clerk, Kamba Kharuna and comprised of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nteziryaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk as Chairperson 2. Mukamusoni beatrice, senior Human Resource Officer as Secretary 3. Sabiti Emmanuel Mugyema, Ag. Principal Education Officer as Member 4. Semahoro Aloysius, Senior Engineer as Member 	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence adduced during assessment that the LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional.</p>	0

8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY had accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. A list of staff recruited during the previous FY titled "List of New Employees" dated November 03, 2023 and signed by the Deputy Town Clerk, Nteziyaremye Moses indicated that Kisoro Municipal Council recruited 8 new staff and below are the details of their access to the salary payroll.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tuyizere Annet Proscovia, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/5/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 53 days. 2. Dushimimana Gloria, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/6/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 52 days. 3. Kwizera Bin Haruna, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/5/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 53 days. 4. Twesiime Jonas, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/5/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 53 days. 5. Niyonzima Ezra, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/2/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 56 days. 6. Ingabire A. Angel, Education Assistant II assumed on 6/5/2023 and accessed on 7/28/2023 after 53 days. 7. Irankunda Eunice, Senior Assistant Accountant assumed on 7/7/2023 and accessed on 9/28/2023 after 81 days. 8. Mahoro Martha, Senior Assistant Accountant assumed on 7/7/2023 and accessed on 9/28/2023 after 81 days. 	0
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>There was evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY had accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. A list of staff retired during the previous FY titled "List of Retired Employees" dated November 03, 2023 and signed by the Deputy Town Clerk, Nteziyaremye Moses indicated that Kisoro Municipal Council retired one employee in the previous FY.</p> <p>Ndagijimana James, an Accountant was retired on 5/1/2023 and accessed the pension payroll on 6/28/2023 after 57 days.</p>	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Annual FY2022/2023 Kisoro Municipality DDEG budget for LLGs was UGX53,470,000. What was transferred to 3 Divisions during the FY according to the financial report was UGX53,470,000, composed as follows:</p> <p>Quarter one UGX0</p> <p>Quarter two UGX17,823,284</p> <p>Quarter three UGX35,469,564</p> <p>Total UGX53,469,848</p> <p>This approximates to UGX53,470,000 and means all the funds (100%) were transferred in accordance with the budget.</p>	2
10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>For KMLG, the DDEG funds were warranted and transferred during FY2022/2023 to LLGs as follows:</p> <p>For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022 and the TC warranted on 10th August 2022. However, no DDEG funds were transferred to LLGs during quarter one. They were all sent in quarter two and three (32 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 19th October 2022 (18 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 13th January 2023 and the disbursements made on 16th January 2023 (18 days).</p> <p>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.</p>	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 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 communicated on October 18, 2022 and reached Northern Division accounts on October 19, 2022 2 days later.

The third quarter release was communicated on January 13, 2023 and reached Northern Division accounts on January 16, 2023 2 days later.

Second quarter release communicated on October 18, 2022 reached Southern Division accounts on October 19, 2022 2 days later.

Third quarter release communicated on January 13, 2023 reached Southern Division accounts on January 16, 2023 2 days later.

Second quarter release communicated on October 18, 2022 reached Central Division accounts on October 19, 2022 2 days later.

Third quarter release communicated on January 13, 2023 reached Central Division accounts on January 16, 2023 2 days later.

11

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 25/07/2022 on subject "MENTORING REPORT ON BUDGET PREPARATION, APPROVAL, EXECUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION". The monitoring activity focused on training on budget preparation, approval and understanding the entire budgeting cycle. In the same quarter, a monitoring report dated 22/07/2022 was provided which reported monitoring of Zindiro HCIII under UgIFT.

For Quarter two: A report dated 15/12/2022 on subject "MENTORING REPORT ON INTEGRATION OF MUNICIPAL/DIVISION DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY INTO LG PLANNING FRAMEWORK". The activity focused on decentralized planning, development planning, strategic planning and the policy framework for development planning. In the same quarter monitoring was focused on DDEG projects in a report dated 14/12/2022.

For Quarter three: A report dated 06/03/2023 on subject "DISCUSSION AND DISSEMINATION OF DDEG GRANT GUIDELINES FOR FY2023/24". This was a 3 day activity which involved dissemination of DDEG guidelines for FY2023/2024. The activity involved training Divisoin staff i.e. Town Agents, Town Clerks and Treasures. For the same quarter, a monitoring report dated 10/02/2023 was seen which highlighted monitoring for 4 MLG schools – Seseme P/S, Kisoro Hill P/S, Kisoro Demo P/S and Gisoro P/S.

For Quarter four: A report dated 26/06/2022 on subject "PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE IN LOWER LOCAL GOVERNMENTS". The activity focused on empowering LLG staff in understanding and applying the concept of performance management. For the same quarter, a monitoring report dated 26/06/2023 highlighted the activity of monitoring the installation of street lights which was carried out by Municipal TPC members.

KMLG sufficiently carried out mentoring/ monitoring/ supervision activities 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. In addition, attendance registers of these meetings were provided and reviewed.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 16/08/2022 discussed quarter one monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN/009/TPC/KMC/2022-23 – Presentation of the findings and recommendations from Zindiro HCIII monitoring). Among the issues discussed were the presence of cracks in the building, peeling of paint, damage on the gypsum ceiling within the post-natal ward and the state of the floor screed in the maternity ward.

TPC minutes for a meeting on 19/12/2022 discussed quarter two mentoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN/031/TPC/KMC/2022-23 – Findings from Monitoring DDEG Projects). Issues handled included need for an exit door in the council hall, need to lobby for more funding, need to change the female washroom to extreme end etc.

TPC minutes for a meeting on 30/06/2023 discussed quarter four mentoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN/073/TPC/KMC/2022-23 – Findings from the Mentoring of Installation of Street Lights). Some of the issues highlighted included salutation to the engineering department for its efforts to beautify the town, eight (08) street lights installed to Bunagana road and need to write to donors and well-wishers to lobby for more street lights.

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

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The LG had an IFMIS based electronic assets register, formatted as required by the LG Accounting Manual. A printed copy was also availed for this assessment.</p> <p>However, the LG’s assets were not engraved and so it wasn’t easy to identify all the sampled assets in the register.</p> <p>Of the eleven (11) assets sampled during this assessment including Council land and buildings, computers, equipment, furniture and motor vehicles and of these, three (03) were not found in the register.</p> <p>The LG had an asset register but it was not updated and its details and content did not satisfy the requirement.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>A Board of Survey report for the year 2021/2022 dated 29th August 2022 with 4 key recommendations was availed. The recommendations included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Council should urgently put in place an assets register that should always be updated on a regular basis ❑ Council should assign an officer to be responsible for the assets register who will coordinate all departments to keep the register updated ❑ Municipal and Divisions should prioritise transport means for field officers for effective service delivery. ❑ Dispose off a recommended list of assets. A list of 28 items was included in the Board of Survey report as those recommended for disposal. <p>As on the date of this assessment on 02/11/2023, the first two recommendations had been implemented and the last two which included disposal of the recommended list of items had not been acted upon.</p> <p>The LG has only partially acted on the recommendations of the Board of Survey report of FY2021/2022.</p>	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>Kisoro MLG has a 13 member Physical Planning Committee, though the appointment letters provided/seen were for only 7 members. According to the documents seen/provided, not much evidence of meetings was provided for this assessment:</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting - No evidence of minutes or their submission was provided/seen.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting - No evidence of minutes or their submission was provided/seen.</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting - No evidence of minutes or their submission was provided/seen.</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting on 11/05/2023 minutes, but no evidence of the submission of these minutes to MoLHUD was seen/provided.</p> <p>The requirement of quarterly physical planning committee meetings and submission of four (04) sets of minutes of the year to MoLHUD was not satisfied and the functionality of the Physical Planning Committee is in question.</p>
----	---	--	---

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>Kisoro MLG has one (01) DDEG funded infrastructural project in its FY2022/2023 annual workplan and budget.</p> <p>Phased construction of the Council Hall block UGX33,244,980.</p> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derived from the LG Development Plan -Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives -Financially feasible -Having costed project profiles. <p>Evidence of desk appraisal for the one (01) KMLG DDEG project for FY2022/2023 was availed/ seen.</p>
----	---	---	--

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>Kisoro MLG had one (01) DDEG funded infrastructural project in its FY2022/2023 budget.</p> <p>Phased construction of the Council Hall block UGX33,244,980.</p> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technical feasibility -Environmental and social acceptability requirements. <p>Evidence was provided concerning field appraisal for the one (01) DDEG infrastructural project of FY2022/2023.</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>Kisoro MLG 5 year Development Plan 2020/2021-2024/2025 contained project profiles for the projects the MLG (Annex 1 - PROJECT PROFILES - Page 119). The profiles cover different aspects of the MLG including Council hall building, Construction of Primary schools, rehabilitation of roads and construction of office blocks, for the 5 years.</p> <p>KMLG FY2022/2023 Project profiles (costed) were presented and discussed in the TPC meeting which sat on 28/03/2023, Minute number MIN.052/TPC/KMC/2022-23: PRESENTATIONOF PROJECT PROFILES.</p> <p>The Municipal Development Plan, DTPC minutes and the separate costed profiles were availed for the assessment and seen/reviewed.</p> <p>Project profiles with costing were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/2024.</p>	1								
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>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction</p> <p>Screening for environmental and social risks/impact for fencing of Zindiro HC III was conducted on 26/9/2023, signed and stamped by SEO and PCDO. Field appraisal were carried out on 24/11/2022, and the endorsement team of appraisal comprised of the following;</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="758 1910 1241 2103"> <tr> <td>1. Birungi Front</td> <td>PCDO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Semahoro Aloysius</td> <td>Sen Engineer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Nizeyimana Anaklet</td> <td>SEO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Mutonyi</td> <td>Planner</td> </tr> </table>	1. Birungi Front	PCDO	2. Semahoro Aloysius	Sen Engineer	3. Nizeyimana Anaklet	SEO	4. Mutonyi	Planner	2
1. Birungi Front	PCDO											
2. Semahoro Aloysius	Sen Engineer											
3. Nizeyimana Anaklet	SEO											
4. Mutonyi	Planner											

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. These include: 1. Construction of Council Hall (Roofing). Estimated (Budget) at UGX 41,973,000/=. 2. Roofing of Office (Central Division). Estimated (Budget) at UGX 30,000,000/=. 3. Phased Construction of Office Block. Estimated (Budget) at UGX 25,000,000/=	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 is evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY (2022/23) using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. The projects listed below were approved in Contracts Committee Meeting dated 20/9/2023 under Min No. 016/CC/2023-24. 1. Roofing Office (Central Division). 2. Phased Construction of Office Block.	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 LG had properly established the Project Implementation team(s) as per guidelines since there was no appointments from the Town Clerk to the Clerk of Works. However, joint appointments through memo dated 16/1/2023 were prepared and signed by the Clerk of Works for: the Project Manager, Contract Manager, Senior Community Development Officer, Senior Environment Officer and Labour Officer.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There is evidence that one infrastructure project implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the Municipal Engineer. The infrastructure project under DDEG Funding was found to be compliant with the standard designs and specifications as provided by the Municipal Engineer as described below: 1. Extension/Renovation of Council Hall- The scope of works comprised of: substructure works (i.e. excavation of foundation, foundation concrete, plinth wall construction, back filling, murrum and hardcore placement and casting of oversite concrete), superstructure works (i.e. walling, casting of ring beam, installation of windows and doors). During assessment, all components of the structure were found to be in good condition and the technical designs were followed.	1

<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 the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY (2022/23).</p> <p>A Project Implementation Team was set up for each project and it comprised of several technical officers that jointly inspected the infrastructure prior to its verification and certification.</p> <p>The following projects among others were sampled:</p>
---	--	---

1. **Renovation of One Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo P/S-** The contractor's claim dated 02/02/2023 was certified for payment by the Town Clerk, Municipal Education Officer and Municipal Engineer. A joint site meeting was held on 16/1/2023 with the Project Manager, Contract Manager, PCDO, Senior Environment Officer and Labour Officer in attendance. Site inspection was done by the Project Manager on 21/2/2023 and a supervision report prepared. A practical completion certificate was prepared and signed on 21/2/2023 by the Project Manager (Senior Assistant Engineering Officer), Senior Engineer and Senior Environment Officer. An Environment and Social compliance certification form was also signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 26/5/2023.
2. **Construction of one classroom at Seseme P/S-**The contractor's claim dated 02/02/2023 was certified for payment by the Town Clerk, Municipal Education Officer and Municipal Engineer. Site inspection was done by the Project Manager on 8/2/2023 and a supervision report prepared. A practical completion certificate dated 10/2/2023 was prepared and signed on 15/2/2023 by the Project Manager (Senior Assistant Engineering Officer), Senior Engineer, PCDO and Senior Environment Officer. Payment Certificate No. 1 dated 10/2/2023 was prepared and signed by the Project Manager, Senior Engineer and Senior Environment Officer. An Environment and Social compliance certification form was also signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 27/01/2023. However, there are no joint site meeting minutes.
3. **Extension/Renovation of the Council Hall-** The contractor's claims dated 12/4/2023 and 19/06/2023 were certified for payment by the Town Clerk and Municipal Engineer. Site inspection was done by the Project Manager on 15/05/2023 and 19/06/2023 and supervision reports prepared. Two practical completion certificates were prepared and signed on 21/2/2023 and 14/04/2023 by the Project Manager (Senior Assistant Engineering Officer), Senior Engineer and Senior Environment Officer. An Environment and Social compliance certification form was also signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 12/4/2023. However, there are

no joint site meeting minutes and some completion reports and certificates are missing.

