



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Sheema District

(Vote Code: 609)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	47%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	80%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	56%
Educational Performance Measures	72%
Health Performance Measures	67%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	72%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	74%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG budgeted for the phased construction of the Administration Block in FY2022/23 using DDEG funds. However, the funds were used for design of the Administration Block.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The LG average score in the overall LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 77%.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>OPAMS Data Generated by OPM</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2023=77%</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2022=0</p> <p><b>Calculation</b></p> <p>Variance Average Overall LLGPA (2023-2022)= 77-0 = 77%</p>	<b>3</b>
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"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewing the Annual Budget and Annual Budget Performance Report for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG budgeted for phased construction of the Administration Block using DDEG funds in FY2022/23. However, the DDEG funds for the construction works were appropriated to Consultancy for capital works (i.e. design) of the District Administration Block.</p>	<b>0</b>

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

A review of LG's Budget Estimates FY2022/23 and Annual Budget Performance Reports FY2023 revealed that the LG spent DDEG funds on ineligible projects/activities as per DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines.

### Evidence

Annual Budget Performance Report FY2022/23

Total District Discretionary Equalization Development Grant UGX 176,059,000

DDEG Allocated to LLGs UGX 102,917,938

DDEG HLG UGX 73,141,062

Infrastructure Projects i.e. 36% (less than 70% minimum allowed)

- Phase Construction of the District Administration block UGX 26,133,000

Performance Improvement i.e. 19% (more than 15% maximum allowed)

- Training Resource Pool on LGPA UGX 900,000

- Training in mainstreaming crosscutting issues in plans and budgets UGX 1,400,000

- Procurement of 1 Cupboard for Internal Audit UGX 1,000,000

- Procurement of 2 Laptops for D/C/person & DCO [DIO] UGX 5,000,000

- Procurement of 4 Desks & Chairs for District Service Commission UGX 2,500,000

- Procurement of 2 Cupboards for SLMO UGX 2,000,000

- LLG Performance Assessment [PA] UGX 1,108,000

Data Collection (Maximum allowed 5%)

Investment Service Costs i.e. 45% (more than 10% maximum allowed)

- Consultancy for capital works for the construction of the District Administration Block UGX 30,000,000

- Environmental and social safeguards UGX 1,000,000

- Quarterly Monitoring & Evaluation UGX 1,200,000

- BOQs Preparation, Desk & Field Appraisal, Inspections UGX 900,000

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The LG did not have a DDEG-funded works infrastructure project in the previous FY. The district contracted a DDEG-funded consultancy services for <b>design and documentation of district administration block, contract amount UGX 45,250,000/=</b> . The engineer's estimate was UGX 56,133,000/=. This represented a variation of -19.388% of the LG engineer's estimate.	2
---	--	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	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	Staffing was in place and was reviewed together with the minimum standards prescribed, staff lists provided by the HRM Division and approved structure provisions at the sampled LLGs Shuuku TC, Kitagata SC and Rugarama SC. The information was not accurate as illustrated by Shuuku TC below.	0
---	--	--	---	---

**Shuuku TC**

The following were found in the HRM staff list, namely e.g. (i) Aruho Apollo -Assistant Veterinary Officer, (ii) Ninsiima Rachel, Agricultural Officer, (iii) Ainembabazi Sarah - Physical Planner, (iv) Atuhaire Hellen- Principal Assistant Secretary, (v) Muhanguzi Obed- Senior Finance Officer (vi)Bwengye Alex - Askari. At the LLG there was a variance in staff identified e.g. Kaihura Collins, Assistant Veterinary Officer as found was not consistent with the HRM Division staff lists.

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.  <b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b>	The LG budgeted for phase construction of Administration Block in FY2022/23 using DDEG funds. However, the funds were used for the design of the block. Therefore no progress reports were produced for this infrastructure project.	0
---	--	---	--	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;	The LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs for 2023 as verified by the IVA team during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise.	4
	Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs	<b>Evidence</b>	
		score 4 or else 0	<b>Sampled LLGS</b>	
		<b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shuuku TC - DLG score was 94% and IVA score was 90%. The deviation was -4% i.e. Credible</li> <li>2. Kitagata SC - DLG score was 61% and IVA score was 60%. The deviation was -1% i.e. Credible</li> <li>3. Masheruka SC - DLG score was 67% and IVA score was 71%. The deviation was +4% i.e. Credible</li> <li>4. Rugarama SC - DLG score was 71% and IVA score was 76%. The deviation was +5% i.e. Credible</li> </ol>	

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement	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.	Sheema DLG did not develop performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:	Sheema DLG did not implement the PIP as it was not developed.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff	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.	Sheema DLG did not provide evidence that they had submitted the consolidated staffing requirements for the coming FY to MoPS. The Assessor was informed this had been done by mail which was not verifiable at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 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

Sheema DLG conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as evidenced by the following reports to the CAO as shown below.

1. June 2023
2. May 2023
3. April 2023
4. March 2023
5. February 2023
6. January 2023
7. December 2022
8. November 2022
9. September 2022
10. August 2022
11. July 2022

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

All HoDs under assessment were found to have been duly appraised by Sheema DLG detailed hereunder.

1. **Ag. Chief Finance Officer**- Tubenawe Rosebel. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

2. **District Planner** - Tuhairwe Doreen. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

3. **Ag. District Engineer** - Mwebembezi Mbaga Allan. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.

4. **District Natural Resources Officer**- Turyatunga Patrick Boaz. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.

5. **District Production Officer**- Kansiiime Robertson. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.

6. **District Community Development Officer**- Mugaririrwe Justine Lenah. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 28th June 2023.

7. **Ag. District Commercial Officer** - Asasira Winson Kafurembe. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 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>Sheema DLG, I was found to have a Rewards and Sanctions Committee in place as evidenced appointment letters of members dated 4th November 2020. Some of the appointees seen on the file included the Head of Department Production and Marketing, Head of Department Administration and Head of Department Education.</p> <p>The Committee was found to be functional through the matters brought to its attention and handled correctively. e.g. as seen in the Minutes of the Committee held on 15th March 2023, the Procurement Officer (Arinaitwe Andrew) was presented as a disciplinary case on grounds of having mismanaged procurement for the works and projects of FY 2022/23 in the Water and Education Departments. The Officer was accused of, amongst others, of not doing due diligence, not displaying best evaluated bids. The said officer acknowledged his commissions and as result of the meeting the corrective measures undertaken were to readvertise and the process was redone.</p>	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>Sheema DLG had not established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional at the time of assessment.</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>During the year under review, Sheema DLG recruited twenty-six staff in the Education Department, all deployed at Kigarama Seed Secondary School. They were all posted on the same date by MOES as seen in a later dated 17th January 2023. They all accessed the pay role in March 2023 as illustrated by the following. (i) Twikirize Lillian, Assistant Education Officer, (ii) Kamukama Sabiiti Dunstan Education Officer (iii) Natuhabura Ivan, Assistant Education Officer, (iv) Komujuni Mutehi, Assistant Education Officer, (v) Agaba Godric, Assistant Education Officer.</p>	1
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>Sheema DLG had twenty-seven staff retiring in the year under review. A list indicating their date of and reason for retirement amongst others was available with no supporting evidence of the dates of access to the pension payroll.</p>	0

**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>A review of the FY2022/23 Annual Budget Estimates and LG Cost Centre List &amp; LLG allocation release for FY2022/23 provided by MoFPED revealed that the LG transferred DDEG for FY2022/23 to LLGs in full.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Bugongi Town Council - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 15,318,435</p> <p>Kakindo Town Council - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 13,686,055</p> <p>Kasaana Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 19,862,210</p> <p>Kigarama Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 26,578,482</p> <p>Kitagata Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 14,119,312</p> <p>Kitagata Town Council - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 15,030,368</p> <p>Kyangyenyi Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 14,313,986</p> <p>Masheruka Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 14,021,974</p> <p>Masheruka Town Council - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 10,805,384</p> <p>Rugarama Subcounty - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 14,021,974</p> <p>Shuuku Town Council - Budgeted and Remitted UGX 17,238,883</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>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions revealed that in the FY2022/23, the LG warranted LLG Direct DDEG transfers more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. LG warranted on 21 October 2022 i.e. 5+ working days</p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG warranted on 13 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Cash limit uploads in the PBS by MoFPED were not accessible.</p>	0

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Sheema DLG did not communicate to the LLGs in the stipulated time as evidenced through the letters seen as follows: (i) Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. LG communicated 21st October 2022 i.e. &gt;5 working days; (ii) Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG communicated on 13th January 2023 i.e. &gt; 5 working days.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG mentored and supervised all LLGs in the LG at least once per quarter in FY2022/23 consistent with guidelines.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q1 FY2022/23</p> <p>VIDE: Mentoring Report for District &amp; LLG Staff on the LG Planning Process in Uganda dated 11 August 2022. Workshop held on 11 August 2022 where 22 LLG were mentored.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orient Staff on the LG Planning and Budgeting Cycle</li> <li>• Equip Staff with knowledge on the timelines involved in the LG Planning Process.</li> </ul> <p>Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decentralized planning</li> <li>• Stakeholders in the LG planning process</li> <li>• The LG planning//budgeting cycle</li> <li>• Development Planning</li> </ul> <p>Q2 FY2022/23</p> <p>VIDE: Mentoring Report for District &amp; LLG Staff on LED and the Impact of Population Growth on Social- Economic Status on Sheema District dated 28 November 2022.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equip District and LLG Staff with skills on Local Economic Development</li> <li>• Orient the District and LLG Staff on the impact of Population Growth on the Socio-economic Status of the District</li> </ul> <p>Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Economic Development amidst Decentralization</li> <li>• Local economic Development Policy and Strategy</li> <li>• The Demographic Dividend of Uganda</li> <li>• The Impact of Population Growth on the Socio-economic status of the District</li> </ul>	2

Q3 FY2022/23

VIDE: Report on the Training and Dissemination of DDEG Guidelines for FY2023/24 to Lower Local Governments dated 29 March 2023.

Objectives

- Train LLG on the Utilization of DDEG Funds
- Disseminate the DDEG Guidelines for 2023/24 FY to Lower Local Governments.

Topics

- Allocation of DDEG across Windows
- Investment Servicing and Monitoring
- Performance Improvement Activities
- Guidelines for Infrastructure Projects at LLG Levels
- Grievances Redress Management under DDEG

Q4 FY2022/23.

VIDE: Report on the Training of Lower Local Government Staff on Final Budget Preparation on 4 May 2023.

Objectives

- Equip Lower Local Government Staff with Skills on Final Budget Preparation
- Orient the Lower Government Staff on Program Budgeting System (PBS) Budgeting and Reporting Process

Topics

- BFP Preparation
- Draft Budget Preparation
- Revenue Projections

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

The LG TPC discussed the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits for only 2 out of the stipulated 4 quarters for FY2022/23 to make recommendations for corrective actions.

#### **Evidence**

Q1 FY2022/23

VIDE: Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee Meeting Held on 29 September 2022 in the New District Council Hall. Min 11/DTPC/09/2022: Presentation of self-assessment results and Quarter One Monitoring Report

- Head Teachers to be trained on asset management
- General problem of transport

Q2 FY2022/23- No Evidence that Monitoring Reports were discussed in the TPC.

Q3 FY2022/23

VIDE: Minutes of the District Extended Technical Planning Committee Meeting Held on 27 March 2023 in the District Council Hall.

Min 15/DTPC/03/2023: Presentation of HLG Priorities for FY2023/24 and Quarter 3 Monitoring Report.

- Most Health Units were understaffed. Recommendations- Recruitment of Health Workers to be Prioritized
- Schools need renovation and some to be demolished. Recommendations- Renovation of 2 classrooms at Bwoma PS to be included in the next Financial Year's Budget.

Q4 FY2022/23- No Evidence that Monitoring Reports were discussed in the TPC.

## **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><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>A review of the Fixed Assets Register revealed that the LG maintained an up-to-date Fixed Asset Register at the time of Assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Additions in the Draft Financial Statements FY2022/23. Page 51 i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land and Buildings UGX 2,251,188,409</li> </ul> <p>Last entries in the Fixed Asset Register</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Machinery, Furniture &amp; Equipment- Filing Cabinets 22 November 2023.</li> <li>• Vehicle and Heavy Machinery- Motorcycle 23 August 2023.</li> <li>• Land and Building – Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education on 16 June 2023</li> </ul>	2
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 copy of the Board of Survey FY2021/22 was not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the LG uses it as a source of guidance for making asset management decisions.</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>The LG provided evidence confirming that the Physical Planning Committee was functional and had submitted at least a set of minutes of the Physical Planning Committee meetings held in each quarter of FY2022/23 to MoLHUD.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Appointment of Members to the Physical Planning Committee. VIDE:CR/D/1200 on 01 July 2022</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Kikwaya Alexander - Chief Administrative Officer</li> <li>2. Mr. Bwebare Wycliffe - Principal Assistant Secretary</li> <li>3. Ms. Kebaraza Edridah - District Health Officer</li> <li>4. Ms. Atuhaire Allen - Town Clerk, Masheruka Town Council</li> <li>5. Ms. Nampe Slyvia - Town Clerk, Kitagata Town Council</li> <li>6. Mr. Mugume Francis - District Inspector of Schools</li> <li>7. Mr. Nkwasiabwe Abias - Senior Engineer</li> <li>8. Mr. Turyatunga Patrick - District Natural Resources Officer</li> <li>9. Ms. Tumushabe Jennifer - District Education Officer</li> <li>10. Mr. Pheonah K. Ndimbirwe - Senior</li> </ol>	2

- Physical Planner
11. Mr. Tumwesigye Samuel - District Staff Surveyor
  12. Ms. Mugabirirwe Justine - Senior Community Development Officer
  13. Ms. Tuhairwe Doreen - District Planner
  14. Ms. Komujuni Barbrah - Senior Lands Officer
  15. Ms. Mwebembezi Mbagu Allan - District Engineer
  16. Mr. Mugabe Arthur - Town Clerk
  17. Ms. Namara Dianah - Town Clerk
  18. Mr. Assimwe Elly - Town Clerk, Shuuku Town Council
  19. Mr. Twinamatsiko David - Principal Agricultural Officer
  20. Mr. Twesigye Gilbert - Senior Environment Officer.