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 Kisoro Municipal Council verified works (certified) and initiated timely payments of contractors timely for example;

1. Payments for Works- Phased construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002. The project had a procurement file and works were included in Quarter 3 of the Education Department Procurement Plan. The Town Clerk and Municipal Engineer approved the contractor's claims dated 7/2/2023 after verification of the works and the Project Manager prepared completion reports dated 8/2/2023 after inspection of the completed works. Practical completion certificates of payment were then initiated on 10/2/2023 by the senior assistant engineering officer (project manager) and verified by the Senior Engineer. An environment and social certificate was also attached to the payment certificate and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 17/02/2023.
2. Payments for Works- Construction of 1 Classroom at Seseme P/S-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005. The project had a procurement file and works were included in Quarter 3 of the Education Department Procurement Plan. The Town Clerk, Municipal Education Officer and Municipal Engineer approved the contractor's claims dated 2/2/2023 after verification of the works and the Project Manager prepared completion reports dated 8/2/2023 after inspection of the completed works. Practical completion certificates of payment were then initiated on 10/2/2023 by the senior assistant engineering officer (project manager) and verified by the Senior Engineer and Senior Environment Officer on 15/02/2023. An environment and social certificate was also attached to the payment certificate and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 15/02/2023.
3. Payments for Works- Renovation of one classroom and Minor repairs on the resource room at Kisoro Demo P/S-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00004. The project had a procurement file and works were included in Quarter 3 of the Education Department Procurement Plan. The Town Clerk, Municipal Education Officer and Municipal Engineer approved the contractor's claims dated 2/2/2023 after verification of the works and the Project Manager prepared completion reports dated 21/2/2023 after inspection of the completed works. Practical completion certificates of payment were also initiated on 21/2/2023 by the senior assistant engineering officer (project manager) and verified by the Senior Engineer and Senior Environment Officer. The PCDO verified the

1

completion certificate on 15/02/2023. An environment and social certificate was also attached to the payment certificate and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 17/02/2023.

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Score 1 or else 0

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:

1. Construction of 1 Classroom at Seseme P/S- KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min049/CC/2022-2023 in a meeting held on 30/11/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee on 28/2/2023. The contract document was signed on 16/3/2023. The project was included in the Education Department procurement plan (3rd Quarter) for the previous FY(2022/23) dated 29/4/2022 and on the contracts register.
2. Phased construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School- KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min049/CC/2022-2023 in a meeting held on 30/11/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee on 30/11/2023. The contract document was signed on 20/12/2022. The project was included in the Education Department procurement plan (3rd Quarter) for the previous FY(2022/23) dated 29/4/2022 and on the contracts register.
3. Renovation of one classroom and Minor repairs on the resource room at Kisoro Demo P/S- KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00004; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min049/CC/2022-2023 in a meeting held on 30/11/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee on 30/11/2022. The contract document was signed on 20/12/2022. The project was included in the Education Department procurement plan (3rd Quarter) for the previous FY(2022/23) dated 29/4/2022 and on the contracts register.

1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	There was evidence that municipality had 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.	In a letter dated 1/7/2023, the Town Clerk appointed Mr Iragaba Julius (SCDO) as the focal point person for grievance redress committee, signed and stamped by Town Clerk Mr Kamba Kharuna, copied to Mayor and division chairpersons. In separate letters dated 1/7/2023, the Town Clerk appointed the following members that established the centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC)	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	1. Nizeyimana Anacklet Member SEO	2. Sabiiti Emmanuel Mugyema Member PEO	
			3. Sebahire Christopher Member SAEO		
			4. Mutoni Justine Secretary Planner		
			5. Busingye Gloria Member SATC		
			6. Mugisha Godfrey Member SATC		
			7. Dr Nkomejimana Benon Member PMO		
			8. Manirakiza Papius Member Ag.SAO		
			9. Mr Iragaba Julius Chairperson SCDO		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	There was evidence that Municipal 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.	The Municipal had log book in place with 7 columns capturing the date, complainant name, address grievance details and action taken after investigation, a public display of information stamped by SCDO and dated 22/2/2022 was displayed on municipal note board.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0			

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	There was no evidence that Municipality had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	Kisoro MLG Development Plan III and Annual Workplan and budget 2022/2023 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:	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure		<p>In the KMLG DDP, there are interventions incorporated on Pages 83-85: Community Mobilization and Mindset Change</p> <p>Page 114 - Climate Change, Natural Resources and Environment (Pages 86-87)</p> <p>Approved budget FY2023/2024</p> <p>For FY2023/2024, there an approved budget for Natural Resources, Environment, Climate Change, Land and Water of UGX150,104,000.</p> <p>Program 06 - Natural resources, environment, climate change, land and water</p> <p>Sub Programme 01 - Environment and natural resources management.</p> <p>Environment and social safeguards.</p> <p>Environmental, social and climate change interventions were integrated into KMLG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets.</p>	

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	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 score 1 or else 0	KMLG Planning Unit disseminated enhanced DDEG guidelines FY2022/2023 by distributing them to LLG staff according to a report dated 06/03/2023 titled: REPORT ON THE DISSEMINATION OF DDEG GRANT GUIDELINES FOR FY2023/2024). In this meeting LLG staff were sensitized on the changes in DDEG guidelines. A sheet dated 28/06/2023 was presented where LLG staff did sign for the guidelines, as evidence. On the sheet, 3 staff from each one of the three Divisions signed as evidence of collecting the guidelines.	1
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 was no 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	0
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 was no evidence for examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change	0

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	There was evidence that all DDEG projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances 1. Request for freehold land title for Town council, dated 13/2/2007 and accepted on 11/2/2008 by district land board signed and stamped secretary to the district land board Mr Kwizera George. In a letter dated 17/10/2023 of REF KMC/1204/1, the Town Clerk Mr Kamba Kharuna Kisoro Municipal Council requested for Title deeds for plot 61 Mutanda road and Plots 8-24, Kisoro Kabale road.	1
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 was evidence 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 renovation of Kisoro Municipal council hall was carried out on 20/3/2023, monitoring reports were reviewed dated 20/3/2023, 27/3/2023 and 10/4/2023, stamped and signed by both SEO and PCDO, project started 16/3/2023 and ended 15/5/2023.	1
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 evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were 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 renovation of Kisoro Municipal council hall was completed stamped and signed by both SEO and SCDO on 12/4/203, the contractor preenpost company ltd was paid Ugx 33,395,463 on 28/6/2023.	1

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to KDGL FY2022/2023 financial report, the LG runs the following bank accounts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treasury single account General Fund account Kisoro MC Revenue Collection Account YLP recovery account UWEP recovery account Kisoro MC Imprest account <p>The responsibility of reconciliation of the TSA is said to have been taken back to MoFPED.</p> <p>Of the remaining bank accounts, as on the day of assessment on 03/11/2023 no evidence of bank reconciliation having been done since the start of the new financial year 2023/2024 was presented/seen and the accounts were not reconciled to 03/10/2023. What was confirmed was that the accounts were reconciled to 30th June 2023 as at the close of the previous financial year.</p> <p>The MLG's bank accounts were not reconciled as required under this manual.</p>	0
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>The four quarterly reports of FY 2022/2023 were produced by the KMLG 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 22/07/2023.</p> <p>There was evidence that the reports were submitted to the Speaker, TC, LGPAC, Auditor General and the Mayor through dated acknowledgement signatures of the recipients on the reports and 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 KMLG quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/2023 did not contain a section for follow-up on the status of implementation of prior audit findings/ recommendations.</p> <p>However, the Internal Audit department produced a consolidated report dated 27/07/2023 following up on the findings made in the first three quarters of the year. The report mainly focused on un-accounted for funds and this was probably that is the main focus of internal audit at the LG and this is an area of capacity building. The report was addressed to the Speaker.</p> <p>We conclude that the LG has made effort to have a documented mechanism for follow-up of previous internal audit findings.</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>KMLG records show that the four quarterly internal audit reports were received by TC, Council and DPAC through witness of the acknowledgement signatures of the recipients on the audit submission memos.</p> <p>Three LGPAC reports were provided as evidence that Internal Audit reports for FY2022/2023 were discussed and followed up by Kisoro District LG PAC.</p> <p>Quarter 1 internal audit report was discussed in LGPAC meeting which sat on 9th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 2 internal audit report was discussed in LGPAC meeting which sat on 27th April 2023</p> <p>Quarters 3 and 4 internal audit reports - were discussed in the DPAC meeting which sat on 28th and 29th September 2023.</p> <p>The Municipal Executive meeting on 29th September 2023 discussed PAC reports per minute MIN.23/KMC/2023/2024 - PAC Recommendations).</p> <p>Internal audit reports of KMLG were presented to the LGPAC and PAC sufficiently discussed and took actions on them.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Kisoro MLG OSR budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX1,212,236,236. What was realised according to the financial report was UGX441,176,607. This was 36.3% of what was budgeted and falls outside the +/-10% range.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

19	<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>According to the financial reports, Kisoro MLG OSR performance for FY 2021/2022 was UGX437,549,299. Performance for FY 2022/2023 was UGX441,176,607. This was an increase in revenue, which was UGX3,627,308 i.e. 0.82%.</p> <p>There was an increase in OSR performance between FY2021/2022 and FY2022/2023 but it was very minimal.</p>	0
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>During the year ended 2022/2023, what was collected by KMLG as OSR was UGX441,176,607. Of this the amount on which the 50% remittance to LLGs was applicable was UGX304,703,440.</p> <p>What was remitted to the 3 divisions (Central, Southern and Northern) during the FY was UGX195,699,283 itemized as follows:</p> <p>On 20/06/2023 UGX21,946,145</p> <p>On 14/11/2022 UGX27,697,150</p> <p>On 12/10/2022 UGX19,498,174</p> <p>On 19/12/2022 UGX18,512,000</p> <p>On 08/02/2023 UGX22,466,108</p> <p>On 24/03/2023 UGX24,232,841</p> <p>On 06/06/2023 UGX16,667,212</p> <p>On 12/05/2023 UGX26,651,048</p> <p>On 30/08/2022 UGX18,028,605</p> <p>TOTAL UGX195,699,283</p> <p>This made 64.2%. This was well above the 50% threshold.</p> <p>The MLG complied with the 50% OSR remittance requirement to LLGs.</p>	2

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 current FY (2023/24) Procurement Plan (published on the Notice Board on 14/7/2023) and the Awarded Contracts were duly published/displayed on the Kisoro Municipal Town Council Procurement Notice board for Public View.</p> <p>Examples of Projects – List of Best Evaluated Bidders under Selective National Bidding;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proc. Ref. No-KISO866/WRKS/2023-23400002: for the Completion of a Phased Classroom at Seseme P/S; Names of shortlisted bidders are: Murapha (U) Ltd, Preenpost Co. Ltd, Shorero United Contractors Co. Ltd; Display date was 11/10/2023 and Removal date was 24/10/2023. 2. Proc. Ref. No-KISO866/WRKS/2023-23400004: for Fencing Zindiro Health Centre III: Names of shortlisted bidders are; Forward Investment (U) Ltd; Rwisheja Enterprise Limited, Preen Post Company Limited; Display date was 11/10/2023 and Removal date was 24/10/2023. 3. Proc. Ref. No-KISO866/WRKS/2023-23400001: for Phased Office Construction (Central Division): Names of shortlisted bidders are; Shorero United Contractors Co. Ltd; Rwisheja Enterprises Limited, Lusa International Limited; Display date was 11/10/2023 and Removal date was 24/10/2023. 	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 TPC and the Executive meetings which sat on 26/08/2022 (24/07/2023 for the TPC), as per minute (MIN/06/KMC/TPC/2023/2024). In this meeting the TC presented the performance of the MLG which had come as 14th position out of 176, having got an average score of 66%. Members appreciated the performance and were challenged on the need to fight to do even better.</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 was provided as evidence titled “REPORT ON BARAZA CONCERNS RAISED DURING FEEDBACK MEETING HELD ON 1st NOVEMBER 2022 IN MAYOR’S GARDEN”. The report dated 03/11/2022 concerned a Baraza held on 1st November 2022.</p> <p>The Baraza was attended by about 300 people who included business community, the Local Council leadership (LC1-LC4), Municipal staff both from headquarters and divisions, Uganda police etc. Issues discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Failure to put buses in the bus park and they end up causing jams on the roads ❑ Piles of garbage along the streets ❑ Few street lights resulting into insecurity in the town ❑ Silting of drainages in the municipality ❑ A lot of street children due to high school drop-out rates ❑ Some areas in the MC which don’t have electricity demanding power to be extended there. <p>The meeting ended with recommendations on things which need to be changed for improved service delivery in the MC.</p> <p>The attendance register for the meeting was availed and reviewed.</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>No evidence was provided/seen as to KMLG publishing i.e. making publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal during the previous FY2022/2023.</p>	0

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 assessment year FY2022/2023, nor was any such report presented to Council during FY2022/2023.

The MLG said they did not have an IGG file and there were no known outstanding issues concerning IGG, though that did not mean they complied. At least no file was availed to the Assessor.

The LG did not meet the requirement of the performance measure.

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2020 and 2022 and calculated the percentage change in performance. We noted that the PLE performance increased by 0.9%. Specific details below:</p> <p>☐ 489 out 515 (94.9%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (4)</p> <p>☐ 621 out of 648 (95.8%) pupils who sat PLE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (07)</p> <p>☐ Thus, a percentage increase between years of 0.9% (Improvement below 1%), 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"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2020 and 2022 for USE school (Sesame Girls SS) and calculated the percentage improvement in performance. We noted that the UCE performance improved by 16.8% between years as detailed below:</p> <p>☐ 55 out of 91 (60.4%) students who sat UCE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (0)</p> <p>☐ 71 out 92 (77.2%) students who sat UCE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (0)</p> <p>☐ Thus, a percentage increase between years of 16.8% (Improvement by more than 5%), the score is 3.</p>	3

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>The performance of KMLG in its LLG Education assessment was 22% in FY2021/2022 and 100% in FY2022/2023, meaning an increase of 78%. This increase was greater than 5%.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 		
		<p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</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>The planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for LGs for the education sector FY 2023-2024, page (17), state that at least 95% of sector development budget will be used for capital investments.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>In line with the above, there was evidence that the education sector development grant was used on eligible activities as per sector guidelines.</p>	
			<p>The review of the 2022-2023 Quarterly performance report (Q4) 713 Kisoro MC, indicated that the approved budget was Ugx.114,664,000 of which Ugx. 108,931,191 was spent on capital investments representing 95%.</p>	
			<p>Specific details outlined below:</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement Ref.No. KMC782/WRKS/2022-2023/00005: Phased classroom construction at Sememe PS at Ugx 30,000,000 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ProcurementRef.No.KMC782/WRKS/2022-2023/00002: Phased construction of a staff house at Gisoro PS at Ugx.40,000,000 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement Ref.No.KMC782/WRKS/2022-2023/00004: Classroom rehabilitation at Kisoro Demo PS at Ugx.24,000,000 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ProcurementRef.No.KMC782/WRKS/2022-2023/00003: Classroom rehabilitation at Kisoro Hill PS at Ugx.14,931,192 	

Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Four (04) KMLG Education infrastructure projects of FY2022/2023 were sampled to check certification before payment.

Payment of retention to Shorero United Contractors Ltd for construction of classroom block at Seseme P/S (UGX669,150) – Requisition dated 15/06/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 15/03/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023.

Payment to Preenpost Company Ltd for renovation of one classroom block and minor repairs on the resource centre at Kisoro Demo P/S (UGX26,883,156) – Requisition dated 24/02/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 21/02/2023 and payment on 17/03/2023.

Payment to Shorero United Contractors Ltd for phased construction of 2 units of staff houses at Gisoro P/S (UGX31,732,647) – Requisition dated 07/02/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 10/03/2023 and payment on 16/03/2023.

Payment to Ndagajose Builders and Engineering Ltd for renovation of one classroom block at Kisoro Hill P/S (UGX11,197,618) – Requisition dated 02/06/2023, certified by the certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 02/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023.

In all the four (04) sampled projects, certification for Education infrastructural projects certification was done before payments were effected in accordance with the requirements.

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 ME and Education offices, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineer's estimate (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages; [(A - B)/A] *100% :	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phased construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro P/S – KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 39,594,310/=; the Contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 39,517,610/=. The Variation was at 0.19% 2. Construction of 1 Classroom at Seseme Primary School – KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 30,020,911/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 29,864,709/=. The Variation was at 0.52%. 3. Renovation of one classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo P/S– KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00004. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 24,001,672; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 23,898,540 /=. The Variation was at 0.43%. 	
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	There was no seed school constructed in the previous FY (2022/23) under Kisoro Municipal Council. However, 3 other Education Projects were sampled as seen below:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phased construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro P/S – KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002. The project commencement date was 21/12/2022 and the completion date was 21/02/2023. The project was completed within the 3rd Quarter as per the Budget performance report for FY 2022/23. 2. Construction of 1 Classroom at Seseme Primary School – KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005. The project commencement date was 10/2/2023 and the completion date was 21/03/2023. The project was completed within the 3rd Quarter as per the Budget performance report for FY 2022/23. 3. Renovation of One Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo P/s - KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00004. The project commencement date was 21/12/2022 and the completion date was 21/03/2023. The project was completed within the 3rd Quarter as per the Budget performance report for FY 2022/23. 	

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>The staff ceilings for primary schools and staff lists for teachers in post were not availed by HRM for review so there was no evidence at the time of assessment that the LG had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>The LG education department maintained a consolidated schools asset registers for FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23 dated 10th September 2021 and 12th September 2022 respectively. The asset register captured the number of classrooms, number of latrines, number of desks and teacher accommodation as per the format provided in the planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for the education and sports sub-program-FY 2023-2024, page57.</p> <p>The review of the consolidated schools asset registers for FYs 2021/22and 2022/22 revealed that the (4) UPE primary schools (Kisoro Demo PS, Gisoro PS, Kisoro Hill PS and Seseme PS) were not meeting all the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines i.e. classroom: pupil ratio of 1:53, desk: pupil ratio of 1:3, latrine stance: pupil ratio of 1:40 and permanent accommodation for at least (4) teachers.</p> <p>For example, none of the (4) UPE schools met the requirement for permanent accommodation for at least (4) teachers, Kisoro Demo. PS and Gisoro PS had latrine stance: pupil ratio of 1:65 and 1:65 respectively. While in Seseme PS, the latrine stance: pupil ratio stood at 1:72.</p> <p>However, Seseme Girls SS) met all the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines. For example, the school had a classroom: pupil ratio of 1:49; latrine stance: pupil ratio of 1:27, desk: pupil ratio of 1:1.08 and teacher houses/accommodation (5).</p> <p>Therefore, one (1) out of the 5 schools (20%) met the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines. The score is 0</p>	0

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

a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The list of primary school teacher deployment dated 14 June 2023, obtained from the MEO's office revealed that a total of (71) teachers were deployed in (4) UPE schools of the Municipality.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment list from the MEO's office.

□ The number of teachers (20) on the MEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (20) in Seseme primary school, Northern division.

The names of teachers verified were:

1. Munyantwari Samuel Baker-HT (Reg.No. G111/1997/8959)

2. Ntakirutimana Irene (Reg.No.47021635416701)

3. Ndinimana Wycliffe (Reg.No.22271572874086)

4. Niringiyimana Michael (Reg.No.28181584287383)

5. Mukarulema Lydia (Reg.No.48801637307422)

6. Byamukama Herbert (Reg.No.34581589046439)

7. Mbabazi Hope (Reg.No.14771588604868)

8. Ndagije Stephen (Reg.No.46211570986573)

9. Mbabazi Lilian (Reg.No.43331575830732)

10. Mwubaha Annet (Reg.No.34871590437220)

11. Ainembabazi Emily (Reg.No.49061570986559)

12. Byiringiro Joyles (Reg.No.1818168097540)

13. Nkubasi Richard Emmanuel (G111/2012/6319)

14. Habumugisha Martin (Reg.No.41341589970924)

15. Kwizira Alex (Reg.No.12411596619165)

16. Namanya Doreen (Reg.No.42071585954093)

17. Irakunda Marion (Reg.No.52421586115693)

18. Turinayo Justus (Reg.No.32341588047512)

19. Niyozima Ezra (File No.085)

20. Dushime Gloria (File No.089)

□ The number of teachers (17) on the MEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (1) in Gisoro Primary school, Southern Division

The names of teachers verified were:

1. Ndagije Paul-HT/Graduate
(Reg.No.406615938004491)
2. Hategekimana Mathias Bizimenya-Grade V
(Reg.No.40901588533286)
3. Nyiramugisha Bujunia-Grade V
(Reg.No.29071586691534)
4. Nyirahabimana Juliet-Grade V
(Reg.No.41311592299782)
5. Bimenyimana John Boosco-Grade V
(Reg.No.38961588763620)
6. Bazimaziki John Wilson-Grade III
(Reg.G111/2003/6155)
7. Nambajimana Gerald-Grade V
(Reg.No.25081633086219)
8. Safari Stephen-Grade V
(Reg.No.GV/2008/4073)
9. Nyiramahoho Pauline-Grade V
(Reg.No.16121583641470)
10. Mukesha Evasta Grade V
(Reg.No.31471575197548)
11. Bigirimana Fidel-Grade V
(Reg.No.4995195070626)
12. Muhire Clesante-Grade III
(Reg.N.18261584874170)
13. Muhawenimana Judith-Grade V
(Reg.No.38071584771642)
14. Mbonimpa Jerurina-Grade V
(Reg.No.52631584988132)
15. Kazungu Christne-Grade V
(Reg.No.30341574616248)
16. Mbabazi Rose-Grade III
(reg.No.15691586494174)
17. Tuyizere Annet Provia-Grade III
(Reg.No.56141575603294)

□ The number of teachers (24) on the MEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (24) in Kisoro T.T.C Dem. Primary School, Southern Division

The names of teachers verified were:

1. Habiyaremye Stephen-HT (Reg.No. 55291575602784)

2. Niyonzimana Sylvia Nzabala
(Reg.No.23121578356781)
3. Muhangyi Christopher (File
No.TSC/KMC/78)
4. Hafashimana Philemon
(Reg.No.28601586357447)
5. Kayitesi Diana
(Reg.No.267415742786617)
6. Ngaboyisonga Edward
(Reg.No.53971588269756)
7. Niyonzima Gerald (Reg.
No.31751574583434)
8. Tumushime Sina Alexander
(Reg.No.41371602398714)
9. Mbabazi Julius (Reg.No.19511617712621)
10. Tusingwire Hope
(Reg.No.40811584794927)
11. Majawimana Anne
(Reg.No.55471582260234)
12. Maniragaba Florence
(Reg.No.52411590433012)
13. Niyonzima Nestor
(Reg.No.34071626996015)
14. Mukisza Godfrey Victor
(Reg.No.21181588792723)
15. Zaninka Harriet
(Reg.No.44131616320949)
16. Bunani Robert
(Reg.No.G111/2003/6103)
17. Mporanyimana Ernest
(Reg.No.54381568315492)
18. Ndikumana Enid
(Reg.No.5158154888058)
19. Faida Abel (Reg.No.17821618294936)
20. Kambabazi Christine Jesca (Reg.No.
24731584685580)
21. Nyiramutuzo Evanis
(Reg.No.30541568397206)
22. Friday Emmanuel
(Reg.No.34231579721000)
23. Musinguzi Wenceslaus
(Reg.No.G111/199/8815)
24. Ingabire A.Angel
(Reg.No.19001680198249)

It was verified that the total number of teachers as indicated on the MEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list in all the (3) sampled UPE schools i.e. Seseme

PS, Kisoro Dem. PS, and Gisoro PS as indicated above. Therefore the information on deployment list of teachers is 100% accurate.