Physical Planning Committee meetings were submitted to MoLHUD Mbarara MZO.

1. Q1 FY2022/23: The meeting was held on 28 September 2022 and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 30 September 2022.
2. Q2 FY2022/23: The meeting was held on 20 December 2022 and submission of the minutes (VIDE: CR/D/1200) to MoLHUD was made on 21 December 2022.
3. Q3 FY2022/23: The meeting was held on 30 March 2023 and submission of the minutes (VIDE: CR/D/1200) to MoLHUD was made on 04 April 2023.
4. Q4 FY2022/23: The meeting was held on 30 June 2023 and submission of the minutes (VIDE: CR/D/1200) to MoLHUD was made on 03 July 2023.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d.For DDEG financed projects;

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals were conducted for DDEG financed projects in the budget FY2022/23, prioritized projects were derived from the LG DPIII and are eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.

**Evidence**

Construction of the District Administration Block derived from DPIII Page 162. Desk Appraisal was conducted on 7 December 2021.

2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for DDEG financed project planned for implementation in FY2022/23 was conducted to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of the District Administration Block was conducted on 8 December 2021.</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>The LG provided evidence confirming that project profiles with costing for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/24 were developed and discussed in the TPC as per the LG planning and DDEG guidelines.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee Meeting Held on the 29 August 2023 in the District Council Hall. Min 09/DTPC/08/2023: Presentation of Project Profiles for 2023/24FY Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase Construction of the District Administration Block Estimated Cost UGX 6,000,000,000</li> <li>• Construction of 4 Stance VIP Latrine at Facility and Construction of 2 in 1 Stance VIP Latrine with a Urinal and Drainage System at Mabaare HC Estimated Cost UGX 57,539,000</li> <li>• Construction of 2 Classrooms at Masya Primary School Estimated Cost UGX 197,865,533</li> </ul>	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 screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures for the DDEG-funded project for the current FY before being approved for construction using a checklist;</p> <p>The construction of Sheema district administration block was screened on 23/11/2023 with mitigation measures costed at UGX: 1,000,000 dated 23/11/2023.</p>	2

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan, dated 1/08/2023, and received by PPDA 7/08/2023.</p> <p>Item to be funded by DDEG:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of district administration block, budgeted for UGX 436,000,000/=. The DDEG-funds expected is UGX 36,000,000/=</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG did not have a works project funded by DDEG in the previous FY. However, the LG conducted the design and documentation of the administration block which were completed, and the technical designs were availed at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The LG has procured the contractor to construct the administration block in the current FY.</p> <p>The consultancy services <b>contract</b> for design and documentation of Sheema district administration block was approved by the contracts committee on 13/12/2022 under minute number: 107/CC/2022-2023.</p> <p>The consultancy services <b>bidding documents</b> for design and documentation of Sheema district administration block was approved by the contracts committee on 05/08/2022 under minute number: 70/CC/2022-2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG properly established the project implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><b>For education sector projects:</b></p> <p>In letters dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the district engineer, Ag. district education officer, district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for 3 education projects implemented in the previous FY. These projects were:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina PS in Masheruka S/C</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at NyakabiriziP/S in Kitagata S/C</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanengyere in Kangyenyi S/C</p> <p>In a letter dated 26/09/2022 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the district engineer, Ag. district education officer, district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for construction of Ryakasinga CHE Seed School in</p>	1



Shuuku T/C.

**For water sector projects:**

In a letter dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for feasibility study of Mabare HC III water supply system and extension of Migyera-Ibiri to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema District.

In a letter dated 10/05/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma-Masyoro II piped water supply system, in Masheruka and Kigarama S/Cs.

In a letter dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, and labour officer, for construction of 3 protected springs in Kitagata S/C.

**For health sector projects:**

In letters dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the Ag. district engineer, ADHO (environment), district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for 3 health projects implemented in the previous FY. These projects were:

>>> Completion of a 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV in Shuuku T/C.

>>> Construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HC III.

>>> Completion of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit in Kyeihara HC III.

**For production sector projects:**

In letters dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the senior agricultural officer, principal agricultural officer, district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and entomologist for 2 small scale irrigation demonstration sites in the previous FY. These projects were as follows:

>>> Construction of a demonstration site for small scale irrigation in Kigarama S/C.

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	The LG did not have infrastructure projects funded by DDEG in the previous FY. The LG procured a consultant to carry out the design and documentation of the administration block. The technical designs were produced successfully, and the entity procured the contractor to construct the administration block in the current FY.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	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	There was no evidence availed that the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of <b>each infrastructure</b> project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a staff house at Kibanga HC III in Kitagata S/C,</b></p> <p>M/S Bravo Land and Construction Co., Limited (Contractor) invoiced (request for payment) on 18/05/2023, engineer certified works on 18/05/2023, and the payment voucher no. 6287795 for certificate number 1, dated 23/06/2023 (voucher).</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Completion of 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV,</b></p> <p>M/S Kegans Engineering Limited (Contractor) invoiced (request for payment) on 4/05/2023, engineer certified works on 24/05/2023, and the payment voucher no. 6363729 for certificate number 1, dated 23/06/2023 (voucher).</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanengyere P/S,</b></p> <p>M/S Kamugira Seith Limited (Contractor) invoiced (request for payment) on 22/05/2023, engineer certified works on 13/06/2023, and the payment voucher no. 6287870 for certificate number 1, dated 23/06/2023 (voucher).</p>	1

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

From the contracts register, the following contracts were sampled:

**>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina P/S.**

The contract agreement was available and dated 16/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 134/CC/2022-2023.

**>>> Construction of demonstration site for small scale irrigation in Kigarama S/C.**

The contract agreement was available and dated 17/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 136/CC/2022-2023.

**>>> Construction of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit at Kyeihara HC III.**

The contract agreement was available and dated 16/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 137/CC/2022-2023.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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.

Score: 2 or else score 0

Bwebare Wycliffe was appointed as chairperson / focal person for the GRC per the appointment letter dated 03/11/2020 by the CAO-, Mr. Dembe Beyeza Davis.

The grievance redress committee was established per appointment letter dated 08/07/2021 by the CAO- Mr. Dembe Beyeza Davis. The members of the committee included;

Mwebembezi Allan- Ag. DE

Dr. Atwongyere Dickens- DHO.

Bamwine Duncan- PHRO.

Mugaririrwe Justus- Ag. DCDO.

Tumusiime K. Lois- DEO.

Turyatunga Patrick - DNRO

Mukasa Zubail- Labour Officer.

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.	Sheema LG presented a complaints log book which had provisions of date, name, contact details, and status. However, no grievance was referred to the district GRC for the previous FY and neither were minutes for the GRC meetings.	<b>0</b>
	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.	The LG had displayed the GRM on the notice board with the names and contacts of the GRC members signed by the CAO though not dated.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that environment, social, and climate change interventions were integrated into the LG DP111, AWP FY2023/24, and budget FY2023/24.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Environmental, Social, and Climate Change interventions i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LG DP111- Page 84 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase forest, tree and wetland coverage, restore bare hills and protect mountainous areas and rangelands</li> <li>• Maintain and /or restore a clean, health and productive environment</li> <li>• Promote inclusive climate resilient and low emissions development at all levels</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. AWP FY2023/24- Page 20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical water catchment areas of bare hills, wetlands, forest reserves and road reserves re-vegetation with suitable agroforestry species</li> <li>• Riverbank and Wetlands restoration</li> <li>• Stakeholder engagements and training in environment and natural resources management</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Budget FY2023/24- Page 62-63 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural Supplies and Services- UGX 5,386,000</li> <li>• Cleaning and Sanitation- Assorted Cleaning UGX 140,000</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG disseminated enhanced DDEG and adaptation and social risk management guidelines to LLGs.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE: Report on the Training and Dissemination of DDEG Guidelines for FY2023/24 to Lower Local Governments dated 29 March 2023.</p> <p>VIDE: CR/D/153/1: Dissemination of Sheema District Vote 928 IPFs to LGGs for FY2023/24.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 4 May 2023. Attached was list of distribution of DDEG Guidelines to SASs and County Chiefs.</li> </ul>

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	Sheema LG did not have investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation for the previous financial year.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	Sheema LG did not implement any DDEG-funded project for the previous FY.	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports. The LG provided only one monitoring report for all projects across all sectors.	<b>0</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at the interim and final stages of projects.  The E&S certification form for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Nabwina Primary School was prepared on 16/06/2023 and payment was made on 16/06/2023.  The E&S certification form for the construction of the staff house at Kyeibanga HC III was prepared on 15/06/2023 and payment was made on 15/06/2023.  The E&S certification form for the construction of the staff house at Kyeihara HCIII was prepared on 15/06/2023 and payment was made on 23/06/2023.	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	The LG did not maintain up-to-date bank reconciliations up to the time of the assessment.  <b>Evidence</b>  Bank of Uganda, A/c No. 006090168000001. Bank Reconciliation Statement for June 2023. Report Date 08 August 2023. i.e. reconciled 30+ days.	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/23.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>All reports were submitted to the Council Speaker with Copies to the District Public Accounts Committee, and the Chief Accounting Officer.</p> <p>Q1 FY2022/23. VIDE: Submission of Statutory Internal Audit Report for 1st Quarter FY 2022/23 (July 2022- September 2022) dated 29 October 2022 i.e. 24 issues in the current quarter.</p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. VIDE: Submission of Statutory Internal Audit Report for Second Quarter 2022/23 FY (October – December 2022) dated 28 January 2023 i.e. 12 issues in the current quarter.</p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. VIDE: Submission of Statutory Internal Audit Report for Third Quarter FY 2022/23 (January –March 2023) dated 15 May 2023 i.e. 19 issues in the current quarter.</p> <p>Q4 FY2022/23. VIDE: Submission of Final Internal Audit Report for Fourth Quarter 2022/23 FY (April- June 2023) dated 29 August 2023 i.e. 16 issues in the current quarter.</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 LG did not provide evidence to establish whether information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY2022/23 was provided to the Council Chairperson and LG PAC.</p>	0



17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence confirming that 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/23 were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer and LG PAC. However, only 3 of the 4 quarterly reports submitted were reviewed and follow-ups made by LG PAC.

**Evidence**

Submitted to District Speaker with Copies to Chief Accounting Officer, and Chairperson LCV. VIDE:

- Sheema District Local Government Public Accounts Committee Report: on the District Operations derived from 4th Quarter 2021/2022 and 1st Quarter 2022/23. Received by Office of Auditor General 11 July 2023.
- Sheema District Government Public Accounts Committee Report: On the District Operations derived from 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2022/2023. Signed by members on 22 August 2023. Received Office of the Auditor General 22 September 2023.

0

**Local Revenues**

18

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.

A review of LG Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23 and LG Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 revealed that the local revenue collected by the LG for FY2022/23 was less than budget by 37% (i.e. outside the +/-10% threshold)

**Evidence**

Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23. Page No. 1

Local revenue amount budgeted was UGX 534,583,000

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23. Page No. 15

Local revenue amount collected was UGX 160,250,362+113,817,415+64,000,000= UGX 338,067,777

**Calculation**

(Amount Collected-Amount Budgeted)/Amount Budgeted\*100=

(338,067,777-534,583,000)/ 534,583,000\*100 = -36.8 %

0

19

The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY

- If more than 10 %: score 2.
- If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.
- If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

A review of the LG’s Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 disclosed that the LG’s OSR collection decreased by 4% between FY2021/22 and FY2022/23

**Evidence**

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No.....

OSR Collection FY2022/23 was UGX.  
160,250,362+113,817,415+64,000,000= UGX 338,067,777

OSR Collection FY2021/22 was UGX  
127,495,700+224,540,857+1,038,500= UGX 353,075,057

**Calculations**

Change in OSR in %age

$(OSR\ FY2022/23 - OSR\ FY2021/22) / OSR\ FY2021/22 * 100$

$(338,067,777 - 353,075,057) / 353,075,057 * 100 = -4.3\%$

0

20

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

A review of the LG’s Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 and remittances to LLGs for FY2022/23 disclosed that the LG remitted less than the 65% mandatory LLG share of local revenues FY2022/23, as mandated in Section 85 of the LG Act CAP 243.