0

5

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

The information on the LG education department consolidated schools 'asset register for FY 2022/23 dated 12 September 2022 (signed & stamped) and school asset registers of the sampled 03 UPE schools was verified and found not to be consistent in 2 out of the 03 sampled UPE schools.

Specific details as indicted below:

☐ Kisoro Demo PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (204) desks and (2) teacher accommodation (2) while the school asset register had (14) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (204) desks and teacher accommodation (2). The information is consistent

☐ Gisoro PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (13) classrooms, (17) latrine stances, (232) desks and teacher accommodation (0) while the school asset register had (15) classrooms, (18) latrine stances, (234) desks and teacher accommodation (0). The information is not consistent

☐ Seseme PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (248) desks and teacher accommodation (3) while the school asset register had (12) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (238) desks and teacher accommodation (4). The information is not consistent

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

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was noncompliance to MoES budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (FY 2023-2024-May 2023, pages 25-28). There was no evidence of submitted annual school reports and budgets for calendar year 2022 by January 30, 2023 as required by the LGMSD Performance Assessment Manual (September 2020).</p> <p>At school level, there was no evidence of copies of Annual School Reports and Budgets for calendar year 2022 in all the 3 sampled UPE schools (Kisoro Demo PS, Gisoro PS and Seseme PS). In Seseme PS, the head teacher was still compiling the report with difficulty. The incomplete report was dated 24 April 2022 and only covered highlights of school performance, SIP and asset register. He reported experiencing difficulties in compiling a cash flow statement and annual budget and expenditure report.</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that education department supported all the 4 (100%) UPE schools to prepare and implement the school improvement plans (SIPs) in line with inspection recommendations.</p> <p>The review of school files in DEO's office revealed that all the (4) UPE schools submitted their SIPs in the required format.</p> <p>The review of the minutes of education staff meeting held on 15 August 2022 indicated school inspectors should check the availability and quality of school improvement plans in sampled schools among others (Min 3 2022: review of performance assessment).</p> <p>It was further verified that all the three (3) sampled UPE schools had in place copies of SIP displayed on the school notice boards as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seseme PS had a SIP 2023 in the recommended format and displayed on school notice board the notice board. For example, poor academic performance (the school had 7 & 5 pupils passing in division 1 in 2022 and 2020 respectively) was one of the key issues to be addressed through; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strengthening remedial teaching o School management Meetings to discuss academic issues o Bench marking from best performing schools 	4

o Creating incentives for best performing students (bursaries)

o Emphasizing weekly tests, assignments and home work activities

.

• Gisoro PS: had a SIP for 2022 in the required format and displayed on the school notice board. Planned activities to address poor academic performance included among others;

o Remedial teaching

o Extensive revision, homework activities,

o Regular inspection supervision and monitoring of teachers

o Sourcing for good math and science teachers (poor PLE performance attributed to incompetent math and science subject teachers)

o Class meeting about career guidance

• Kisoro Demo PS: had a SIP for 2023 in the required format and displayed on the school notice board. Planned activities to address poor academic performance included among others;

o Teacher regular school attendance

o Preparation of up to date schemes of work and lesson plans

o Preparation of instruction materials and wall charts displayed in classrooms

In view of the above, there was evidence that all the three sampled UPE schools had their SIPs in place representing 100% hence the score is 4.

6

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- If 100% score: 4:
- Between 90 - 99% score 2
- Below 90% score 0

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 (4) captured in 2022-2023 Approved Performance contract_713_KISORO MC was consistent with the number of schools (4) in excel data sheet (EMIS) for FY 2022/23

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	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:	Kisoro MC budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (7) teachers per school or a teacher per class in all the (4) Government aided primary schools as per the staff list for the FY 2023/24. The total of primary teachers as per the approved staff lists and wage estimates by vote and cost centre FY 2023-2024 (PBS) was 68 teachers. The total wage bill provision for teachers was UGX462,499,000 as per the LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/24. Kisoro Demo.PS had the highest number of teachers (23) while Kisoro Hill PS had the lowest number of teachers (10).	4
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 4 or else, score: 0			
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	b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,	The education department primary school deployment list for FY 2023/24 obtained from the PEO revealed that a total of (71) teachers were deployed in 4 UPE schools in FY 2023/24 as per sector guidelines e.g. all the (4) UPE schools had a minimum of (7) teachers.	3
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 3 else score: 0		Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment/ school staff lists.	
			□ Seseme PS: The number of teachers (20) on deployment list 2023 was consistent with the number of teachers (20) on the school staff list.	
			□ The names of teachers that were verified:	
			1. Munyantwari SamuelBaker-HT (Reg.No.G111/1997/8959)	
			2. Ntakirutimana Irene (Reg.No.47021635416701)	
			3. Ndinimana Wycliffe (Reg.No.22271572874086)	
			4. Niringiyimana Michael (Reg.No.28181584287383)	
			5. Mukarulema Lydia (Reg.No.48801637307422)	
			6. Byamukama Herbert (Reg.No.34581589046439)	
			7. Mbabazi Hope (Reg.No.14771588604868)	
			8. Ndagije Stephen (Reg.No.46211570986573)	
			9. Mbabazi Lilian (Reg.No.43331575830732)	
			10. Mwubaha Annet (Reg.No.34871590437220)	
			11. Ainembabazi Emily (Reg.No.49061570986559)	
			12. Byiringiro Joyles (Reg.No.1818168097540)	
			13. Nkubasi Richard Emmanuel	

(G111/2012/6319)

14. Habumugisha Martin
(Reg.No.41341589970924)

15. Kwizira Alex (Reg.No.12411596619165)

16. Namanya Doreen
(Reg.No.42071585954093)

17. Irakunda Marion
(Reg.No.52421586115693)

18. Turinayo Justus
(Reg.No.32341588047512)

19. Niyozima Ezra (File No.085)

20. Dushime Gloria (File No.089)

Kisoro Demo PS: The number of teachers (24) on deployment list 2023 was consistent with the number of teachers (24) on the school staff list.

The names of teachers that were verified:

1. Habiyaremye Stephen-HT (Reg.No. 55291575602784)

2. Niyonzimana Sylvia Nzabala
(Reg.No.23121578356781)

3. Muhangyi Christopher (Reg.No.....)

4. Hafashimana Philemon
(Reg.No.28601586357447)

5. Kayitesi Diana
(Reg.No.267415742786617)

6. Ngaboyisonga Edward
(Reg.No.53971588269756)

7. Niyonzima Gerald (Reg. No.31751574583434)

8. Tumushime Sina Alexander
(Reg.No.41371602398714)

9. Mbabazi Julius (Reg.No.19511617712621)

10. Tusingwire Hope
(Reg.No.40811584794927)

11. Majawimana Anne
(Reg.No.55471582260234)

12. Maniragaba Florence
(Reg.No.52411590433012)

13. Niyonzima Nestor
(Reg.No.34071626996015)

14. Mukisza Godfrey Victor
(Reg.No.21181588792723)

15. Zaninka Harriet
(Reg.No.44131616320949)

16. Bunani Robert
(Reg.No.G111/2003/6103)

17. Mporanyimana Ernest
(Reg.No.54381568315492)
18. Ndikumana Enid
(Reg.No.5158154888058)
19. Faída Abel (Reg.No.17821618294936)
20. Kambabazi Christine Jesca (Reg.No.
24731584685580)
21. Nyiramutuzo Evanis
(Reg.No.30541568397206)
22. Friday Emmanuel
(Reg.No.34231579721000)
23. Musinguzi Wenceslaus
(Reg.No.G111/199/8815)
24. Ingabire A.Angel
(Reg.No.19001680198249)

□ Gisoro PS: The number of teachers (17) on deployment list 2023 was consistent with the number of teachers (17) on the school staff list.

The names of teachers that were verified:

1. Ndagije Paul-HT/Graduate
(Reg.No.406615938004491)
2. Hategekimana Mathias Bizimenya-Grade V
(Reg.No.40901588533286)
3. Nyiramugisha Bujunia-Grade V
(Reg.No.29071586691534)
4. Nyirahabimana Juliet-Grade V
(Reg.No.41311592299782)
5. Bimenyimana John Boosco-Grade V
(Reg.No.38961588763620)
6. Bazimaziki John Wilson-Grade III
(Reg.G111/2003/6155)
7. Nambajimana Gerald-Grade V
(Reg.No.25081633086219)
8. Safari Stephen-Grade V
(Reg.No.GV/2008/4073)
9. Nyiramahoho Pauline-Grade V
(Reg.No.16121583641470)
10. Mukesha Evasta Grade V
(Reg.No.31471575197548)
11. Bigirimana Fidel-Grade V
(Reg.No.4995195070626)
12. Muhire Clesante-Grade III
(Reg.N.18261584874170)
13. Muhawenimana Judith-Grade V
(Reg.No.38071584771642)
14. Mbonimpa Jerurina-Grade V

(Reg.No.52631584988132)

15. Kazungu Christne-Grade V
(Reg.No.30341574616248)

16. Mbabazi Rose-Grade III
(reg.No.15691586494174)

17. Tuyizere Annet Provia-Grade III
(Reg.No.56141575603294)

It was established that the teachers as indicated in the staff lists were deployed in those schools. The score is 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:

☐ Seseme PS (Northern Division) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (20) teachers i.e. Male (10) and Female (10)

☐ Gisoro PS (Southern Division) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (17) teachers i.e. Male (8) and Female (9)

☐ Kisoro Demo PS (Southern Division) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (24) teachers i.e. Male (15) and Female (9). The score is 1.

1

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>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</p>	<p>Kisoro Municipal Council had four primary schools. There was no evidence that all primary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copied to MEO for the previous school year. The appraisals found on file indicated that:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Habyaremye Stephen, the headteacher of Kisoro TTC Demonstration Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Mugisha Godfrey, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on October 10, 2022. 2. Ndagije Paul, the headteacher of Gisoro Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Mugisha Godfrey, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on December 21, 2022. 3. Tumusabe Emmanuel, the headteacher of Kisoro Hill Primary School in Southern Division was appraised by Mugisha Godfrey, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on February 15, 2023 which was out of the stipulated timeline of December 31. 4. Munyantwari Samuel Baker, the headteacher of Seseme Primary School in Northern Division was appraised by Busingye Gloria, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on January 21, 2022 which was out of the stipulated timeline of December 31. 	
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 Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was only one senior secondary school and Ruzaza Peace, the headteacher of Seseme Girls Secondary School in Northern Division was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on December 31, 2022.</p>	2
	<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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the two management staff in the LG Education department had been appraised against their performance plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Senior Inspector of Schools, Sabiti Emmanuel Mugyema was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 28, 2023. 2. The Education Officer (Administration), Mukankucisi Assumpta was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023. 	2
---	--	--	--	---

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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department prepared a Training Plan for FY 2022-2023 to address staff capacity gaps. The plan was dated 2 February 2023 (signed and stamped by Senior Inspector of Schools). Training areas included among others;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Training of head teachers on human capital management b) Ball game competition c) PLE training of supervisors and invigilators d) School feeding e) Upgrading of teachers to higher academic levels 	2
---	--	---	---	---

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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>We noted from the PEO, that Kisoro Municipal Council was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data in PBS for 2022_2023_Approved Performance Contrat_713_Kisoro MC which was submitted to MoFPED. It was further established that the list of government aided primary schools (4) captured in 2022-2023 Approved Performance contract_713_Kisoro Municipal Council, was consistent with the number of schools (4) in excel data sheet (EMIS) from MoES</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 Kisoro Municipal Council.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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 MLG 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 LG Approved budget estimates FY 2022-2023 and established that the total approved budget for inspection and monitoring functions was Ugx.13,424,000 (page 27), which was in line with MoES guidelines –page 17.</p>	
			<p>Funds were used to conduct inspection and support supervision to enhance effective learning.</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>Kisoro 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 CAO warranted 13th January 2023 and the disbursements made on 18th January 2023 (15 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 2 (which was quarter 4 FY2022/2023), MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2023 and the CAO warranted on 24th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 18th May 2023 (18 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 3 (which was quarter 1 FY2023/2024), the MoFPED circular is dated 6th July 2023, the CAO warranted on 24th July 2023 and the funds were transferred on 25th July 2023 (18 days).</p>	
			<p>In all the three cases, the 5 days' time limit for warranting was not met.</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>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the PEO communicated capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED as per details below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The cash limits for Term 1 QTR3 FY 2022/23 were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29 December 2022. The TC warranted on 13 January 2023. The municipal Treasurer invoiced for the funds on 17 January 2023 and disbursements made on 18 January 2023. The Ag.PEO publicized the capitation grants release totalling to Ugx.941,951,066 for Q3 on 18 January 2023.</p>	
			<p>The cash limits for Term 2 QTR4 were</p>	

communicated through MoFPED circular dated 6 April 2023 and the TC warranted on 24 April 2023 and funds were disbursed to schools on 18 May 2023. The Ag.PEO publicized the capitation grants release totalling to Ugx.98,777,399 for Q4 on 18 May 2023.

Information on cash limits from MoFPED and warranting by TC was not availed at the time of the assessment. However capitation grant releases amounting to Ugx.48,872,151 to schools for quarter 1 FY 2023/24 was effected on 24 July 2023. The Ag.PEP publicized it on the MC notice board on 24 July 2023.

In view of the above, the LG not compliant with the requirement of 3 working days of release from MoFPED

Verification from the sampled (3) UPE schools revealed that DEO did not communicate/ publicize capitation grants in three working days of the release. However, there was evidence of display of capitation grants releases on school notice boards in all the 3 sampled UPE schools indicated below:

- Seseme PS: The display on school notice board contained capitation grants releases as follows;

- Term 3 of 2022 (Q3-FY 2022-2023); Ugx 2,317,833 dated 26 August 2022 and Ugx.2,317,833 dated 23 October 2022

- Term I of 2023 (Q4-FY 2022-23)- Ugx.4,635,667 dated 24 January 2023

- Term II of 2023 ,Ugx.4,635,667 dated 30 May 2023

- Gisoro PS: The display on school notice board contained UPE capitation grant releases as follows;

- Term 3 of 2022 (Q3)-Ugx.2,100,000 not dated

- Term I of 2023 (Q4)- Ugx.4,100,000 not dated .

- Term 2 of 2023, Ugx.4,100,000 not dated.

- Kisoro Demo PS: The display on school notice board indicated UPE funds received as follows:

- Term 3 of 2022-Ugx. 6,276,233 dated 24 October 2022

- Term 1 of 2023-Ugx.6,276,233 dated 24 January 2023

- Term II of 2023-Ugx.6,276,233 dated 30 May 2023

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.

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

There was evidence that the education department held meetings to plan for inspection activities as shown below:

i) Inspection plan/programme for school inspection for Term I of 2023 dated 9 February 2023. Inspection of schools started on 13

February 2023 up to 4 April 2023. The inspection was conducted by the Ag.PEO and Senior Inspector of schools and covered (19) primary schools, (10) secondary schools, and (5) tertiary schools

ii) Inspection plan/programme for school inspection for Term II of 2023 dated 14 June 2023 (signed & stamped by Inspector of schools). The school inspection started on 1 June 2023 and ended on 10 August 2023. The inspection was conducted by the Ag.PEO (Sabiiti) and Ag.Senior Inspector of schools (Mukankuzi) covering (21) primary schools, (8) secondary schools, and (3) tertiary schools

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:

- If 100% score: 2
- Between 80 - 99% score 1
- Below 80%: score 0

There was evidence of two (2) out of the (3) school inspection reports and monitoring reports as indicated below:

(i) School Inspection Report Term 3 of 2022 dated 15 February 2023. The inspection was conducted by (the Ag.PEO and Ag. Senior Inspector of schools and covered all the (4) UPE schools representing (100%).

(ii) School monitoring report for Term 3 of 2022 dated 30 January 2023. It was conducted by Ag.PEO, Mayor, TC, Members of spectral committee, TPC and Executive committee. The monitoring team visited: (i) UPE schools (4), (ii) Private primary schools (12), (iii) secondary schools (11) and (iv) Tertiary institutions (6).

(iii) School Inspection report for Term I of 2023 dated 11 July 2023.

The inspection was conducted by the Ag.PEO and Ag.Senior Inspector of schools and covered all the (4) UPE schools (Gisoro PS, Seseme PS, Kisoro Hill PS & Kisoro Demo PS) representing (100%).

School Monitoring report of Term 1 of 2023 dated 11 July 2023. It was conducted by Ag.PEO, Mayor, TC, Members of spectral committee, TPC and Executive committee. The monitoring team visited; (4) UPE schools and (12) primary schools.

The school inspection/monitoring reports for Term 2 of 2023 were not availed at the time of the assessment. Thus, the score is 0.

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 of (1) set of minutes of departmental meeting that discussed the school inspection report for Term 3 of 2022. No evidence found for discussion of the inspection reports for term 1 and 2 of 2023.

- Kisoro Municipal education staff meeting held on 2 February 2023, discussed the findings of the inspection report for term 3 of 2022 under Min.3:2023 School inspection report by Ag.Senior Inspector of schools. The key finding discussed included poor sanitation in some schools, failure to display the timetables in classrooms, inadequate learning materials, and teachers not signing attendance books as required. No evidence of recommendations made in the minutes.

Verification was done through the review of inspection files in 3 sampled UPE schools and established that:

□ Seseme PS in Northern Division had evidence of inspection/monitoring reports (2) including school inspection report dated 26 June 2023 which recommended topic outlines in classrooms, provision of instructional learning materials and involvement of all stakeholders in school activities especially parents (Nabakka-AA). Other feedback inspection/monitoring reports on file were dated 25 June 2023- recommended P7 candidates to get lunch from schools; inspection report dated 27 September 2022 by Ag.SIS

□ Gisoro PS in Southern Division had evidence of (1) inspection report on file and it was dated 21 June 2023. It recommended display of timetables in classrooms, provision of adequate teaching materials and participation of parents in school activities.

□ Kisoro Demo PS in Southern division had evidence of inspection reports (2) during FY 2022/23. The school inspection report dated 23 June 2023- recommended; provision of learning materials, updating timetables and supervision of teachers by SMC. The feedback inspection report dated 20 June 2023 recommended preparation of schemes of work and encouraged parents to attend PTA meetings.

In view of the above, there was no evidence of follow up on the implementation of inspection recommendations by the Ag.SIS. The score is 0.

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 2 out of the (3) inspection reports to DES as indicated below:

- School inspection and monitoring reports for Term 3 of 2022 were submitted and received by DES secretary (Komugabe Edith) on 6 March 2023
- School inspection and monitoring reports for Term 1 of 2023 were submitted and received by DES secretary (Komugabe Edith) on 21 July 2023

Findings from the 03 sampled UPE schools indicated that copies of inspection reports from the previous three terms were not left behind as expected.

□ Seseme PS in Northern Division had evidence of inspection/monitoring reports (2) including school inspection report dated 26 June 2023 which recommended topic outlines in classrooms, provision of instructional learning materials and involvement of all stakeholders in school activities especially parents (Nabakka-AA). Other feedback inspection/monitoring reports on file were dated 25 June 2023- recommended P7 candidates to get lunch from schools; inspection report dated 27 September 2022 by Acting Inspect of schools.

□ Gisoro PS in Southern Division had evidence of (1) inspection report on file and it was dated 21 June 2023. It recommended display of timetables in classrooms, provision of adequate teaching materials and participation of parents in school activities.

□ Kisoro Demo PS in Southern division had evidence of inspection reports (2) during FY 2022/23. The school inspection report dated 23 June 2023- recommended; provision of learning materials, updating timetables and supervision of teachers by SMC. The feedback inspection report dated 20 June 2023 recommended preparation of schemes of work and encouraged parents to attend PTA meetings.

Based on the above, the score is 0.

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 and Community Development issues at KMLG 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 22/07/2022 discussed Education, Health and Community issues as per minute MIN.20/KMC/2022/2023 - PRESENTATION OF FIRST QUARTER WORKPLANS. Discussions focussed on multiple Education issues within the quarter including annual 1st quarter budget, 4th quarter report and state of 18 pre-primary schools, 12 private primary schools and 10 private secondary schools. Only one government funded secondary school in the municipality.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 14/10/2022 per minute number (MIN.25/KMC/2022/2023 - SECOND QUARTER WORKPLANS AND FIRST QUARTER REPORT). Among the issues discussed included the ongoing projects in primary schools, challenges faced in Education department work. Recommendations were then made for improvements for future service delivery.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 31/01/2023 per minute number (MIN.27/KMC/2022/2023 - PRESENTATION OF SECOND QUARTER REPORTS AND THIRD QUARTER WORKPLANS). Issues discussed included among others: PLE results of 2022, school inspections, funds released for quarter two, projects in the third quarter and recommendations were made for improvement of service delivery.

Minutes of the Social Services Committee which sat on 22/05/2023 per minute number (MIN.31/KMC/2022/2023 - DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT BUDGET). Issues discussed included among others: Draft budget for FY2023/2024.

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of community engagement meetings held in FY 2022/2023. During the PTA General Meeting that took place at REAL Quality PS on 16 June 2023 which was attended by 150 parents. Under Min 05/2023: Remarks from Kisoro Municipality, the Acting Principal Education Officer (PEO) appealed to parents to always get involved in their schools for performance improvement to be realized, encouraged teamwork by contributing towards school improvement, monitoring children regular attendance, supporting children completing homework, holding schools accountable for provision of quality education, mobilizing fellow parents to participate in school activities among others.
----	--	--	--

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 and found not up-to-date. However there was evidence 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).

We noted that Municipal education department had a consolidated schools' asset register that was not up-dated at the time of assessment.

Verification of the asset register was found not to be consistent in 2 out of the 03 sampled UPE schools.

Specific details as indicted below:

□ Kisoro Demo PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (204) desks and (2) teacher accommodation (2) while the school asset register had (14) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (204) desks and teacher accommodation (2). The information is consistent

□ Gisoro PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (13) classrooms, (17) latrine stances, (232) desks and teacher accommodation (0) while the school asset register had (15) classrooms, (18) latrine stances, (234) desks and teacher accommodation (0). The information is not consistent

□ Seseme PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (248) desks and teacher accommodation (3) while the school asset register had (12) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (238) desks and teacher accommodation (4). The information is not consistent

In view of the above, information on the consolidated school asset register was not up- dated. 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 KMLG Education department had the following infrastructural projects:</p> <p>Renovation of classroom block at Kiroro Hill P/S UGX14,770,721</p> <p>Renovation of classroom block at Kiroro Demo P/S UGX23,898,540</p> <p>Phased construction of staff house at Seseme P/S UGX29,864,709</p> <p>Phased construction of staff house at Gisoro P/S UGX39,517,610.</p> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derived from the LG Development Plan -Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives -Financially feasible -Having costed project profiles. <p>Evidence of desk appraisals for the four (04) KMLG Education Department projects for FY2022/2023 was availed/ seen.</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 Education department had the following infrastructural projects:</p> <p>Renovation of classroom block at Kiroro Hill P/S UGX14,770,721</p> <p>Renovation of classroom block at Kiroro Demo P/S UGX23,898,540</p> <p>Phased construction of staff house at Seseme P/S UGX29,864,709</p> <p>Phased construction of staff house at Gisoro P/S UGX39,517,610.</p> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technical feasibility -Environmental and social acceptability requirements. <p>Evidence of field appraisals for the four (04) KMLG Education Department projects for FY2020/21 was availed/ seen.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There is no seed school project budgeted for at the Municipal Town Council Education department for the FY 2023/24. However, the department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan as per the Approved Work Plan for FY 2023/24 dated 14/7/2023. Listed below are the incorporated projects. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phased construction of 2 unit staff house at Gisoro P/S; Budgeted at UGX 37,689,685/=. 2. Phased Construction of a Classroom at Seseme P/S: Budgeted at UGX 22,639,652/=. 3. Retention for the works at Gisoro P/S and Seseme P/S; Budgeted at UGX 4,893,327/=. 	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There is evidence that School infrastructure Projects were approved by the Contracts Committee (C.C) before commencement of Works. Under Min. No. 049/CC/2022-23 of the CC meeting held on 30/11/2022 , three projects were approved as listed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phased Construction of 2 units Staff House at Gisoro P/S. 2. Construction of 1 Classroom at Seseme P/S. 3. Renovation of 1 Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo P/S. 	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the Project Implementation Team for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines.

A copy of joint appointment by the Town Clerk of: the Project Manager, Senior Environment Officer, SCDO, Labor Officer, Contract Manager as members of the PIT for Construction Works under Education Department dated 16/1/2023 was present; Another appointment letter dated 12/1/2023 of the Project Manager by the Town Clerk was present. However no COW was assigned to any school construction project. The following Projects were considered:

1. Construction of One Classroom at Seseme Primary School.
2. Renovation of One Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo Primary School.
3. Phased Construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES

Score: 1, else, score: 0

There was no Seed School Infrastructure implemented at Kisoro Municipal Council. However, the following sampled project followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES.