**Evidence**

Amount of local revenue collections subject to share with LLGs

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No. 15

Local Revenue UGX  
160,250,362+113,817,415+64,000,000= UGX 338,067,777

Total Remittance of Local Revenue to LLGs  
UGX 69,000,000+131,288,560= UGX 200,288,560

**Calculations**

$Remittances / Total\ Local\ Revenue\ Mandatory\ for\ Sharing * 100 =$

$200,288,560 / 338,067,777 * 100 = 59.2\%$

0

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts were published. The information is publicized to citizens on awarded contracts and amounts.</p> <p>The previous FY procurement plan was displayed on the district noticeboard on 18/10/2022.</p> <p>Three (03) projects were captured to support the scoring of this indicator:</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of facilities at Ryakasinga CHE Seed School.</b></p> <p>The best-evaluated bidder (BEB) was GESES (U) Limited and was displayed on the district noticeboard on 14/07/2022 and removed on 28/07/2022. The award amount was included in the notice as UGX 3,282,311,600/=.</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HC III in Kitagata S/C.</b></p> <p>The best-evaluated bidder (BEB) was Bravo Land Construction Limited and was displayed on the district noticeboard on 1/03/2023 and removed on 15/03/2023. The award amount was included in the notice as UGX 169,143,977/=.</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyakabirizi P/S in Kitagata S/C.</b></p> <p>The best-evaluated bidder (BEB) was Rimston &amp; Mark Projects Limited and was displayed on the district noticeboard on 1/03/2023 and removed on 15/03/2023. The award amount was included in the notice as UGX 71,517,440/=.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicized the District's performance assessment results and their implications for 2022.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>LGPA results and implications were pinned on the District Main Notice Board.</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>The LG provided evidence confirming that discussions were conducted with the public during FY2022/23 to provide feedback on the status of activity implementation.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on Radio Talk Show on PDM on UBC West Radio on 30 September 2022</li> <li>• Report on the Radio Talk Show on PDM on Voice of Sheema on 10 February 2023</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
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>The LG provided evidence confirming that information on Tax Rates, Collection Procedures, and Procedures for Appeal were made public at the time of assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Pinned on the District Main Notice Board</p>	<b>1</b>
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG received correspondence from the office of the IGG in FY2022/23 involving an allegation of irregular procurement. However, no reports were availed during the assessment on the status of actions taken arising from the correspondence. i.e.</p> <p>VIDE: MBR/01/11/2020: Alleged Irregular Procurements in Sheema District Local Government dated 30 September 2022.</p>	<b>0</b>

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed PLE results released by UNEB in 2020 and 2022 for Sheema District and we noted the following:</p> <p>In 2020, Sheema District performed as follows; Div. I:816; ; Div. II:2157; and Div. III:437 ; totalling to 3410 pupils against 3623 candidates in (82 primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates into 94.1% pass rate (3410/3623).</p> <p>In 2022, Sheema performed as follows; Div.1: 1169; Div.11:2084 and Div.111;396 totalling to 3649 pupils against 3936 candidates in (82 primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates into 92.7% pass rate (3649/3936).</p> <p>There was a decline in performance of 1.4 % (92.7% - 94.1%).</p> <p><b>NB. The results released by UNEB included those of Sheema Municipality. The latter have been removed to get what was due for Sheema District.</b></p> <p>Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did not conduct PLE in 2021 hence the comparison between school years, 2020 and 2022 instead of 2021 and 2022 as guided by MoES.</p>	<b>0</b>

1

Learning Outcomes:  
The LG has improved  
PLE and USE pass  
rates.

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

b) The LG UCE pass rate has  
improved between the previous  
school year but one and the  
previous year

- If improvement by more than 5% score 3
- Between 1 and 5% score 2
- No improvement score 0

We obtained and reviewed UCE results  
released by UNEB in 2020 and 2022  
for USE schools in Sheema District and  
we noted the following:

In 2020 Sheema District performed as  
follows; Div. I:202 ; Div. II:365; and  
Div.III: 339 totalling to 906 pupils  
against 1243 candidates, in nine ( 9 )  
secondary schools that sat for UCE  
that year. This translates to 72.8 %  
pass rate (906/1243).

In 2022, Sheema performed as follows;  
Div.I; 280; Div.II:358 ; and Div.III:338  
totalling to 976 pupils against 1290  
candidates (in nine (9) secondary  
schools) that sat for UCE that year.  
This translates to 75.6% pass rate  
(976/1290).

There was an improvement in  
performance of 2.8 % (75.6% - 72.8%).

**NB. The results released by UNEB  
included those of Sheema  
Municipality. The latter have been  
removed, to get what was due for  
Sheema District.**

Due to COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did  
not conduct UCE Exams in 2021.  
Hence the comparison between school  
years 2020 and 2022, instead of 2020  
and 2022 as guided by MoES.

2

2

N23\_Service Delivery  
Performance: Increase  
in the average score in  
the education LLG  
performance  
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

a) Average score in the  
education LLG performance has  
improved between the previous  
year but one and the previous  
year

- By more than 5%, score 2
- Between 1 and 5%, score 1
- No Improvement, score 0

NB: If the previous average  
score was 95% and above,  
Score 2 for any increase.

The LG average score in the Education  
LLG performance assessment for 2023  
was 64%.

**Evidence**

Education LLGPA Scores for 2023 was  
64%

Education LLGPA Scores for 2022 was  
0%

**Calculation**

Education LLGPAS (2023-2022)= 64-0  
= 64%

2

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

a) If the education development  
grant has been used on eligible  
activities as defined in the  
sector guidelines: score 2; Else  
score 0

We obtained and reviewed the  
Education Sector Planning, Budgeting  
and Implementation Guidelines for  
Local Governments FY 2022/2023 and  
the budget performance report to  
determine eligible activities.

We established evidence that, the  
development grant was used in  
accordance with sector guidelines i.e.  
supply of desks, construction of  
latrines, construction of classrooms  
and construction of teacher's houses.  
The activities conducted were;

— Construction of a Seed Secondary  
School at Ryakasinga- Centre for  
Higher Education (CHE).

— Construction of a two (2)-classroom  
block at Nyabwina P/S

— Construction of a two (2) classroom  
block at Karengyere P/S and

—Construction of a two (2)-classroom  
block at Nyakabirizi. P/S

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

We obtained payment vouchers for all education construction projects contracts for the previous FY 2022/2023 in Sheema District, to establish whether the CDO and the Environment officer signed the completion certificates

We established the following details;

1. Payment of UGX 549,606,870 was made, vide voucher No 3710376 dated 15 February 2023 and UGX 869,633,570. Vide voucher No 6291603 dated 23 June 2023 and UGX 286,180,776 vide No 2418332, dated 1st December 2022 for construction of a Seed Secondary School at Ryakasinga - CHE (still on -going). The CDO and Environment officer signed on ; 02/02/2023, 16/06/2023 and 16/06/2023 respectively,

2. Payment of UGX 59,812,000 was made vide voucher No 6438740 dated 28th June 2023, for construction of a two (2) classroom block at Nyabwina P/S and was, certified by the; DCDO on 14/06/2023 and The Natural Resources Officer, on 14/06/2023 ,respectively.

3. Payment of UGX 57,577,600 was made Vide voucher No. 6360204 dated 23rd June 2023 for Construction of a two (2) classroom block at Nyakabirizi P/S. The CDO and Environment officer certified on 14/06/2023.

4. Payment of UGX 27,897,255 was made vide Voucher No 6287870 dated 23rd June 2023 for partial construction of a two (2) classroom block at Kanengyere P/S. works were certified by the; Natural Resources Officer and CDO on 14/06/2023

The Natural Resources Officer (standing in for the Environment Officer and the Community Development Officer signed the certificate of completion before payment was made.



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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0

The three (03) projects sampled were as follows:

>>> Construction of facilities at Ryakasinga Seed School; Contract reference number: SHEE609/WRKS/2021-2022/00022; Contractor: GESES (U) Ltd; Contract Sum: UGX 3,282,311,600/=. The MoWT estimate was UGX 3,290,000,000/=. *The variation in the contract price was -0.234% of the MoWT estimate.*

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina P/S; Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/00019; Contractor: Arthure Technical Services Limited; Contract sum: UGX 74,292,800/=. The MoWT estimate was UGX 74,424,000/=. *The variation in the contract price was -0.176% of the MoWT estimate.*

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanegyere P/S in Kakindo T/C; Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/000020; Contractor: Kamugira Seth Investments Limited; Contract sum: UGX 34,651,290/=. The MoWT estimate was UGX 35,000,000/=. *The variation in the contract price was -0.996% of the MoWT estimate.*

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had one (01) seed school constructed in the previous FY, that is,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of facilities at Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education Seed School; Contract reference number: SHEE609/WRKS/2021-2022/00022; Contractor: GESES (U) Ltd; Contract Sum: UGX 3,282,311,600/=.</p> <p>The contract signing date was 23/09/2022 as per contract agreement and commencement order was given on 30/09/2022 and the contract period is twenty-four (24) months.</p> <p>The contract duration that would have elapsed by 1st July 2023 was 9 months and 1 week. This represents 37.5% of the contract duration.</p> <p>According to the engineer's inspection report addressed to the CAO on 16/06/2023, the engineer reported the project at 70% physical completion.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>There was evidence that education project's (Ryakasinga CHE Seed Secondary Schools) works were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY.</p>	2
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"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the staffing structure from HRM and noted that Sheema District had recruited 767 (128%) teachers staff in position against a staff ceiling of 597 teachers (in 85 schools) as per the guidelines prescribed by MoES, i.e, a 1:53 (teacher: pupil ratio) and a teacher per class and a head teacher for a school with P7 and a teacher for each class and head teacher for schools below P7.</p>	3

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"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed the list of UPE and USE registered schools and the consolidated asset register for UPE and USE schools for FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23 of Sheema District.</p> <p>None of the 85 (0%) UPE and/or, 09 (0%) of USE schools, met the basic requirements and minimum standards, set out in the DES guidelines for schools.</p> <p>All schools, required additional classrooms or repair/renovation, additional desks, additional latrines and teachers' houses respectively</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed the teacher deployment list from the LG education office and noted that Sheema District had accurately reported on 767 (100%) staff in position, including where they were deployed, in 85 schools..</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Kyabuharambo P/S (semi- urban) there were 11 teachers, in Rweibale P/S (rural) there were 11 teachers and in Masheruka Modern P/S (urban), there were 20 teachers.</p> <p>This information was collated with the teacher's arrival books at the three schools, the staff lists for 2022/23 from the education office and the staff lists found at the sampled schools. The three sources of info were in synch.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

We reviewed the school asset registers of the three sampled schools and verified the information therein, which revealed evidence that Sheema District had a consolidated school asset register accurately reporting on infrastructure in all the three (3) sampled schools (100% accuracy).

In the three sampled schools, we noted the information below;

— Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban) there were five (5) classroom blocks with 10 classrooms; three(3) latrine blocks with 22 stances, 195 three-seater desks and one teachers house, accommodating six (6) teachers.

— In Rweibale P/S (rural), there were, six (6) classroom blocks with 10 classrooms, four (4) latrine blocks with 17 stances, 190 three-seater desks and two (2) teacher's houses in permanent material accommodating eight(8) teachers.

— In Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) there were six (6) classroom blocks with 14 classrooms, seven(7)latrine blocks with 25 stances, 282 three-seater desks and five (5)teachers houses, accommodating 19 teachers

This information was corroborated with the consolidated Asset register at the Education Department office and both were in tandem.