1. Construction of One Classroom at Seseme Primary School- The size of the classroom block was 10.55x7.35mm; with a concrete floor slab; with 230mm thick walling constructed in burnt clay block work and cement/sand mortar; with 5No. window openings and 1 door opening; with corrugated roofing iron sheets on treated timber rafters and purlins.

The two other projects sampled were under renovation. Therefore, there were no standard technical designs from MoES to follow. These include:

1. Renovation of 1 Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo Primary School. The renovation works comprised of: **1 classroom block**- removing and replacing the wooden door and windows with 1 No. steel door (size 950x2100mm) and 5No. glazed steel windows (size 1200x1200mm); **Resource room**- replacing the wooden door and windows with 1No. steel door (size 950mmx2300mm) and 5 No. glazed steel windows (size 1500x1500mm); plastering and painting internal and external walls. The school was inspected and all renovated components were found to be in good condition.
2. Renovation of 1 Classroom at Kisoro Hill Primary School. The renovation works comprised of: replacing the wooden door and windows with a steel door (size 950x2300mm) and glazed steel windows (size 1300x1400mm); plastering and painting internal and external walls.

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 <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed School Infrastructure implemented at Kisoro Municipal Council. However, the following sampled projects were listed in the Departmental Work Plan for Education dated 29/04/2022. Progress reports and minutes of meetings were also prepared.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of One Classroom at Seseme Primary School with a memo/progress report dated 8/2/2023. 2. Renovation of 1 Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo Primary School with a project progress report dated 21/02/2023 and Minutes of Meeting dated 16/01/2023. 3. Phased Construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School with a memo/progress report dated 8/2/2023. 	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 for all the sampled projects.</p> <p>Out of the 3 sampled projects as listed below, minutes of a meeting and a joint inspection were held for only one project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of 1 Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo Primary School has a project progress report dated 21/02/2023 and Minutes of Meeting dated 16/01/2023 that included joint participation of: the project manager (senior assistant engineering officer), contract manager (inspector of schools), Senior Environment officer, PCDO and Labour Officer. 2. Construction of One Classroom at Seseme Primary School with a memo/progress report dated 8/2/2023 after a site inspection conducted by the senior assistant engineering officer. However, there were no joint site inspections nor minutes of meetings recorded. 3. Phased Construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School with a memo/progress report dated 8/2/2023 after a site inspection conducted by the senior assistant engineering officer. However, there were no joint site inspections nor minutes of meetings recorded. 	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

Four (04) KMLG Education projects of FY2022/2023 were sampled to check certification and timeliness of effecting payments for infrastructural projects.

Payment of retention to Shorero United Contractors Ltd for construction of classroom block at Seseme P/S (UGX669,150) – Requisition dated 15/06/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 15/03/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023 (13 days).

Payment to Preenpost Company Ltd for renovation of one classroom block and minor repairs on the resource centre at Kisoro Demo P/S (UGX26,883,156) – Requisition dated 24/02/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 21/02/2023 and payment on 17/03/2023 (21 days).

Payment to Shorero United Contractors Ltd for phased construction of 2 units of staff houses at Gisoro P/S (UGX31,732,647) – Requisition dated 07/02/2023, certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 10/03/2023 and payment on 16/03/2023 (37 days).

Payment to Ndagajose Builders and Engineering Ltd for renovation of one classroom block at Kisoro Hill P/S (UGX11,197,618) – Requisition dated 02/06/2023, certified by the certified by the Municipal Engineer, Municipality Education Officer, Environment Officer, CDO and TC on 02/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023 (27 days).

In the three (03) of the four (04) sampled projects, payments were effected beyond the 14 days' time limit.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There is evidence that the Municipal Town Council Education Department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit on 29/04/2022. . The following projects were included among other Works/Supplies; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phased Classroom Construction at Seseme P/S. 2. Phased Construction of a Staff House at Gisoro P/S. 3. Classroom Rehabilitation at Kisoro Demo P/S. <p>Contract implementation progress reports were also present e.g. inspection reports dated; 8/2/2023 for Seseme P/S; 21/2/2023 for Kisoro Demo P/S and 8/2/2023 for Gisoro P/S.</p> <p>All three schools were approved by the Contracts Committee under Min no. 049/CC/2022-23 during the meeting held on 30/11/2022</p>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There was no Seed School Infrastructure implemented at Kisoro Municipal Council. However, the following sampled school infrastructure projects had complete procurement files. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of One Classroom at Seseme Primary School-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005. Approved by the CC under Min049/CC/2022-23 in a meeting held on 30/11/2023. The Contract was awarded on 20/12/2022. 2. Renovation of 1 Classroom and Minor Repairs on the Resource Room at Kisoro Demo Primary School-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00004. Approved by the CC under Min049/CC/2022-23 in a meeting held on 30/11/2023. The Contract was awarded on 20/12/2022. 3. Phased Construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro Primary School-KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002. Approved by the CC under Min049/CC/2022-23 in a meeting held on 30/11/2023. The Contract was awarded on 20/12/2022. 	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 was no evidence that grievances were been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</p> <p>Negligence of duty by Nyiramasabiti Hohah was recorded by the Head Teacher of Seseme Girls S.S Mrs Peace Ruzaza in a letter date dated 18/8/2022. However there was no evidence for recording, investigating and responding to this grievance in the centralized log book</p>	0
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><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of school environment education guidelines as per the report submitted to all head teachers of primary and secondary schools dated 23 December 2022. The dissemination report was signed by both the Senior Environment Officer and Principal Community Development Officer and copied to Municipal Mayor, TC, Engineer, Education officer and health officer.</p> <p>The Environment guidelines highlighted the key points among others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction must be done on land owned by schools evidenced by lad titles/ or agreements in the names of the school • Construction of school infrastructure should not be in wetlands • Screening of school infrastructure • Ensuring proper drainage • Fencing off construction sites • HIV awareness among the surrounding community and workers 	3

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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>There was evidence that LG had in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of one classroom at Kisoro hill P/s Proc ref No KMC713/WRKS/2022-23/00003, a costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents under item 1.7 for environment impact mitigation and site restoration at cost of Ugx 500,000. 2. Construction of one classroom block at Seseme P/s Proc ref No KMC713/WRKS/2022-23/00005, a costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents under item I for planting trees and flowers at cost of Ugx 200,000. 3. Phased construction of 2 units staff house at Gisoro P/s Proc ref No KMC713/WRKS/2022-23/00002, a costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents under item H for planting trees and flowers at cost of Ugx 200,000. 	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	<p>There was evidence for proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects where the projects are implemented.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land consent for Gisoro P/s between Municipal council and catholic church, dated 20/12/2022, signed and stamped by Rev Fr Mbabazi Alfonse on behalf of St Peters church Gisoro catholic Parish. copied to Mayor, MEO ME MHO and MEO 2. Land consent for Seseme P/s between Municipal council and Anglican church, dated 21/12/2022, signed and stamped by Rev Mujabwami Herbert on behalf of Muhabura Anglican Diocese. copied to Mayor, MEO ME MHO and MEO 3. Land consent for Seseme P/s between Municipal council and Anglican church, dated 22/12/2022, signed and stamped by Rev Mujabwami Herbert on behalf of Muhabura Anglican Diocese. copied to Mayor, MEO ME MHO and MEO 	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>There was 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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support supervision and monitoring for construction of one classroom block at Seseme P/s was carried on 28/12/2022, signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO, monthly reports were reviewed dated 28/12/2022, 4/1/2023, 25/1/2023, project started on 2/12/2022 and ended on 21/2/2023 2. Support supervision and monitoring for Renovation of one classroom at Kisoro Demo P/s was carried on 2/1/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO, monthly reports were reviewed dated 2/1/2023, 10/1/2023, 15/2/2023, project started on 21/12/2022 and ended on 21/2/2023 3. Support supervision and monitoring for phased construction of staff house at Gisoro P/s was carried on 10/1/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO, monthly reports were reviewed dated 10/1/2023, 15/1/2023, project started on 21/12/2022 and ended on 21/2/2023 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. E&S certifications for construction of one classroom block at Seseme P/s was approved stamped and signed by both PCDO and SEO on 27/1/2023, payments were made to Preen post company Ltd under proc ref No KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00005 on 28/3/2023 2. E&S certifications for phased construction of staff house at Gisoro P/s was approved stamped and signed by both PCDO and SEO on 17/2/2023, payments were made to Preen post company Ltd under proc ref No KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/00002 on 28/2/2023 3. E&S certifications for Renovation of one classroom at Kisoro Demo P/s was approved stamped and signed by both PCDO and SEO on 17/2/2023, payments were made to Preen post company Ltd under proc ref No KMC782/WRKS/2022-23/000024 on 28/5/2023 	1

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was no evidence to confirm whether Kisoro 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>Kisoro MLG has only one government health facility (Zindiro HC III) conducting deliveries. The total number of deliveries for FY 2021/2022 was 160, and for FY 2022/2023, it was 167, representing an overall increase of 4.2%.</p> <p>As a result, Kisoro MLG did not achieve the recommended 20% increase in the utilization of healthcare services, as required by the performance measure.</p>	0
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"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The performance of KMLG in its LLG FY2022/2023 Health assessment was 100%, making it fall within the 70% and above range.</p>	2
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"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>This indicator is applicable in this round of assessment.</p>	0

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.	Kisoro MLG did not receive the Health Development Grant for FY2022/2023. This is not applicable.	2
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 Kisoro MLG Health only one (01) project payment in FY2022/2023 was made and was availed to test for certification before payments.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Retention payment to Ricky Building Material Ltd for upgrade of Zindiro HCII to III (UGX20,118,316) – Requisition dated 24/03/2023, certified by Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer and Town Clerk on 18/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023.	
			Certification for the infrastructural project was done before payments were effected in accordance with the requirements.	
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 were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	There was evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG recruited staff for Zindiro 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 48 staff, while HC IIIs were required to have 19 health workers.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	According to the approved budget for FY 2022/2023, the allocated conditional sector conditional grant for wages was UGX 355,204,000. This allocation covered the wages of for the 15 health staff members out of the required 19, as per the staffing norms for the available HC IVs and HC IIIs. This indicates that only 78.9% of the health worker positions for Zindiro HC III.	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council. Therefore this performance measure is Not Applicable.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	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 Kisoro MLG on the position of health workers filled was accurate as evidenced by the findings the visit at Zindiro HC III. The assessment team reviewed the staff list for FY 2023/2024 and compared it with the staff lists found at the health facility. The staff list obtained from Principal Health Office (PHO) indicated 15 health workers were deployed at the health facility. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the PHO and the list found at the facility.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The assessment team established that Kisoro MLG health department did not undertake any health facilities upgrade or construction of any nature in the FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Zindiro HC III prepared and submitted its annual workplans and budget to the Principal Health Office (PHO) by March 31st of the FY 2022/2023, as per the LG Planning Guidelines for the Health Sector. The assessment team established that the annual workplan and budget was submitted on March 6th, 2022, by the health facility in charge (Muridahabi Peter) and was received by the PHO on the same day.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Zindiro HC III prepared and submitted Annual Budget Performance Reports to the PHO for the FY 2022/2023 by July 15th, as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. The assessment team established that the submitted budget performance report included performance highlights, a reconciled cash statement, an annual expenditure and budget report, and an asset register. Additionally, it was endorsed by the facility in charge, Mr. Muridahabi Peter and Chairperson HUMC, Mr. Rwerokare Herbert.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that health facilities in Kisoro MLG had developed and reported on the implementation of facility improvement plan that incorporated performance issues identified in MHMT monitoring and assessment reports. The assessment team reviewed MHMT monitoring and assessment reports dated 13th August 2022, 4th November 2022, 15th February 2023, and 29th May 2023, and established that the identified performance issues had been integrated into the Zindiro HC III Facility Improvement Plan (PIP).</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>For example, the monitoring and assessment reports dated 13th August 2022 and 29th May 2023 noted that the grass in the compound had overgrown and needed to be cleared. In response, the facility's PIP, submitted to the PHO on 28th March 2023, prioritized hiring a person to maintain the compound grass, allocating approximately UGX 320,000 for this activity.</p>	

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>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%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that that the health facilities in Kisoro MLG consistently 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. For instance, the HMIS 105 reports for the only health facility managed by the MLG (Zindiro HC III) for the months of June, May, April, and March were submitted on the following dates: July 5, 2023, June 6, 2023, May 3, 2023, and April 6, 2023.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

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>KMLG Planning Unit did have a system for capturing dates of submission of Health department reports for integration into the overall quarterly MLG report. The submission dates were as below:</p> <p>Quarter one report submitted on 12/10/2022</p> <p>Quarter two report submitted on 13/01/2023</p> <p>Quarter three report submitted on 11/04/2022</p> <p>Quarter four report submitted on 14/07/2022</p> <p>All the quarterly submissions were made before the deadline of one month after end of the quarter.</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 implemented 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 evidence presented to the assessment team indicated that the Kisoro MLG Health Department developed a Performance Improvement Plan targeting to improve the performance of Zindi HC III for the FY 2022/2023. The PIP was endorsed by the PHO and Town Clark on 7th June 2023.</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 implemented 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>The health department's performance improvement plan prioritized acquiring land for garbage disposal. The assessment team observed that the department had successfully acquired a parcel of land situated in Butuga Village, Wrangle Parish, Nyakabande Sub-County, totaling approximately 1.5 acres. This land was purchased from Byensi Expedito (Seller). The agreement for this transaction was drafted on June 22, 2023, and it indicated a total value of UGX 75,50000.</p>	1

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>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).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Kisoro 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 25 healthcare workers.</p> <p>A review of the approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024 revealed that the allocated conditional Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) for Kisoro MLG was 293,837,000 UGX, intended to cover the salaries of 18 healthcare workers in post out of the required 25 according to the staffing norm (72%). 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</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>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).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that the Kisoro 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 noted that 15 out of the required 19 healthcare workers (79%) were deployed at Zindiro HC III.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>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).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that health workers in Kisoro 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 Zindiro HC III and established that the two were in agreement.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

7	<p>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).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that that Kisoro MLG publicized the deployment of health workers through various means, including posting on facility notice boards. The assessment team visited Zindiro HC III and observed that staff lists for FY 2023/2024 were available deployed on the notice board at the facility OPD.</p>	2
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>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>There was only one health facility in the Municipality and Mbonye Evarist, Senior Clinical Officer and in-Charge Zindiro HC III was on official study leave from October 2022 for five years.</p>	1

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 workers were appraised in accordance with the guidelines as all the appraisals were done out of the stipulated timeline of June 30. Some files reviewed showed that:

1. Mujya Jolly, Nursing Officer (Nursing) posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Dusabe Annet, Senior Assistant Town Clerk on August 09, 2023.
2. Assimwe Charity, Enrolled Nurse posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nkomejimana Benon, Principal Medical Officer on July 08, 2023.
3. Niyonshuti Charity, Porter posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 03, 2023.
4. Tumuramyé Kate, Health Information Assistant posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 17, 2023.
5. Tusingwire Winfred, Askari posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 11, 2023.
6. Uwiragiye Hellen, Laboratory Assistant posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 29, 2023.
7. Dusingizmana Anistansia, Enrolled Midwife posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 22, 2023.
8. Usabyeneza Agnes, Enrolled Midwife posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 22, 2023.
9. Murindahari Peter, Enrolled Nurse posted to Zindiro HC III was appraised by Nteziyaremye Moses, Deputy Town Clerk on July 12, 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 corrective action was taken by the Medical Officer of Health Services 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 was no evidence accessed by the assessment team to confirm that Kisoro MLG conducted training for health workers as part of Continuous Professional Development. The assessment did not access evidence inform of training reports, CDP plans to confirm that LG had Conducted training of Health workers (Continuous Professional Development). By the end of day two of the assessment exercise in the MLG, no other evidence was provided by PHO with regard to this performance assessment measure.</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 was no evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG had documented training activities in the training/CPD database. Health department did not share with the assessment team evidence in form of training/CPD database. By the end of day of the assessment team, no other form of evidence was shared with the assessment team.</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 PNF 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 was no evidence to confirm whether the Town Clerk verified the list of health facilities (Government of Uganda and Private-Not-For-Profit) receiving PHC NWR grants and notified the Ministry of Health in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been incorrectly listed or omitted in the FY 2023/2024.</p> <p>The assessment team, reviewed a letter dated August 5, 2023, addressed to the MoH and signed by the Deputy Town Clerk, Mr. Ntezigaremye Moses. The letter indicated that Zindiro HC III received PHC funding amounting to UGX 14,450,924. However, the assessment team could not confirm whether the letter was received by the MoH, as it lacked a stamp from the MoH registry.</p> <p>The PHO informed the assessment team that the stamped letter was in possession of the outgoing Town Clerk, although it was not been shared with the assessment team by the end of the assessment exercise in the district.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

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>Kisoro MLG FY2022/2023 budget - PHC NWR grant for Lower Level Health Facilities was UGX41,413,000.</p> <p>Total allocation in the DHO's budget for management and monitoring activities in the same year was UGX15,913,000 which 38.4% of the total. This was above the 15% minimum.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<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 KMLG, 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 10th August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 24th August 2022 (32 day).</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 26th October 2022 (18 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 13th January 2022 and the disbursements made on 18th January 2023 (20 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the TC warranted on 24th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 18th May 2023 (18 days).</p> <p>In all the four quarters, the warranting/verification of PHC NWR grants was effected beyond the 5 days time limit.</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 all 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 10th August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 24th August 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 1 was dated 24/08/2022 (26 days).

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the TC warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 26th October 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 2 was dated 26/10/2022 (26 days).

For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The TC warranted 13th January 2022 and the disbursements made on 18th January 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 3 was dated 18/01/2023 (20 days).

For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the TC warranted on 24th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 18th May 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 4 was dated 18/05/2023 (24 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.

Score: 0

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 that LG** 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. All the displays were made beyond the 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED as highlighted below.

1. **Quarter 1:** Expenditure limits from MoFPED on 5th August 2023. The display was made on 24th August 2022. This indicates a difference of 19 days from the date when the expenditure limits were received from MoFPED.
2. **Quarter 2:** Expenditure limits from MoFPED on 13th October 2022. The display was made on 26th October 2022. This indicates a difference of 13 days from the date when the expenditure limits were received from MoFPED.
3. **Quarter 3:** Expenditure limits from MoFPED on 12th January 2023. The display was made on 18th January 2023. This indicates a difference of 6 days from the date when the expenditure limits were received from MoFPED.
4. **Quarter 4:** Expenditure limits from MoFPED on 20th April 2023. The display was made on 18th May 2023. This indicates a difference of 29 days from the date when the expenditure limits were received from MoFPED.

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There **was evidence to confirm** that the Kisoro MLG Health Department implemented the actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings held during the FY 2022/2023. The assessment team reviewed the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings dated September 20, 2022, November 24, 2022, May 16, 2023, and June 16, 2023, and observed that the Health Department had indeed implemented the actions recommended by these Quarterly Performance Review Meetings.

For example, during the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meeting dated September 20, 2022, under Minute 6/1/2022-2023 - "Way forward," it was indicated that the doctor should inform the municipal engineer to visit the facility and show the members the boundary of the land designated for the construction of staff houses at Zindiro HC III.

The assessment also reviewed a requisition form requesting UGX 10,200,000 for land surveying and titling. This was in response to a request for boundary opening.

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	There was no evidence to confirm that the Kisoro MLG Health Department's quarterly performance review meetings included all the necessary participants, such as health facility in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, and key LG departments. The assessment reviewed the attendance lists for DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings dated September 20, 2022, November 24, 2022, May 16, 2023, and June 16, 2023, and observed that only the department staff and in charge of Zindiro HC III were in attendance.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	The assessment team established that the Health Department of Kisoro MLG did not have HC IVs and general hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grants) under its supervision. The only health facility under the supervision of the Health Department was Zindiro HC III.	1
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	The assessment team established that Kisoro MLG does not have Health Sub Districts (HSDs). However the MHT undertook the mandatory support supervision for Zindiroo HC III as confirmed by the reports dated ; 13th August 2022, 4th November 2022, 15th February 2023, and 29th May 2023.	1

If not applicable, provide the score

• If not applicable, provide the score

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 to confirm that Kisoro MLG utilized results and reports from support supervision and monitoring visits to make recommendations for specific corrective actions, and the implementation of these recommendations was followed up during FY 2022/2023. The assessment team reviewed the support supervision book and noted that the support supervision and monitoring visit dated 17th July 2023 (4th Quarter) advised that the in charge should arrange all the new beds in the wards. On the day of assessment these beds were found well arranged in the female, male and maternity wards. The support supervision and monitoring visit dated 20th January 2023, the MHT recommended that in charge should plant trees in the compound. The assessment team noted that 5 trees had been planted in the facility compound.</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>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 was no evidence to confirm whether Kisoro MLG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies during FY 2022/2023. There was no evidence inform of support supervision reports shared with the assessment team to confirm that Zindiro HC III had been supported the management of medicines and health supplies during FY 2022/2023. In addition, the review of the support supervision book at the facility indicated that the drug supervisor last visited the facility in 2018.</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>Kisoro MLG DHO health office budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX15,913,000. Out of this a total of UGX6,000,000 was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities.</p> <p>This was a proportion of 37.7%, which was above the 30% minimum.</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 was evidence to confirm that the Kisoro MLG Municipal Health Team (MHT) took the lead in health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization activities, as confirmed by the following activities:</p> <p>The assessment team reviewed the quarterly health promotion progress report submitted by the Municipal Health Inspector on July 7, 2023, and found that the district had written to the town clerk requesting the reallocation of vacant plots that had become a public health risk due to open defecation and garbage dumping sites. Additionally, the health department conducted a monitoring visit to the lagoons and noted, among other things, that sewage was overflowing into a nearby wetland and gardens. The trees and grass that should have acted as a barrier had dried up, leaving the land bare.</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>Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the Kisoro MLG Health Team regarding health promotion and disease prevention issues were documented in their minutes and reports. For example, in the minutes of the Municipal Health Team (MHT) submitted to the PHO on April 7, 2023, Minute 2 noted the need to recruit an additional health assistant for the Southern Division. As a result, Birungi Scovia was appointed, as per the District Service Commission letter dated May 24, 2023, with her appointment letter signed by the Town Clerk on May 30, 2023 (Ref: Cef:A001). Her file information shows that she assumed her duties on July 12, 2023.</p> <p>The report also indicated that the Municipality acquired land for use as a garbage dumping site at a value of UGX 71,870,000. In addition, they conducted outreaches for immunization, antenatal care (ANC), and health education.</p>	1
----	---	--	--	---

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 was no evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG health department had an updated Asset register that set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. The assessment team was not provided with the compressive asset register at Municipal health office. The inventory book maintained by Zindiro HC III was not well aligned with the service standards list for health facilities.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</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>Kisoro MLG did not receive the Health Development Grant for FY2022/2023. This is not applicable.</p>	1
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</p> <p>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>Kisoro MLG did not receive the Health Development Grant for FY2022/2023. This is not applicable.</p>	1
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 was 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</p> <p>1. Screening for environmental and social risks for the fencing of Zindiro HC III was carried out on 26/9/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO, ESMP was prepared at cost of Ugx 500,000, mitigation measures were put in place i.e. planting of fruit trees, removal of waste stamped and signed by both SEO and PCDO.</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>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 the Municipal Town Council health department timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plans for the current FY (2023/24) by 30th April; The following Project was visible;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing Zindiro HC III-KMC713/WRKS/2023-23400004. The short-listed bidders include: Forward Investment (U) Limited, Rwisheja Enterprise Limited, Preen Post Company Limited. Selective bidding method was used during the bidding process. <p>A memo of copy of Form PP1 to PDU was also present (i.e. Fencing Zindiro HCIII in 4th Quarter with an estimated total cost of UGX 29,990,903/=) signed by the Senior Health Officer on 4/8/2023, Authorising Officer and Town Clerk on 5/8/2023.</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>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 Town 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 Senior Health Officer and confirmation of funding by Town Clerk on 5/8/2023.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing Zindiro HCIII with an Estimated total cost of UGX 29,990,903/=. <p>The Contracts Committee held a meeting on 20/9/2023 and the project was discussed under Min016/CC/2023-24</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>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 was no Health Infrastructure project implemented in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town Council Health Department.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	There were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	There was no Health Infrastructure project implemented in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town Council Health Department.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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 were no infrastructure projects from the Health Department implemented in the previous FY (2022-23) under Kisoro Municipal council.</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 was no Health Infrastructure project implemented in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town Council Health Department.</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>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>Kisoro MLG Health had one (01) certified project payment in FY2022/2023 and it was tested for certification and timeliness of payment for works executed.</p> <p>Retention payment to Ricky Building Material Ltd for upgrade of Zindiro HCII to III (UGX20,118,316) – Requisition dated 24/03/2023, certified by Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer and Town Clerk on 18/06/2023 and payment on 28/06/2023.</p> <p>The payment to Ricky Building Material Ltd was made beyond the 14 days’ time limit. However, this being a retention payment this was understandable.</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>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</p>	<p>There was no Health Infrastructure project implemented in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town Council Health Department.</p>	1
----	--	---	---	----------