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"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed 85 copies of the Annual school reports from the DEO for FY 2022/2023</p> <p>We noted that none had submitted copies, that were complete with; highlights of performance, a reconciled cash flow statement, a budget and expenditure report and an asset register, signed by the Chair SMC and head teacher and were submitted on/or before 30 January 2022.</p> <p>In three sampled schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban) had one and it was submitted to DEO, but was inadequate</li> <li>— Rweibale P/S (rural) had not submitted any.</li> <li>— Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) had submitted one that lacked the reconciled cash flow statement and no evidence of the date of submission</li> </ul> <p>Since all schools had submitted copies that were not complete, and there was no evidence of receipt of the reports, the district was not compliant.</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"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the inspection reports for; Term 111, 2022, Term 1, 2023 and Term 11, 2023 for FY 2022/2023. We observed that Sheema district had supported all 85 schools to develop SIPs, and 85(100%) schools in Sheema district, had submitted copies to the DEO.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Masheruka Modern P/S (urban), Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban) and Rweibale P/S (rural), all had been supported, had submitted copies and also displayed them, in their offices.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the OTIMS data extract for Sheema District and noted that, they submitted data for (31.689) pupils (100%).</p> <p>We reviewed the Sheema LG performance contract for FY 2022/23 and noted a list of 85 schools.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG collected and compiled data for all registered schools (UPE) in the District and submitted it accordingly.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Sheema LG budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for schools with P7 and a teacher for each class and a head teacher for schools below P7, for (85 schools) to the tune of UGX 6,583,833.,000 for FY 2023/2024 as per the Performance Contract FY 2023/2024 (not signed by PS/ST) and approved budget estimates 2023/24.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department had deployed 767 staff in position as per sector guidelines, i.e. a head teacher and a teacher per class for a P7 school and a head teacher and one teacher for each class for a school below P7, in 85 primary schools</p> <p>In three sampled schools, we noted the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban) - 11 teachers;</li> <li>— Masheruka Modern P/S(urban) - 20 teachers; and</li> <li>— Rweibale P/S (rural -11 teachers</li> </ul> <p>.</p> <p>This information was corroborated with staff lists at school, teacher’s arrival books and staff lists from the education department office, hence synced.</p>	3
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>	<p>We reviewed the teacher deployment list and inspected the notice boards at the DEO's office and in the three sampled schools.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>We established evidence that the teacher deployment had been disseminated and/ or publicized at the DEO's school noticeboards, in the three sampled schools; Kyabuharambo P/S (semi -urban, Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) and Rweibale P/S (rural).</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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has eighty-five primary schools. All files were reviewed and hereunder are illustrative findings of the appraisals conducted by the Town Clerks and Sub-County Chiefs. They were all not appraised by 31st December 2022 as stipulated.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kabumbire Joy, HT Runyinya PS, appraised 20th January 2023.</li> <li>2. Asiiimwe Hilda, HT Nyakwehundika PS, appraised 20th January 2023.</li> <li>3. Kamukama Eric, HT Katoojo PS, appraised 10th January 2023.</li> <li>4. Mugume Deus, HT Nyakasharara PS, appraised 10th January 2023.</li> <li>5. Bangirana Bernard, HT Rwengiri PS, appraised 19th January 2023.</li> <li>6. Kyokunda Margaret, HT Bwayegamba PS, appraised 10th January 2023.</li> <li>7. Karughanga Edison, HT Kasaana I PS, appraised 17th February 2023.</li> <li>8. Tukurane Kenneth, HT Bugongi Central PS, appraised 21st February 2023.</li> <li>9. Namanya Bernard, HT Nyakanyinya PS, appraised 19th February 2023.</li> <li>10. Mwesigye Denis, HT Nyakayojo PS, appraised 20th April 2023.</li> </ol>	

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>No information or files of appraised Secondary School Head Teachers was available at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>All Sheema DLG Education Department Staff were appraised as detailed hereunder.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p><b>1. Ag. District Education Officer</b> - Mushabe Jennifer. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.</p>	
			<p><b>2. Principal Inspector of Schools</b> - Sempa Muzafaru as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 21st November 2022 referenced under Min. No. 151/2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 2nd August 2023.</p>	
			<p><b>Inspectors of Schools:</b></p>	
			<p>3. Birihihi Alex. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	
			<p>4. Mwijukye Zebedee. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	
			<p><b>5. Education Officer Special Needs</b> - Tumuramye Deodato. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</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>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 style="text-align: right;"><b>2</b></p> <p>We obtained a training plan from the DEO Sheema District developed during FY 2022/23 dated 29/06/2022. The following were some of the activities therein;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Roles and Responsibilities of an administrator. in line with an institution/School</li> <li>— Appraisal and Assessment management and</li> <li>— Skills training of teachers in assessment of learners..</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--

**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.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>2</b></p> <p>The Sheema LG did not write to MoES, regarding the list of schools and enrolment because all the data had been captured appropriately.</p>
---	---	---	--

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>We reviewed the MoES guidelines, the budget estimates contained in performance contract for FY 2022/23 and annual performance report for FY 2022/23.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Review of the approved budget estimates in the performance contract revealed, evidence that Sheema District allocated UGX 33,456,000 towards inspection and monitoring.</p>	
			<p>The annual performance report revealed an expenditure of UGX 33,456,000 (100 %) on inspection and monitoring activities, that included the following;</p>	
			<p>— Conducting inspections, thrice for each school</p>	
			<p>— Conducting follow up inspections to establish whether recommendations were implemented and</p>	
			<p>— Discussion of findings and dissemination to head teachers</p>	
			<p>We established that the inspection and monitoring activities conducted, complied to sector guidelines.</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 If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions for school capitation grants revealed that the LG in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	
			<p>Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG warranted on 13 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p>	
			<p>Q4 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 06 April 2023. LG warranted on 26 April 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p>	
			<p>Q1 FY2023/24. Cash limit communication on 06 July 2023. LG warranted on 24 July 2023 i.e 5+ working days</p>	
			<p><b>Note:</b> Information on cash limit uploaded in the PBS by MoFPED could not be accessed.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Review of copies of MoFPED release circulars for the last three quarters indicated the following dates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— 2022/23 Q3: 10 January 2023</li> <li>— 2022/23 Q4: 24 April 2023 and</li> <li>— 2023/24 Q1: 17 July 2023</li> </ul> <p>The education department did not provide evidence that Sheema District made release circulars and invoices of capitation to schools for the last three (3) quarters.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools of Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban), Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) and Rweibare P/S (rural), there was no evidence that the education department formally communicated this information through circulars within the timeline.</p> <p>The head teachers indicated that they were informed through, WhatsApp messages or SMS.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained a copy of the Annual inspection plan for FY 2022/23 dated 9 July 2022 from the DIS and minutes of the inspection and monitoring preparatory meetings for the previous three terms held as follows;</p> <p>Term 111, 2022 on 25/09/22022</p> <p>Term 1, 2023 on 12/03/2023 and</p> <p>Term 11, 2023 on 06/06/2023.</p> <p>There was therefore evidence, that the LG had prepared for the inspections accordingly.</p>	2

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

We reviewed inspection reports and noted that all the 85 UPE schools had been inspected thrice, once in each of the three (3) previous terms. The inspection reports were dated as follows;

— 25 August 2022 for term two (2) of 2023;

— 05 May 2023 for Term one (1) of 2023 and

— 09 December 2022 for term three (3) of 2022.

The number of schools inspected as per the inspection reports corresponded with what was on PBS, thus 100%.

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

We obtained minutes of the departmental meetings where highlights of the previous inspections were given during the planning meetings of inspection and monitoring for FY 2022/23.

In the three sampled schools, the following were the findings;

In Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) a report dated 02/06/2023 by the Ag DEO Tumushabe Jennifer, a recommendation was made that the school needed more desks. The head teacher through the SMC and PTA, had purchased 30 desks, since then. The head teacher had, also written to the DEO on 30/09/2023, seeking consideration, to have more classrooms built at the school.

In Rweibale P/S (rural) a report dated 17/07/2023 by Tumushabe Jennifer was on file and a recommendation to have more classrooms built was made. The head teacher was new and was yet to take action on the recommendation, although he had started with renovation of old classrooms, using funds donated by PTA and Old Boys and Old Girls Associations, respectively.

In Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban), reports dated 01/03/2023 and 21/03/2023 were on file. The issue of lack of an SIP and inadequate classrooms, was raised. By the time of inspection, the SIP was in place and displayed in the head teachers office.

There was therefore evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to make corrective actions.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>We obtained a list of primary schools and sampled three primary schools to establish whether copies of inspection reports were left at schools. We established the following;</p> <p>In Masheruka Modern P/S(urban) a report dated 02/06/2023 was left behind. In Kyabuharambo P/S( semi-urban) reports dated 01/03/2023 and 21/03/2023 were left at school and in Rweibale P/S (rural) a report dated 17/07/2023 was left behind.</p> <p>The DIS had submitted school inspection reports to DES and they were acknowledged to have been received by DES as follows;</p> <p>Term 3, 2022; 21/11/2022. Term 1, 2023; 05/05/2023 and Term2, 2023; 25/08/2023 respectively.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG provided minutes confirming that the Education and Health Sectoral Committee met and held discussions of service delivery issues in the Education Sector in the FY2022/23.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Sheema District Local Government. Education and Health Sectoral Committee Meeting held on 26 October 2022 at the District Headquarters</p> <p>Min.42/EH/2022: Resolutions</p> <p>Resolution made to present following schools to Council for construction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Masya Primary School in Bugongi Town Council</li> <li>2. St. Jude Primary School in Masheruka Town Council</li> <li>3. Buraro Primary School in Kitagata Town Council</li> <li>4. Bunura Primary School in Kigarama Sub County</li> </ol> <p>Sheema District Local Government. Education and Health Sectoral Committee Meeting held on 13 February 2023 at the District Headquarters</p> <p>59/2022/23: Review of Progress Sector Reports</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sheema is lagging in sports, particularly in Primary and Secondary Schools</li> <li>2. School Inspectors do not have smartphones to use for e-inspection of schools</li> <li>3. The sector has fewer operation funds to enable the sector to</li> </ol>	2

cover its operation costs

Sheema District Local Government.  
Education and Health Sectoral  
Committee Meeting held on 20 March  
2023 at the District Headquarters

Min.4/EH/2023: Brief Reports from  
Sectors

1. Funds for the construction of Kanengyere Primary School, Nyabwina Primary School, and Nyakabirizi Parents Primary School were not enough to carry out completion works. Recommendations- Before launching of government projects, Councillors should be BoQs.
2. The sector lacks enough teachers to carry out teaching and learning effectively. Recommendations- Wage should be sought from the Ministry of Public Service
3. The process of taking disciplinary action against errant teachers will continue. Recommendations- Teachers who abscond from teaching should be removed from the payroll.

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>	We obtained a report from events and/or meetings conducted to mobilize, attract and retain children at school dated 25/07/2022 and had 40 head teachers attending the meeting.	2
----	--	--	--	---

## 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*

We obtained a copy of the school asset register for FY 2022/23 to establish whether Sheema had an up-to-date register that set out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards of the three sampled schools and we verified and established that, the LG was compliant (100%) accuracy.

In the three sampled schools, we noted the information below;

— Kyabuharambo P/S (semi-urban) there were five (5) classroom blocks with 10 classrooms; three(3) latrine blocks with 22 stances, 195 three-seater desks and one teachers house, accommodating six (6) teachers.

— In Rweibale P/S (rural), there were, six (6) classroom blocks with 10 classrooms, four (4) latrine blocks with 17 stances, 190 three-seater desks and to (2) teacher's houses in permanent material accommodating eight(8) teachers.

— In Masheruka Modern P/S (urban) there were six (6) classroom blocks with 14 classrooms, seven (7) latrine blocks with 25 stances, 282 three-seater desks and five (5) teachers houses, accommodating 19 teachers.

This information was corroborated with the consolidated Asset register at the Education Department office and both were in tandem.



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>The LG provided evidence confirming that LG TPC conducted desk appraisals of all sector projects in the budget FY2022/23, prioritized projects were derived from the LG DP III and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Construction of Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education on Shuuku Town Council derived from the DP III Page x. Desk appraisal completed on 12 July 2022.</p> <p>Construction of 2 Classrooms at Nyakabirizi Parents in Kitagata Sub County School derived from the DP III Page x. Desk appraisal completed on 12 July 2022.</p> <p>Construction of Kanegyere Primary School 2 classroom Block in Kakindo Sub County derived from the DP III Page x. Desk appraisal completed on 12 July 2022.</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>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals of sector projects in FY2022/23 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs to suit site conditions.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education on Shuuku Town Council was completed on 12 July 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of 2 Classrooms at Nyakabirizi Parents in Kitagata Sub County School was completed on 13 July 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of Kanegyere Primary School 2 classroom Block in Kakindo Sub County was completed on 13 July 2022</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, dated 1/08/2023, and received by PPDA on 7/08/2023.</p> <p><i>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Ryakasinga CHE Seed School in Shuuku T/C (ongoing project is properly planned and budgeted for)</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Pass</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was 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.</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Ryakasinga CHE Seed School in Shuuku T/C.</b></p> <p>The Contracts Committee approved the contract on 14/07/2022 under minute number: 48/CC/2022-2023 and the Solicitor General cleared the contract on 23/08/2022, letter reference number: DLAS/MBR/082/2022.</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina P/S;</b> Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/00019; Contractor: Arthure Technical Services Limited; Contract sum: UGX 74,292,800/=. The Contracts Committee approved the contract on 01/03/2023 under minute number: 134/CC/2022-2023</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanegyere P/S in Kakindo T/C;</b> Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/000020. Contractor: Kamugira Seith Investments Limited; Contract sum: UGX 34,651,290/=. The Contracts Committee approved the contract on 01/03/2023 under minute number: 134/CC/2022-2023</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines.</p> <p>In letters dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the district engineer, Ag. district education officer, district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for 3 education projects implemented in the previous FY. These projects were:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina PS in Masheruka S/C</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at NyakabiriziP/S in Kitagata S/C</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanengyere in Kangyenyi S/C</p> <p>In a letter dated 26/09/2022 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the district engineer, Ag. district education officer, district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for construction of Ryakasinga CHE Seed School in Shuuku T/C.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES. A visit to Ryakasinga center for higher education seed school.</p> <p>The following facilities were constructed: ICT &amp; Library block, Science lab, multi-purpose hall, Administration block, and 3-classroom block, and 2-classroom blocks, 2 in 1 staff houses, staff kitchens and 5-stance VIP latrines. These were constructed as per standard technical designs issued by MoES.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY for Ryakasinga CHE seed secondary school. Three meetings were captured to support the scoring of this indicator:  <i>&gt;&gt;&gt; Site meetings were held on 28/10/2022, 12/12/2022, and 4/4/2023. This was confirmed through site meeting minutes, reports, and visitors's book.</i>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was no evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, <b>at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision</b> involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs.  <i>Although site meetings were conducted effectively, there was no evidence that the technical team (Engineer, CDO, and Environment officer) jointly participated in any meeting which would confirm joint inspection/supervision.</i>  <i>Joint supervision reports were not availed, and the visitors' book was reviewed to track days when the technical team jointly visited the site, and no date confirmed the same.</i>	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*

A review of AWP and a sample of LG's payment vouchers for payments to 3 contractors for education Infrastructure projects implemented in FY2022/23 revealed that the LG initiated and made timely payments to contractors as per contract and implementation results.

### **Evidence**

Payments to Contractors are recommended to be made within 30 days from the certification of works.

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Arthur Technical Services SMC LTD on 15 May 2023 for the construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina Primary School in Masheruka Sub County for UGX 74,292,800. The District Education Officer recommended payment on 29 May 2023. Payment Certificate was prepared on 24 May 2023 and approved by the Accounting Officer on 16 June 2023. Payment was made on EFT No. 6438740 on 28 June 2023 i.e. This payment was made 12 days after certification of works.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s GESES Uganda Ltd on 2 June 2023 for the proposed construction of facilities at Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education in Shuuka Town Council for UGX 1,210,512,770. Payment Certificate No.3 was prepared on 16 June 2023 and approved by the Accounting Officer on 16 June 2023. Payment was made on EFT No. 6291603 on 23 June 2023 i.e. This payment was made 7 days after certification of works.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s GESES Uganda Ltd on 12 January 2023 for the construction of facilities at Ryakasinga Centre for Higher Education in Shuuka Town Council for UGX 1,210,512,770. The District Education Officer recommended payment on 2 February 2023. Payment Certificate No. 2 was approved by the Accounting Officer on 3 February 2023. Payment was made on EFT No. 3710376 on 15 February 2023 i.e. This payment was made 12 days after certification of works.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, score: 1, else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30.</p> <p>The plan was submitted on 10/03/2023 and had some of the following projects:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Kanegyere P/S facility, budgeted for UGX 74,460,840/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Ryakasing CHE Seed school, budgeted for UGX 2,300,000,000/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Nyabwiina P/S facility, budgeted for UGX 74,460,000/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Etc.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p><i>For the seed school:</i></p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Ryakasinga CHE Seed School in Shuuku T/C.</b></p> <p>The contract agreement was available and dated 23/09/2022; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 14/07/2022); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 14/07/2022) - contract approved under minute number: 48/CC/2022-2023.</p> <p>Other projects files were also complete, for example,</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nyabwina PS in Masheruka S/C.</b></p> <p>The contract agreement was available and dated 16/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 134/CC/2022-2023.</p>	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 recorded, investigated, responded to, and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</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 that the LG had disseminated the education guidelines to provide for access to land(without encumbrances) , proper siting of schools, green schools and energy and water conservation. This was done on 29/08/2023 and attended by a total of 95 participants that included; head teachers, DEO's staff and some members of SMC and PTA.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that costed ESMPs were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents for education projects;</p> <p>Construction of a two-classroom block at Kanengyere primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 900,000 in the BoQs.</p> <p>Construction of a two-classroom block at Nyabwina primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 50,000 in the BoQs.</p> <p>Construction of a two-classroom block at Nyakabirizi primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 200,000 in the BoQs.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>Sheema LG did not provide evidence of land ownership for projects implemented under education at the time of this assessment. The schools were Kanengyere p/s, Nyabwina p/s , and Nyakabirizi p/s.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was no 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. The LG provided only one monitoring report dated 31/07/2023 for all education projects.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was no evidence that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments.	<b>0</b>



**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Despite an increment in deliveries of 3.3%, the LG did not register more than 20% increase in utilization of health care services in deliveries. The sampling done from all the 11 Health facilities conducting deliveries from the health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for financial years 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 indicated a 3.3% increment.</p> <p>In the financial year 2021/2022, total deliveries amounted to 6167 while 2022/2023 total deliveries amounted to 6383. Therefore, (6383-6176) divided by 6176, and then multiplied by 100, which equaled to 3.3%.</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"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the Health LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 81%.</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 Ills and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0

Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

A review of the LG's Annual Budget Performance Report and Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG Health Development Grant was budgeted and spent on eligible activities as per the Health Grant and Budget Guidelines.

**Evidence**

- Construction of a placenta pit, septic tank, and 5-stance VIP at Kyeihara HC III for UGX 65,524,000
- Completion of a staff house at Shuuku HC IV for UGX 65,000,000
- Construction of a staff house at the upgraded Kyeibanga HC III for UGX 170,000,000
- Launch of projects, production of building plans, Monitoring and inspection of works for UGX 6,870,000

Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The LG provided evidence confirming that the LG Health Officer, Engineer, Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer certified works implemented by the LG's Health Department in FY2022/23 before payments were made to contractors.

#### **Evidence**

Review of a sample of 3 payment vouchers

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Bravo Land and Construction Company Limited on 18 May 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HCIII for UGX 95,267,517. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO. 6287795. Payment Certificate 1 was prepared on 18 May 2023 and signed by the District Engineer, District Health Officer, District Natural Resources Officers, and District Community Development Officer.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Rim and J Contractors Limited on 16 June 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeihara HCIII for UGX 92,934,217. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO. 6347983. Payment Certificate No. 3 was prepared on 16 June 2023 and signed by the District Engineer, District Health Officer, District Natural Resources Officers, and District Community Development Officer.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Bravo Land and Construction Company Limited on 8 June 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HCIII for UGX 89,143,977. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO.6287795. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared on 15 June 2023 and signed by the District Engineer, District Health Officer, District Natural Resources Officers, and District Community Development Officer.

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	The LG had three (03) health infrastructure projects in the previous FY. These were as follows:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		>>> Completion of a 4 in one staff house at Shuuka HC IV in Shuuka T/C; Contractor: Kegans Engineering Limited; Contract sum: UGX 50,980,720/=; Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/00017. The engineer's estimate was UGX 53,000,000/=. <i>This represented a variation of -3.810% of the MoWT Engineers estimate.</i>	
			>>> Construction of a staff house at Kibanga HC III; Contractor: Bravo Land & Construction Co., Limited; Contract amount: UGX 169143,977/=; Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/00021. The engineer's estimate was UGX 170,000,000/=, according to the annual procurement plan. <i>This represented a variation of -0.504% of the MoWT Engineers estimate.</i>	
			>>> Construction of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit in Kyeihara HC III; Contractor: Muhwezi Herbert Construction Co., Ltd; Contract reference number: SHEE928/WRKS/2022-2023/00018; Contract amount: UGX 61,000,690/=. The engineer's estimate was UGX 65,000,000/=. <i>This represented a variation of -6.153% of the MoWT Engineers estimate.</i>	
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	The LG did not have HC II's being upgraded to HC III's in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The approved structure for HCIV and HC III facilities provides for staffing levels as follows: (i) HC IIIs – 19 and (ii) HC IVs – 49. A review of the data provided revealed that Sheema DLG has one HC IV and five HC IIIs. The total number of staff found in-post at the time of assessment was one hundred twenty-seven against the expected staffing of one hundred eighty-two for the eight facilities. Therefore, the total staffing level at HCIII at the time of assessment was found to be 70%.</p> <p>The following staffing levels were found:</p> <p><b>HCIV</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shuuku HC IV - 33/49 (67%)</li> </ol> <p><b>HC III</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kigarama HC III -17/19 (89%)</li> <li>2. Kyangenty HC III - 15/19 (79%)</li> <li>3. Mabaare HC III - 12/19 (63%)</li> <li>4. Bugongi HC III - 15/19 (79%)</li> <li>5. Rugarama HC III - 11/19(58%)</li> <li>6. Kyeihara HC III - 10/19 (52%)</li> <li>7. Kyeibanga HC III -14/19 (73%)</li> </ol>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p><i>The LG had no project for upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIs in the previous FY.</i></p> <p><i>The existing health infrastructure projects met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</i></p>	2

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 22nd November 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Shuuku Health centre IV, Kigarama Health centre III and Kyangenyi Health centre III as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Shuuku Health center IV, 33 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 33 staff list of 1st October 2023.</li> <li>2. At Kigarama Health center III, 17 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 17 staff list of 30th November 2023</li> <li>3. At Kyangenyi Health center III, 15 out of 19 staff was indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 15 staff list un dated on the notice board</li> </ol>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health sector had upgrades under the financial year assessed. Muzira HC II was upgraded to HC III as evidenced on the PBS report.</p>	2
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>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; 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"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO for the previous financial year. The sampled health facilities of Kyangenyi HC III, Kigarama HC III and Shuuku HC IV submitted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kyangenyi HC III submitted on 31st January 2023</li> <li>2. Kigarama HC III submitted on 16th March 2023 and;</li> <li>3. Shuuku HC IV submitted on 21st March 2023</li> </ol> <p>All the submissions were by 31st March which was within the timeline and also conformed to the prescribed formats.</p>	2

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>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"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the sampled Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kyangeny HC III submitted on 8th July 2023</li> <li>2. Rugarama HC III submitted on 10th July 2023</li> <li>3. Shuuku HC IV submitted on 16th June 2023</li> </ol> <p>The submissions complied to The timeline submission by July 15th of the current FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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>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"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility improvement plans incorporated performance issues for the current financial year. This was evidenced from the previous financial year monitoring and assessment reports which included the following performance issues from the DHMT reports</p> <p>These performance issues were identified from the PIP facility included leadership/governance, human resources, medicines/supplies and facility specifics submissions below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plans to complete the incomplete 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV by followed up by the DHMT</li> <li>2. Timely submission of work plans and budgets in the new rolled out annual comprehensive work plans (HMIS 001) timely for better planning. Recommended by all the health facility in-charges.</li> <li>3. Replacement of terrazzo with the non-standard floor at the upgraded Rugarama HC III maternity ward to suit the standard guidelines as recommended by the DHMT.</li> </ol> <p>The samples and visited health facilities submitted their annual comprehensive work plans (HMIS001) which has replaced the improvement plans which the MOH roll out nationally. The submissions were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kyangenyi HC III submitted on 31st January 2023</li> <li>2. Kigaram HC III submitted on 16th March 2023</li> <li>3. Shuuku HC III submitted on 21st March 2023</li> </ol>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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>	<p>There was evidence that the health facilities submitted HMIS 105 monthly reports which were 100% up to date and timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities of Kigarama HC III, Shuuku HC IV and Kyangenyi HC III were indicated as follows;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Kigarama HC IV submitted as follows; 7th August, 5th September, 4th October, 5th November, 5th December, 4th January, 3rd February, 3rd March, 6th April, 3rd May, 4th June and 5th July.</p>	
			<p>Shuuku HC IV submitted as follows; 2nd August, 2nd September, 3rd October, 2nd November, 4th December, 2nd January, 4th February, 2nd March, 3rd April, 2nd May, 2nd June and 2nd July.</p>	
			<p>Kyangenyi HC III submitted as follows; 5th August, 3rd September, 5th October, 4th November, 4th December, 3rd January, 6th February, 5th March, 7th April, 5th May, 6th June and 5th July</p>	
			<p>All the health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter</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>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</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>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 was not applicable</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the Health Department compiled and submitted timely Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY2022/23 to the Planner for consolidation.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2022/23- Submission of Quarter One 2022/23 Performance Progress Report for Health Department on 24 October 2022.</li> <li>• Q2 FY2022/23- Submission of Quarter Two 2022/23 Performance Progress Report for Health Department on 23 January 2023</li> <li>• Q3 FY2022/23- Submission of Quarter Three 2022/23 Performance Progress Report for Health Department on 25 April 2023</li> <li>• Q4 FY2022/23- Submission of Quarter Four 2022/23 Performance Progress Report for Health Department on 24 July 2023</li> </ul>	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>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>There was evidence that the LG developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). This was evidenced from the LG PIP submitted on 30th May 2023. The improvement plans and the PIP implementation reports indicated 5 facilities as the weak performing health facilities; Mabaare HC II, Mabaare HC III, Rugarama HC III, Shuuku HC IV and Kyeihara HC III</p> <p>The facilities were identified as weak performing health facilities in the indicators below,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of sanitary facilities at Mabaare HC II upgrade. The budget was formulated and followed up by the ADHO environmental health</li> <li>2. At Mabaare HC III, there was lack of OPD, store, laboratory facilities. The facility did not have a standard floor as per the guidelines and it lacked a drainage system. All were budgeted for and the in-charge followed up.</li> <li>3. At Shuuku HC IV, the 4 in one staff house was incomplete and hence the DHO and the facility in-charge had to follow up</li> </ol>	1
	<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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities. The improvement plans and the PIP implementation reports indicated Mabaare HC II, Mabaare HC III, Rugarama HC III, Shuuku HC IV and Kyeihara HC III as the weak performing health facilities</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

## Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

The LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms. Under vote 928 of the LG approved estimates, the LG budgeted for 287 instead of 434 health workers.

The total number of staff on the approved was 434 on the approved structure and the filled posts were 287 staff at a budget amounted to 7,173,722,000/=. This indicated that (434-287) =147 staff who were not budgeted for.