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	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 was evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG Health Department had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management to health facilities. The assessment noted that charts on medical waste segregation were found displayed in the OPD.</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 was evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG had a functional system/central infrastructure with equipment for medical waste management and had a dedicated/operational budget. The assessment team established that Zindero HC III's medical waste are transported burnt from the Kisoro hospital.</p>	2
----	--	---	--	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to confirm that Kisoro MLG conducted training and raised awareness in healthcare waste management. For instance, the assessment reviewed a report dated March 3, 2023, which indicated that the department organized a training session for health workers on medical waste management. The review of the training attendance list attached to the report revealed that approximately 30 health workers attended the training.	1
Maximum 5 points on this performance measure				
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	No applicable, because the municipal didn't carryout any project in health sector in the previous FY	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There was evidence that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances 1. Sale agreement of land in Zindiro village dated 23/11/2018, Mr Buhinja David and his wife Nyirazaninka Peace sold 0.059 acres of land to Kisoro Municipality at Ugx 10,000,000, the agreement was signed between the vendor Mr Buhinja David and his wife Nyirazaninka Peace and Kisoro Town clerk Peter Masiko, stamped and signed by the town clerk.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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.	No applicable, because the municipal didn't carryout any project in health sector in the previous FY	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

No applicable, because the municipal didn't carryout any project in health sector in the previous FY

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	N/A	0
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	N/A	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	N/A	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	N/A	0

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	N/A	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	N/A	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.	N/A	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.	N/A	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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	N/A	0
---	--	---	-----	---

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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 <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>	N/A	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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. Kisoro Municipal Council is served by national Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable. Kisoro Municipal Council is served by national Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
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. Kisoro Municipal Council is served by national Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
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>N/A</p>	0

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"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>N/A</p>	0
---	---	---	------------	---

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>	N/A	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"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	N/A	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>	N/A	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>	N/A	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"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	N/A	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.	N/A	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	N/A	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.	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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</p>	<p>This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no projects under Water and Environment in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town 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:</p>	<p>This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no projects under Water and Environment in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town 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:</p>	<p>This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no projects under Water and Environment in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town 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>N/A</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 were no projects under Water and Environment in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town 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 NWSC	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 were no projects under Water and Environment in the previous FY (2022/23) at the Municipal Town 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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program</p>	0
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"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program</p>	0
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"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program</p>	0
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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program</p>	0

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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	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	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	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 • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	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 installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that there were any extension workers appointed or deployed in the Municipal Council Divisions.	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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 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	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	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that there were any extension workers appointed or deployed in the Municipal Council Divisions.	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	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that there were any extension workers appointed or deployed in the Municipal Council Divisions.	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	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that there were any extension workers appointed or deployed or appraised in the Municipal Council Divisions.	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	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that there were any action taken on appraisals.	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	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	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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	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	Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	0
Investment Management				
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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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>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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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>This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.</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>This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.	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	This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.	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	This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.	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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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 Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale 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	This indicator is Not Applicable since there were no Micro-Scale Irrigation projects at the Municipal Town Council.	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	0
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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	0
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 because Municipality doesn't Implement Micro-Scale Irrigation program	0

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
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>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Principal Finance Officer was substantively filled by Niringiye Godson appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 24, 2023 ref.: CR/KMC/10 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 47/2023. The Principal Finance Officer, Niringiye Godson was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 06, 2023.</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>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Senior Planner was substantively filled by Mutoni Justine appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/50 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 95/2021. The Senior Planner, Mutoni Justine was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.</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>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Principal Engineer was substantively filled by Semahoro Alloysius appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 27, 2016 ref.: CR/KMC/22 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 118/2015. The Principal Engineer, Semahoro Alloysius was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on August 09, 2023.</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>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Nizeyimana Anaklet appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/60 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 92/2021. The Senior Environment Officer, Nizeyimana Anaklet was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.</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>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the position of Senior Veterinary 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>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Principal Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Birungi B. Front appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated April 11, 2022 ref.: CR/KMC/57 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 21/2022. The Principal Community Development Officer, Birungi B. Front was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July27, 2023.</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>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The approved structure for Kisoro Municipal LG was customized and communicated in a letter from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service to the Town Clerk ref.; MSD 135/306/01 Vol. 51 dated March 17, 2023 and provides for the position of Senior Commercial Officer. There was evidence that the position of Senior Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Mfitumukiza Aaron appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/47 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 93/2021. The Senior Commercial Officer, Mfitumukiza Aaron was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 02, 2023.</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>The approved structure for Kisoro Municipal LG was customized and communicated in a letter from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service to the Town Clerk ref.; MSD 135/306/01 Vol. 51 dated March 17, 2023 and provided for the position of Senior Procurement Officer.</p> <p>There was evidence that the position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Ahimbisibwe Gertrude appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/65 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 91/2021. The Senior Procurement Officer, Ahimbisibwe Gertrude was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 05, 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>There was no evidence that the position of Assistant Procurement 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>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the position of Senior Human Resource Officer (Administration) was substantively filled by Mukamusoni Beatrice appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 30, 2022 ref.: CR/KMC/102 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 55/2022. The Senior Human Resource Officer (Administration), Mukamusoni Beatrice was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 14, 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>There was evidence that the position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Nizeyimana Anaklet appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/60 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 92/2021. The Senior Environment Officer, Nizeyimana Anaklet was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 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>The approved structure for Kisoro Municipal LG was customized and communicated in a letter from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service to the Town Clerk ref.; MSD 135/306/01 Vol. 51 dated March 17, 2023 and provides for the position of Senior Physical Planner. There was evidence that the position of Senior Physical Planner was substantively filled by Mbabazi Kenneth Collins appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated November 11, 2022 ref.: CR/KMC/19 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 70/2022. The Senior Physical Planner, Mbabazi Kenneth Collins was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on September 06, 2023.</p>	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Bagaragaza Alex appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 17, 2016 ref.: CR/KMC/14 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 115/2016. The Senior Accountant, Bagaragaza Alex was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 30, 2023.	2	
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the position of Senior Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Kamari Emmanuel appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 27, 2016 ref.: CR/KMC/13 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 117/2016. The Senior Internal Auditor , Kamari Emmanuel was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 03, 2023	2
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Mugisha Francesca appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated 3/4/2005 ref.: CR/D/10109 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 08/2005. The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), Mugisha Francesca was appraised by Mayanja Badru , Chief Administrative Officer on 6/25/2023.	2
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.					

2

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

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).

Kisoro Municipal Council had three Divisions of Northern, Southern, and Central. There **was evidence** that Kisoro Municipal Council had appointed a Senior Assistant Town Clerk in all the Divisions.

1. Mfitundinda Angello, Senior Assistant Town Clerk was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated July 07, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/58 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 90/2021 and posted to Central Division .
2. Busingye Gloria, Senior Assistant Town Clerk was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 27, 2017 ref.: CR/KMC/55 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 84/2017 and posted to Northern Division .
3. Mugisha Godfrey, Senior Assistant Town Clerk was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 20, 2018 ref.: CR/KMC/04 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 09/2018 and posted to Southern Division .

5

2

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.

Kisoro Municipal Council had three Divisions of Northern, Southern, and Central. There was evidence that Kisoro Municipal Council had appointed a Community Development Officer in all the Divisions.

1. Nkomejimana Andrew, Community Development Officer was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated September 14, 2021 ref.: CR/KMC/37 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 123/2021 and posted to Central Division .
2. Mwiza Odeth, Community Development Officer was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 14, 2018 ref.: CR/KMC/62 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 57/2018 and posted to Northern Division .
3. Niyiguha Sharon, Community Development Officer was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 14, 2023 ref.: CR/KMC/92 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 01/2023 and posted to Southern Division .

5

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>Kisoro Municipal Council had three Divisions of Northern, Southern, and Central. There was evidence that Kisoro Municipal Council had appointed a Community Development Officer in all the Divisions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hakiza Benon, Treasurer was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 27, 2016 ref.: CR/KMC/31 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 108/2016 and posted to Central Division . 2. Ntirenganya Richard, Accountant was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated December 28, 2016 ref.: CR/KMC/38 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 197/2016 and posted to Northern Division . 3. Irankunda Eunice, Senior Accounts Assistant was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 24, 2023 ref.: CR/KMC/104 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 49/2023 and posted to Northern Division . 4. Mahoro Martha, Senior Assistant Accountant was appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated May 24, 2023 ref.: CR/KMC/105 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 49/2023 and posted to Southern Division . 	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 KMLG Natural Resources what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX71,815,127. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX63,674,973. The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 88.6%, which was less than 100%.</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 KMLG Community Based Services what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX49,175,170. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX47,376,688. The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 96.3%, which was way less than 100%.</p>	0

4	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY</p> <p>1. Social and Climate Change screening for the extension/renovation of Municipal Council Hall was carried out on 20/3/2023, signed and stamped by both SEO and PCDO.</p>	4
4	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The DDEG project that was implemented by the Municipal in the previous FY, was screened by SEO and PCDO. However after screening the project, it didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.</p>	4
4	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There evidence that the LG had a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)</p> <p>1. A costed ESMP for the extension/renovation of Municipal Council Hall was prepared at a tune of Ugx 300,000 signed and stamped by both PCDO and SEO on 20/3/2023.</p>	4

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>Kisoro 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 Kisoro MLG, a report on the implementation status of OAG recommendations for FY2021/2022 was submitted to the office of the Internal Auditor General on 12/04/2023.</p> <p>The submission to the IAG 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, Kisoro MLG Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) was submitted on 15/08/2023. This 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, Kisoro MLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) was submitted on 23/08/2023.</p> <p>This was before the mandatory August 31 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, Kisoro MLG Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (TC) were submitted as follows:

Quarter 1 report on 20/12/2022

Quarter 2 report on 01/02/2023

Quarter 3 report on 17/04/2023

Quarter 4 report on 23/08/2023

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
Human Resource Management and Development				
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.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	There was no evidence that the position of Principal Education Officer was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
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.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	There was evidence that the position of Senior Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Sabiti Emmanuel Mugyema appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 04, 2018 ref.: CR/KMC/75 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 72/2018. The Senior Inspector of Schools, Sabiti Emmanuel Mugyema was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on June 28, 2023.	40
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	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)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	<p>There was evidence that Municipal carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for all Education projects for the previous FY,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for renovation of one classroom at Kisoro Demo P/s was carried out on 2/1/2023, stamped and signed by both SEO and PCDO 2. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for phased construction of one classroom at Seseme P/s was carried out on 28/12/2023, stamped and signed by both SEO and PCDO 3. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for renovation of one classroom at Kisoro Hill P/s was carried out on 20/3/2023, stamped and signed by both SEO and PCDO 	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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)

If the LG carried out:
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

The projects in Education sector implemented by the Municipal in the previous FY, were screened by SEO and PCDO. 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.

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

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

1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

There was evidence that the position of Principal Medical Officer was substantively filled by Nkomejimana Benon appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated March 02, 2017 ref.: CR/KMC/48 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 27/2017. The Medical Officer of Health Services, Nkomejimana Benon was appraised by Kamba Kharuna, Town Clerk on July 05, 2023.

1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>	<p>The approved structure for Kisoro Municipal Council was customized and communicated in a letter from the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Public Service to the Town Clerk dated March 23, 2023 ref.: MSD 135/306/01 Vol 51 providing for a Senior Health Inspector. There was evidence that the position of Senior Health Inspector was substantively filled by Acar Moses appointed by the Town Clerk in a letter dated June 30, 2022 ref.: CR/KMC/35 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 57/2022. The Senior Health Inspector, Acar Moses was appraised by Dr. Nkomejimana Benon, Principal Medical Officer on June 30, 2023.</p>	20
---	---	---	--	-----------

1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the position of Health Educator was substantively filled and there was no secondment from the line ministry.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	----------

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 was evidence 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 fencing of Zindiro HC III was carried out on 26/9/2023, stamped and signed 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>The projects in Health sector implemented by the Municipal in the previous FY, were screened by SEO and PCDO. 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>	15
---	---	---	--	-----------

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
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.	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
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.	Not applicable	0

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0

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.	N/A	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.	N/A	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.	N/A	0
---	---	--	-----	---