The staffing norms included;

1. DHOs office staff deployed=14/11
2. 1 General Hospital staff deployed=113/169
3. 1 HC IV staff deployed=44/49
4. 7 HC IIIs staff deployed =94/133
5. 8 HC IIs staff deployed=29/72

Total deployed =287 out of 434 staff.

0

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:

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

Not all health facilities had the required 75% of the health staff required in accordance with the staffing norms. The staff lists of the assessed facilities against the staffing norms were;

1. Shuuku HC IV had 33/49=67%
2. Kigarama HC III had 17/19=89%
3. Kyangenty HC III had 15/19=79%
4. Mabaare HC III had 12/19=63%
5. Bugongi HC III had 15/19=79%
6. Rugarama HC III had 11/19=58%
7. Kyeihara HC III had 10/19=52%
8. Kyeibanga HC III had 14/19=73%

Shuuku, Mabaare, Rugarama, Kyeihara and Kyeibanga health facility staffing did not conform to the 75% guidelines.

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed. The reviewed Health workers' staff lists, facility attendance book/register (DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports; Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) indicated that the health workers were working where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities below;

This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 22nd November 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Shuuku Health centre IV, Kigarama Health centre III and Kyangenyi Health centre III as indicated below;

1. At Shuuku Health center IV, 33 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 33 staff list of 1st October 2023 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility
2. At Kigarama Health center III, 17 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 17 staff list of 30th November 2023 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.
3. At Kyangenyi Health center III, 15 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 15 un-dated staff list that was pinned at the Health facility notice board

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG had publicized health worker's deployment and disseminated as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities notice boards. The displayed lists of the health facilities visited indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, and gender among others as they appeared on the health facility notice boards

1. At Shuuku Health center IV, the 33 staff list of 1st October 2023 was pinned on the notice board at the facility

2. At Kigarama Health center III, the 17 staff list of 30th November 2023 was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.

3. At Kyangenyi Health center III, the 15 undated staff list was pinned at the Health facility notice board

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

Sheema DLG has a total of sixteen health facilities and Health facility In-Charges were appraised as shown hereunder.

1. **Karuhanga Darius**, Clinician, Kigarama HC III, appraised 27th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
2. **Namara Henry**, Enrolled Nurse, Kitagata Hospital, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
3. **Natukunda Mollen**, Kyanjenyi HC III, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 14th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
4. **Nuwasiima Hilard**, Kitagata Hospital, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
5. **Kyomuhendo Helen**, Kitagata Hospital, Enrolled Midwife, appraised 26th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
6. **Katusiime Melon**, Mabaale HC III, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 6th July 2023 as seen in the APR.
7. **Katusiime Penlope**, Kasaana East HC II, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
8. **Tusiime Susan**, Enrolled Nurse, Bugongi HC III, appraised 28th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
9. **Akatukunda Christine**, Kitagata Hospital, Assistant Nursing Officer, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
10. **Ampeire Bright**, Kitagata Hospital, Assistant Nursing Officer, appraised 10th July 2023 as seen in the APR.

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

Sheema DLG Health facility In-Charges and were found to have conducted performance appraisals of health facility workers as illustrated here under.

1. **Karugorora HC III** - Agabirwe Gift, Assistant Nursing Officer, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in the APR.
2. **Kyeihara HC II** - Richard Bells, Clinical Officer, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
3. **Muzira HC III**- Muheesi Joshua Muhindo, Senior Clinical Officer, appraised 20th June 2023 as seen in APR.
4. **Kyeibanga HC III** - Atusimirwe Jovile, Senior Clinical Officer, appraised 12th July 2023 as seen in APR.
5. **Kyanjenyi HC III** - Mandela Nelson, Senior Clinical Officer, appraised 14th June 2023 as seen in APR.
6. **Bugongi HC III** - Kamugisha Joseph, Senior Clinical Officer, appraised 20th June 2023 as seen in APR.
7. **Shuuku HC IV** - Dr. Katwaza Brian, Medical Officer, appraised 30th July 2023 as seen in APR.
8. **Bigona HC II** - Mweteise Amon, Senior Clinical Officer, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
9. **Kitagata Hospital** - Dr. Twijukire Balam Nkunda, Medical Officer-Special Grade, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
10. **Rukondo HC III** - Nahweera Sharon, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
11. **Masyoro HC II** - Suubi Mubarak, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
12. **Mabaale HC III** - Lubega Muzamir, Senior Clinician, appraised 30th June 2023 as seen in APR.
13. **Kigarama HC III** - Arituha Ronah, Clinical Officer, appraised 26th June 2023 as seen in APR.
14. **Buraro HC II** - Ampeire Sylvia, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 24th June 2023 as seen in APR.
15. **Kasaana East HC II** - Kihembo Annet, Enrolled Nurse, appraised 29th June 2023 as seen in APR.
16. **Rugarama HC III** - Kukundakwe Deo, Clinical Officer, appraised 27th June 2023 as seen in APR.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	DHO took corrective actions resulting from appraisal of the health workers as evidenced by an invitation to trainings of all in charges and the medical superintendent of Kitagata Hospital by the CAO dated 14th November 2023. The trainings was held on 21st and 22nd November 2023 to enhance their capacity in (i) public financial management and preparation of financial statements, (ii) training on RBF mainstreaming in to PHC Non-Wage funds. The report on the training proceedings was still under preparation at the time of assessment.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	The LG did not conduct the training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans. Despite the training reports availed, no training plan was availed to the assessment team. Therefore, the assessment team could not establish the training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans.  The availed training reports included  1. Orientation on malaria (ICCM) dated 10th June 2023  2. Immunisation (UNEPI) effective management  3. Journey plan (patient registration and management)	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence whether the LG documented the implemented the CPD trainings in the training data base. During the assessment time, no training data base was availed for review.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

**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>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP 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 evidence that the CAO confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th as there were 9 Health facilities that did not received PHC</p> <p>This was evidenced from the letter dated 4th September 2022 reference: CR/D/148 from CAO to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health confirming the correctness of the 20 Health facilities. This confirmation was received and acknowledged at MOH on 13th September 2023.</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of Budget Estimates FY2022/23 revealed that the LG allocated less than 15% of PHC NWR Grant for Lower Level Facilities FY2022/23 towards monitoring service delivery and management of LG Health services.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>PHC NWR UGX 157,582,763+ 7,471,220 = UGX 165,053,983</p> <p>DHO Allocation for monitoring service delivery &amp; management of LG Health Services UGX 9,495,200</p> <p><b>Calculation</b></p> <p>DHO Allocation/PHC NWR*100</p> <p>9,495,200/165,053,983*100=5.8% (i.e. this is less than the 15% maximum allowed in Sector Grant Guidelines)</p>	2

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

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

A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions of PHC NWR to Health Facilities revealed that the LG in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.

#### **Evidence**

Q1 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 08 July 2022. LG warranted on 11 August 2022 i.e. 5+ working days

Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. LG warranted on 21 October 2022 i.e. 5+ working days

Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG warranted on 13 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days

Q4 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 06 April 2023. LG warranted on 26 April 2023 i.e. 5+ working days

**Note:** Information on cash limit uploads by MoFPED could not accessed.

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

A review of transfers to 3 health facilities sampled from the LG Cost Centre List & LLG allocation release provided by MoFPED revealed that the LG communicated PHC NWR grant releases for FY2022/23 to health facilities before releasing the grants

#### **Evidence**

##### **KIGARAMA HEALTH CENTRE III**

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 994673 was dated 9 Sept 2023. Communication made on 1 September 2022 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 1622777 was dated 27 October 2022. Communication made on 24 October 2022 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 3244341 was dated 23 January 2023. Communication made on 30 January 2023 i.e. Communication made within 5 days after the release of grants.

Q4 FY2022/23. Invoice No. 5116005 was dated 03 May 2023. Communication made on 24 April 2023 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

##### **BIGONA HEALTH CENTRE II**

Q4 FY2022/23. Invoice No. 5138944 was dated 03 May 2023. Communication made on 24 April 2023 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

##### **SHUUKU HEALTH CENTRE IV**

Q1 FY2022/23. Invoice No. 994639 was dated 9 September 2022. Communication made on 1 September 2022 i.e. Communication made before release of grants.

Q2 FY2022/23. Invoice No. 1622778 was dated 27 October 2022. Communication made on 24 October 2022 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

Q4 FY2022/23. Invoice No. 5116013 was dated 03 May 2023. Communication made on 24 April 2023 i.e. Communication made before the release of grants.

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

Despite the fact that the LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities, they were beyond the 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED. These were posted on DHOs and the visited health facility notice boards as noted below;

1. Q1 posted on 1st September 2022 after a communication on 11 August 2022 (5+ working days)
2. Q2 posted on 24th October 2022 after a communication on 21 October 2022 (5 working days)
3. Q3 posted on 30th January 2023 after a communication on 13 January 2023 (5+ working days)
4. Q4 posted on 28th April 2023 after a communication on 26 April 2023 (5 working days)

Quarter 1 and 3 were posted after 5 working days

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department implemented the actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY. The following recommendations were implemented as observed from quarter 4 performance minutes dated 20th July 2023;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The in-charges and data persons endured that the test results from the lab registers and the OPD registers were matching for data quality and documentation</li> <li>2. Each health facility identified a Malaria focal person</li> <li>3. The in-charges ensured that data review and quarterly performance review meetings were conducted and actions followed up.</li> <li>4. The DHO followed up with NMS and MOH on irregular supply of medicines and other supplies</li> </ol> <p>These recommendations were implemented as evidenced from the quarterly review meeting minutes and implementation reports dated;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 dated 22th October 2022</li> <li>2. Q2 dated 24th February 2023</li> <li>3. Q3 dated 2nd May 2023 and</li> <li>4. Q4 dated 26th July 2023</li> </ol>
----	---	--	--

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs and key LG departments. This was evidenced from the attached attendances of the minutes of the meetings held on;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 dated 22th October 2022 attendance list had 40 participants.</li> <li>2. Q2 dated 24th February 2023 attendants list had 47 participants.</li> <li>3. Q3 dated 2nd May 2023 attendance list had 51 participants and</li> <li>4. Q4 dated 26th July 2023 attendance list had 29 participants.</li> </ol> <p>The participants included all Health Facility In-charges, focal persons, Implementing partners and the District Health Team</p>
----	---	--	--

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY</p> <p>The one government General hospital (Kitagata Hospital), one HC IV and 3 PNFPs were supervised at least once every quarter in the previous FY</p> <p>This was evidenced from the quarterly support supervision reports as indicted below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one supervision report dated 10th October 2022</li> <li>2. Quarter two supervision report dated 15th December 2022</li> <li>3. Quarter three report dated 17th April 2023 and;</li> <li>4. Quarter four report dated 28th June 2023</li> </ol> <p>Some of the recommendations as evidenced from quarter one of 10th October 2022 included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensured that the documentation journal on nutrition assessment was monitored and updated monthly at all the health facilities by allocating a responsible person.</li> <li>2. The in-charges effected the CMEs immediately for orientation and capacity building of the health workers due to the knowledge gaps</li> <li>3. Allocated a clinician in the ART clinic at Mushanga HC II for management of breastfeeding and HIV positive mothers.</li> </ol> <p>These gaps were discussed and actions implemented as noted.</p>
----	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that the Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY. This was evidenced from the HSD Support Supervision and Monitoring visit reports of the health sub districts as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 report dated 15th August 2022</li> <li>2. Q2 report dated 27th October 2022</li> <li>3. Q3 report dated 25th May 2023 and,</li> <li>4. Q4 report dated 11th September 2023</li> </ol>
----	---	--	--

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that corrective actions were made as evidenced from the HSD supervision reports</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routine display of the duty rota</li> <li>2. Conducting HUMC meetings and documenting of the minutes</li> <li>3. Re-distribution of essential drugs to take care of the stock outs at some health facilities</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
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 evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2022/2023. These reports indicated that guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies</p> <p>The feedback and guidance given to the in-charges included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensured that the date of labeling the drugs is labelled on the drugs and the drug tins to be covered after daily work. This feedback was given to the in-charge at Kyangenyi HC III.</li> <li>2. The emergency tray was missing some drugs and the in-charge was mentored that the emergency tray should be fully equipped with expected drugs all the time.</li> <li>3. Stock outs reported at Kyeibanga HC III and internal re-distribution form the district facilities was recommended.</li> </ol> <p>This was evidenced from the quarterly medicine management, supervision and monitoring reports of;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 dated 30th September 2022</li> <li>2. Q2 dated 31st December 2022</li> <li>3. Q3 dated 3rd March 2023</li> <li>4. Q4 dated 30th June 2023</li> <li>5. Integrated support supervision report on medicine management dated 17th April 2023.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>

Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

A review of LG's Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG allocated less than 30% of the District Health office budget to health promotion, education, and prevention (Community Health) activities.

#### **Evidence**

DHO Budget UGX 45,238,029

DHO Budget FY2022/23 allocated to health promotion and prevention activities

EFT No. 5299551 for Technical Support Supervision for Health Promotion, Hygiene, and Sanitation Amount was UGX 236,000

EFT No. 5836657 for Fuel for Technical Supervision for Health Promotion, Hygiene and Sanitation and Disease Prevention Amount was UGX 1,808,000

EFT No. 4274785 for Fuel supplied for Sub County Sensitization and Training in the District Amount was UGX 1,350,000

EFT No. 6360661 for fuel supplied for vaccine and logistics distribution in lower health units Amount was UGX 851,930

Total UGX 4,245,930

Allocations/DHO Budget\*100=4,245,930/45,238,029 = 9.4% (i.e. less than at least 30% as required per PHC NWR Grant Guidelines)



Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHT implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities. This was evidenced from the Health promotion reports of the previous financial year below;

1. Conducted radio talk shows on non-communicable diseases, integrated child health days and sanitation with the health educators and district leaders.
2. Conducted physical exercises and medical checkups for the district staff
3. Conducted community dialogues on malaria, sanitation, nutrition and hygiene
4. Distributed information, education and communication materials in the 15 sub counties
5. Conducted adolescent sexual health education in schools

Note; the above activities were noted from quarter 4 report dated 7th July 2023.

The quarterly health promotion and education reports were availed to the assessment team as noted below;

1. Quarter one report dated 5th October 2022
2. Quarter two report dated 9th January 2023
3. Quarter three report dated 3rd April 2023 and
4. Quarter four report dated 7th July 2023.

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District health team followed up the actions on health promotion and disease prevention from the progress reports and minutes of the conducted health promotion activities. The follow up actions included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The district team participated in community mobilisation. The CAO, RDC and other political leaders conducted routine radio talk shows, spot messages and distribution of promotion materials.</li> <li>2. Noted increment in the number of the district staff that participated in the physical exercises both at the headquarters and the community venue.</li> <li>3. Reduction of new HIV infections and STIs among the high risk groups as a result of awareness campaigns and condom distributions.</li> <li>4. High turn up of parents who immunized their children on the child health days</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had an updated asset register that set out the health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards as per the format.</p> <p>The asset register for the financial year 2022/2023 vote 928 of Sheema district local government health assets dated 27th November 2023. This asset register detailed health facility and equipment in the LG, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. The standard list of medical equipment for Health Facilities and service standards were availed</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

12

Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);

(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and

(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));

score 1 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals for all Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted, the prioritized projects were derived from the LG DPIII and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.

#### **Evidence**

Construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Mabaare HC III derived from DPIII Page x. Desk appraisal was completed on 10 November 2021

Construction of 4 in 1 staff house at Shuuku HCIV derived from DPIII Page x. Desk appraisal was completed on 10 November 2021

Construction of 4 stance lined Pit Latrine, Placenta Pit, Medical Waste Pit and Maternity Ward Floor at Kyeihara HCIII derived from DPIII Page x. Desk appraisal was completed on 10 November 2021

12

Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for the Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.

#### **Evidence**

Desk appraisal for the construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Mabaare HC III was completed on 10 November 2021

Desk appraisal for the construction of 4 in 1 staff house at Shuuku HCIV was completed on 10 November 2021

Desk appraisal for the construction of 4 stance lined Pit Latrine, Placenta Pit, Medical Waste Pit and Maternity Ward Floor at Kyeihara HCIII was completed on 10 November 2021

1

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>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>Completion of four stance VIP latrine at Kyeihara HC III was screened on 23/07/2022 with mitigation measures costed at UGX: 1,100,000.</p> <p>Construction of the placenta pit at Kyeibanga HCIII was screened on 23/07/2023 with mitigation measures costed at UGX: 600,000.</p> <p>Completion of four in-one staff house quarters at Shuuku HC IV phase II was screened on 26/07/2022 with mitigation measures costed at UGX: 600,000.</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 was 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.</p> <p>The Ag. DHO submitted the department requests for the current FY on 27/03/2023.</p> <p><i>Items included:</i></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of 4-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal and drainage system and replacement of cement-sand screed with terrazzo at Mabare HC III, budget UGX 126,254,504/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Procurement of fuel and oils and lubricants, budget UGX 26,835,348/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Motor vehicle maintenance, budget UGX 6,000,000/=.</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 was evidence that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY, specifically on 4/08/2023.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Replacement of cement-sand screed floor with terrazo in the maternity ward, budget of UGX 32,240,000/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of 4-stance VIP lined latrine and 2 in one stance VIP latrine with a urinal and drainage system, at a budget of UGX 57,539,877/=.</p>	1

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. There was no project above UGX 200,000,000/=. The projects were as follows:

**>>> Completion of a 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV in Shuuku T/C.**

Contract amount was UGX: 50,980,720/=. Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 143/CC/2022-2023.

**>>> Construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HC III.**

Contract amount was UGX 169,143,977/=. Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 139/CC/2022-2023.

**>>> Completion of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit in Kyeihara HC III.**

Contract amount was UGX 61,000,690/=. Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 137/CC/2022-2023.

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

There was evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects.

In letters dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the Ag. district engineer, ADHO (environment), district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for 3 health projects implemented in the previous FY. These projects were:

*>>> Completion of a 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV in Shuuku T/C.*

*>>> Construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HC III.*

*>>> Completion of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit in Kyeihara HC III.*

1

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	The LG had no project for upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIs in the previous FY.	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	The LG had no project for upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIs in the previous FY.	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	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	The LG had no project for upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIs in the previous FY.	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	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	The LG had no project for upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIs in the previous FY.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The LG Health Officer certified and recommended payments to contractors implementing Health Projects in FY2022/23 more than 10 working days after the payment request was made by contractors.

#### **Evidence**

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Bravo Land and Construction Company Limited on 18 May 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HCIII for UGX 95,267,517. The payment was recommended by the District Health Officer on 5 June 2023. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO. 6287795. Payment Certificate 1 was prepared on 18 May 2023 and signed by District Health Officer and approved by the Accounting Officer on 5 June 2023. The District Health Officer recommended payment and certified works 12 days after the payment request was made by the contractor.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Rim and J Contractors Limited on 16 June 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeihara HCIII for UGX 92,934,217. The District Health Officer recommended payment on 16 June 2023. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO. 6347983. Payment Certificate No. 3 was prepared, signed by the District Health Officer, and approved by the Accounting Officer on 16 June 2023. The District Health Officer recommended payment and certified works same day payment request was made by the contractor.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Bravo Land and Construction Company Limited on 8 June 2023 for the construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HCIII for UGX 89,143,977. The payment was made on 23 June 2023 EFT NO.6287795. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared, signed by the District Health Officer, and approved by the Accounting Officer on 15 June 2023. The District Health Officer certified works within 5 days after the payment request was made by the contractor.

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

*All procurement files were complete. The entity had only three (03) projects in health.*

**>>> Completion of a 4 in one staff house at Shuuku HC IV in Shuuku T/C.**

The contract agreement was available and dated 17/03/2023; Contract amount UGX: 50,980,720/=; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 143/CC/2022-2023.

**>>> Construction of a staff house at Kyeibanga HC III.**

*The contract agreement was available and dated 17/03/2023; Contract amount UGX 169,143,977/=; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 139/CC/2022-2023.*

**>>> Completion of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, placenta pit, maternity ward floor, and medical waste pit in Kyeihara HC III.**

The contract agreement was available and dated 16/03/2023; Contract amount was UGX 61,000,690/=; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 137/CC/2022-2023.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework for projects implemented under health.

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 that the LG issued guidelines on medical waste management and followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs. This was evidenced the national health care waste management plan 2010-2012 was disseminated to 23 health facility representatives on May 2021</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>The LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management and a local infrastructure for managing medical waste. Green label services ltd was the service provider contracted to manage medical waste. This was evidenced from the Memorandum of Understanding dated 1st October 2022 to manage health care waste at the general hospital (Kitagata GH) and at the Health center IV (Shuuku).</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Health care waste management trainings were conducted. This was evidenced from the training reports below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Human waste management training held during the sanitation week dated 11th April 2023</li> <li>2. Health care waste management and segregation training for facility in-charges and environmental health officers held on 20th December 2022.</li> </ol>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into, BoQs for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY;</p> <p>The following projects had no costed ESMPs in the BoQs;</p> <p>Completion of four stance VIP latrine at Kyeihara HCIII.</p> <p>Construction of a placenta pit at Kyeibanga HC III.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability;</p> <p>While Kyeihara HC III and Kyeibanga HC III had evidence of ownership, the LG did not provide evidence of Shuku HC IV at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports. All health projects had one monitoring report dated 12/04/2023.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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 the interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects.</p>	0

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; 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"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) Management Information Systems (MIS) report, the Local Government had 87% rural water sources functional.</p>	<b>1</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; 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 &amp; 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"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Review of the Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) Management Information System (MIS) report, the LG had 95% of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees characterized with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with approval of the WSCs.</p>	<b>2</b>
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"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the Water LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 77%</p>	<b>1</b>

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.

o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

There was evidence that the LG Water Office implemented budgeted WSS projects in Kigarama sub-county that was below the district safe water average.

According to MoWE MIS report for FY 2022/2023, Sheema District had a safe water coverage of 83%. The sub-county of Kigarama with 76% was reported below district average.

From the reviewed Annual Work Plan & Budget, Annual Performance Report FY 2022/2023, the LG had a total development grant of UGX 372,336,954/= and the following budgeted WSS projects were reported implemented.

a) Extension of water from Migyera-ibiri to Muzira in Kyagyenyi sub-county at UGX 108,515,434/=. Kyagyenyi sub-county benefited despite having a safe water coverage of 95% because of the provision in grant guidelines that stipulates extension of safe water to UgIFT projects including Health Facility upgrades and Seed Schools.

b) Overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma-Kyahi-Kigarama seed secondary school phase I piped water supply system at UGX 220,104,847/= in Kigarama sub-county

c) Construction of (03) protected springs in Kitagata sub-county at UGX 22,876,471/=

From the analysis above, it was established that 88% of the budgeted WSS projects were in LLGs below average and those that had implementation of UgIFT projects as stipulated by the guidelines.

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

There was proof that the sampled WSS projects implemented in FY 2022/2023 had price variations within +/-20% of the engineers estimates. Sampled contracts included;

a) Extension of water from Migyera-ibiri to Muzira that had engineer's estimates of UGX 97,419,102/=. Review of the contract agreement signed on 16th/03/2023 between Sheema District LG and M/S Hemo Engineering Services Ltd Ref.928/wrks/2022-2023/00016 the contract sum was UGX 95,401,306/=. The project had a price variation of 2%.

b) The overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma-Kyali-Kigarama seed secondary school phase I piped water supply system had engineer's estimates of UGX 254,656,750/=. From the presented contract agreement signed on 9th/05/2023 between the LG and M/S Hemo Engineering Services Ltd the contract price was UGX 241,161,283/=. It was established that the project had a price variation of 5.2%

c) The construction of (03) protected springs in Kitagata sub-county had engineer's estimates of UGX 25,000,000/=. From the signed contract agreement dated 17th/03/2023 Ref.928/Wrks/2022-2023/00024 the contract price was UGX 24,382,812/=.The variation was 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

There was evidence Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2022/2023 were completed as per annual workplan. In the plan projects to be implemented included construction of 03 protected springs in Kitagata sub-county, extension of water from Migyera-ibiri to Muzira and overhaul and extension of water to Katojo-Katooma-Kyali-Kigarama seed school. From the annual budget performance report (status of implemented projects) all the projects were reported completed within FY 2022/2023.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence of percentage increase in functionality of water supply facilities between FY 2022/2022 and 2022/2023. The functionality of facilities in the district remained static at 87% for the two FYs under review in this performance indicator.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>During the assessment exercise, it was established from the MoWE MIS reports that there was no percentage increment in water facilities with functional Water and Sanitation Committees in the two FYs under review. It was established that functionality was static at 95% in both FY 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 hence the awarded score.</p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>There was evidence of accuracy in reporting on WSS facilities constructed in FY 2022/2023 and performance of the facilities as reported. Review of the annual performance report FY 2022/2023, the LG Water Officer reported about the implemented WSS projects of FY 2022/2023 and their respective status. Field visits to the sub-counties of Kigarama, Kyangenyi and Kitagata for triangulation on overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma-Kyahi to Kigarama water supply system phase I, Extension of water from Migyera-ibiri to Muzira and construction of protected springs respectively. It was established that the infrastructure investments were constructed as reported in the APR FY 2022/2023.</p>	3
---	---	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Water Office collected and compiled quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs and community involvement. Presented for review were four quarterly reports that detailed facilities' functionality, WSCs that were functional, those non-functional that needed rejuvenation or replacement. Issues of equity, gender and fulfillment of critical requirements (community involvement) were captured in the presented reports. The presented quarterly reports were compiled on the dates below.</p> <p>Quarter one on 12th/10/2022, quarter two on 10th/01/2023, quarter three on 13th/04/2023 and quarter four on 12th/07/2023.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was proof that the LG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) at a quarterly basis in FY 2022/2023. Using the standard data collection forms from MoWE, information regarding new facilities, population served, functionality of facilities and WSCs was captured at submitted to the MIS on the following dated;</p> <p>Quarter one submission on 12th/10/2022, quarter two submission on 10th/01/2023, quarter three submission on 13th/04/2023 and quarter four submission on 14th/07/2023. There was proof of acknowledgement of receipt by MoWE Central Registry as per appended signature and stamp.</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p> <p><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></p>	<p>There was no evidence the LG Water Office had supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in performance assessment. The LG conducted LLG assessment and the average score under water and environment was 77%. The LG had a total of 6 sub-counties eligible for the rural water grant. The 25% lowest performing was comprised of Rugarama and Kitagata both with 5/10. according to verified results by OPM. The LG Water Office did not prepare Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) as precursor to build the capacity of these weak LLGs.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>A review of the Sheema District Local Government Budget Estimates for FY 2023/24(Vote 928), the Water Officer budgeted for the critical staff as found at page 57 sub-programme water.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>A review of the Sheema District Local Government Budget Estimates for FY 2023/24(Vote 928), the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for the critical staff as found at page 61 sub-programme Natural Resources.</p>	2
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>Sheema DLG District Water Officer appraised all the District Water Office staff within the stipulated time for the period under review as shown below.</p> <p><b>Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization</b> - Mwesigwa Isaac. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 24th June 2023.</p> <p><b>Assistant Engineering Officer</b>- Byaruhanga Tarsis. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.</p> <p><b>Natural Resources Officer</b>- Turyatunga Patrick Boaz. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.</p> <p><b>Forestry Officer</b>- Twesigye Gilbert. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	3



Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence the LG Water Office had identified capacity needs of staff from performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities were conducted in adherence to the training plans. The staff of Water Office included both recruited and assigned staff members.

There was evidence the staff were appraised using Public Service Performance Appraisal Form PS-5. Individual capacity gaps were identified. Presented for review was capacity training plan for District Water Office. Plan was prepared on 10th/03/2023 detailing identified gaps and the proposed support systems including the Technical Support Unit (TSU), PHRO and DWO.

Presented and reviewed was training report on capacity building, ethic and integrity leadership. The presented report was dated 30th March 2023 and covered the following topics planning, evaluation and implementation of Government programmes, ethics and integrity crisis in public service, transformational leadership, effective service delivery in Local Governments, conflict resolution and management. The report recommended transfer of knowledge to junior cadres. Facilitation of training was by Engineers from MoWE (TSU-Mbarara Region), Senior Sociologist MoWE (TSU-Mbarara) , Deputy CAO and DWO Sheema District.

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

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.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

- 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

There was evidence the LG Water had prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that had safe water coverage below that of the district. According to the MoWE MIS the LG had an average safe water coverage of 82%. The sub-county of Kigarama with coverage at 76% was reported below average. Review of the AWP &B FY 2023/2024 dated 13th/07/2023 Ref.CR/D/752 the LG had a total development budget of UGX 456,638,661/=. The grant guidelines stipulate up to 75% of the grant towards capital investment projects.

The following projects were prioritized.

a) Extension of water from Masheruka CBD to Mabaare HC III and construction of Rainwater harvesting Tanks at Kyabuharambo Primary School in Masheruka sub-county at a cost of UGX 182,539,000/=. Mabaale HC III was a UgIFT project, and the grant guidelines permit such allocations.

b) Construction of Rainwater harvesting tank at Nyarutooma Primary School in Kitagata sub-county at UGX 20,000,000/=

c) Extension of Matsyoro-piped water to Kigarama sub-county at total cost of UGX 161,210,000/= of which 137,633,000/= was from rural grant and UGX 23,577,000/= was UgIFT.

d) Rehabilitation of 03 protected springs in Kigarama sub-county at UGX 20,630,000/=

It was established that 83% of the grant was utilized in Kigarama which was below district average and Masheruka that had a UgIFT project.

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>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence the LG Water Office communicated to LLGs their respective allocations per source constructed. Presented as evidence was a circular addressed to Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS) of Maseruka, Kitagata and Kigarama sub-counties detailing respective projects and budget allocations.</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Presented for review were circulars dated 14th July 2023 indicating priority investments in FY 2023/2024 under Water. They were addressed to SAS of Kigarama, Kitagata and Masheruka LLGs. The communication was made by the Ag.LG Water Officer.</p>	
			<p>Request letter from the community of Kyabuhambo Primary School addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer for a Rainwater harvesting tank. The letter was dated 20th/4/2023. There was evidence of acknowledgement of request by Local Government Water office and Office of the CAO.</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>	<p>Presented as evidence was monitoring reports for projects implemented in FY 2022/2023. The reports presented included monitoring 7th/13/2023 and report dated 25th/07/2023. The presented evidence did not meet the requirements of this particular indicator that calls for monitoring of all WSS facilities in the district. The indicator calls for establishment of list of facilities, development of monitoring plan and compilation of monitoring reports in standard formats capturing key issues including functionality, environmental and social safeguards of which none of the presented evidence captured.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>		

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence the LG Water Officer conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and incorporated in FY 2023/2024 Annual Work Plan. From the presented evidence, quarter one DWSCC meeting was held on 10th/12/2022 under minute: 04/12/022 the LG Water Officer informed stakeholders about status of projects implemented in 2021/2022 and functionality.

In quarter two, DWSCC meeting was held on 7th/12/2022 where under minute 04/12/022, stakeholders were notified of shoddy works at Kyehora and Rugarama WSS facilities where the tanks were reported leaking. There was reported no value for money, and it was resolved that the issue be urgently attended to.

Quarter three DWSCC meeting was held on 15th/03/2023, under minute 04/2022/23 the LG Water Officer clarified to stakeholders regarding the operations of the Southwestern Umbrella where operational office was established in Masheruka to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in operations.

The fourth quarter DWSCC held on 8th/06/2023 under minute 04/2023 the LG Water Office informed stakeholders about conflicts between the management body (Southwestern umbrella) and residents. It was reported that the natives never wanted metered water.

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence the LG Water Officer publicized budget allocations for FY 2023/2024. Presented during assessment as evidence was a circular dated 29th/06/2023 (Priority WSS Projects for FY 2023/2024) The extension of piped water supply system from Masheruka CDB, construction of Rainwater harvesting tanks and extension of Matsyoro piped water system to Kigarama were captured in the circular that was displayed at the LG Public Notice Board.

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	There was evidence the DWO allocated 47% of the non-wage recurrent rural water and sanitation budget to mobilization activities as per grant guidelines. Review of the AWP FY 2022/2023, the total NWR budget was UGX 45,768,947/=. The LG Water Office allocated UGX 21,689,370/= towards mobilization activities. This was above the minimum of 40% as stipulated by the guidelines.	<b>3</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

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.	There was evidence the Ag. LG Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities. Reviewed was report dated 10th June 2023 on the formation and training of WSCs in Kitagata sub-county for the construction of protected springs. Other WSS facilities constructed in the FY 2022/2023 were operated and managed by Southwestern Umbrella. The report was compiled by the Assistant Water Officer-Mobilization.	<b>3</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

**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	The LG Water Office had an up-to-date LG asset register that sets out water and sanitation facilities by location. Presented for review was Sheema District Water and Sanitation register that captured all WSS facilities per sub-county, parish, village and area of location. It captured functionality of the facility, type of technology, Year of Construction, project costs and source of funding. Projects of FY 2020/2023 were equally incorporated.	<b>4</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals for all WSS projects to be implemented in FY2023/24 were conducted, the prioritized projects were derived from the LG DPIII and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of Muziira-Kakiindo-Kigarama SC Piped Water Supply System in Kigarama SC derived from DPIII Page x. Desk appraisal was completed on 7 Nov 2022</li> <li>• Extension Masherura CD- Masherura HCIII- Rweicum piped Water Supply System in Masheruka Sub County derived from DPIII Page x. Desk appraisal was completed on 8 Nov 2022</li> <li>• Construction of 10,000 litre rain water harvesting tank at Kyabuharambo Primary School derived from DPIII Page x. Desk Appraisal was completed on 7 Nov 2022</li> </ul>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The budgeted investments of FY 2023/2024 had proof that they were demand driven. Presented was evidence of application letters/requests from beneficiary communities. For example, the community of Masheruka through their LC III SAS applied for safe water in the area in an application dated 25th/05/2023.</p> <p>Letter dated 14th/02/2023, request for Rainwater harvesting tank at Nyarutooma Primary School. The letter was addressed to the CAO through Ag.DWO. Critical requirements were adhered to hence projected sustainability of investments.</p>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for WSS Projects to be implemented in FY2023/24 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p>	2	
			<p><b>Evidence</b></p>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field appraisal for the extension of Muziira-Kakiindo- Kigarama SC Piped Water Supply System in Kigarama Sub county was completed on 8 Nov 2022</li> </ul>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field appraisal for the extension Masherura CD- Masherura HCIII- Rweicum piped Water Supply System in Masheruka Sub County was completed on 8 November 2022</li> </ul>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field appraisal for the construction of 10,000 litre rain water harvesting tank at Kyabuharambo Primary School was completed on 8 November 2022</li> </ul>		
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that water infrastructure projects for the previous FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts prepared before being approved for construction;</p>	2	
			<p>Extension of Migyera ebiri piped water supply system to Kakindo-Muzira piped line was screened on 28/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000.</p>		
			<p>Overhaul and extension of Katogo-Katooma seed school phase one piped water supply system was screened on 27/07/2022 with costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000.</p>		
			<p>Construction of three medium protected springs in Kitagata sub county was screened on 25/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 430,000</p>		

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan date 30/09/2022, received by PPDA on 10/10/2022 and Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development on 17/10/2022.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Overhaul and extension of Katojo - Katoma - Kyahi - Kigarama seed water supply system Phase I in Kigarama and Masheruka S/Cs, budgeted for UGX 130,104,000/=.</i></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Feasibility study of Mabare HC II and extension of Migyera to Ibiri to Muzira to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema district, budgeted for UGX 90,000,000/=.</i></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Construction of three (03) protected springs in Kitagata S/C, budgeted for UGX 25,400,000/=.</i></p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Overhaul and extension of Katojo - Katoma - Kyahi - Kigarama seed water supply system Phase I in Kigarama and Masheruka S/Cs. The project was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction on 1/03/2023, under minute number 129/CC/2022-2023.</i></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Feasibility study of Mabare HC II and extension of Migyera to Ibiri to Muzira to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema district. The project was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction on 1/03/2023, under minute number 130/CC/2022-2023.</i></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Construction of three (03) protected springs in Kitagata S/C. The project was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction on 1/03/2023, under minute number 135/CC/2022-2023.</i></p>	



Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:

*There was evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines.*

In a letter dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for feasibility study of Mabare HC III water supply system and extension of Migyera-Ibiri to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema District.

In a letter dated 10/05/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district natural resources officer, district community development officer, labour officer, and clerk of works for overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma-Masyoro II piped water supply system, in Masheruka and Kigarama S/Cs.

In a letter dated 17/03/2023 with reference number: CR/D/105/2, the CAO appointed the civil engineer/water officer, CDO (in charge of mobilization in water sector), district planner, district natural resources officer, district community development officer, and labour officer, for construction of 3 protected springs in Kitagata S/C.

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2

There was evidence that the three water infrastructure sampled were constructed as per standard technical designs. Sampled infrastructures included; Overhaul and extension of Katojo-Katooma to Kigarama seed secondary school piped water supply system phase I. The extension of water from Migyera-ibiri to Muzira HCIII in Kyangyenye sub-county and the construction of a protected spring in Kitagata sub-county.

The Overhaul and extension of piped water to Kigarama Seed School was to cover a distance of 3kms (2.44km and 0.66km), earth works, building works, concrete works, plumbing drains and soak pit. Have a lockable steel meter protected box. Dual tap outlets GI/HDPE 20 service Inc. One tap stand at Kigarama seed school.

The protected springs works involved wing walls, C25 reinforced concrete cement (standard mix accordance to BS CP 114) of thickness 100mm. Stone Masonry works in 1:3 for walls with thickness of 200mm. Plastering walls in two layers of 12mm in 1:3 and construction of alive fence with barbed wire G10 3lines around the immediate catchment, size min 100x50 with treated poles. There was adherence to the technical specifications given to contractors by District Engineer for the implemented WSS projects.

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2

The LG had three (3) water projects:

>>> *Overhaul and extension of Katojo - Katoma - Kyahi - Kigarama seed water supply system Phase I in Kigarama and Masheruka S/Cs, budgeted for UGX 130,104,000/=.*

>>> *Feasibility study of Mabare HC II and extension of Migyera to Ibiri to Muzira to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema district, budgeted for UGX 90,000,000/=.*

>>> *Construction of three (03) protected springs in Kitagata S/C, budgeted for UGX 25,400,000/=.*

Report dated July 7, 2023, prepared by the DWO reported supervision of water projects implemented in the 4th quarter of the previous FY. The projects supervised were the ones listed above. There was evidence that the environment officer, engineer, and CDO participated in the supervision.

Report dated March 7, 2023, prepared by prepared by the DWO reported supervision of water projects implemented in the 3rd quarter of the previous FY. The projects were spring wells. There was evidence that the environment officer, engineer, and CDO participated in the supervision, appended signatures.

Reports dated 26/7/2022, 31/07/2023, and 11/05/2023 prepared by the district natural resources officer reported supervision of WSS projects in the previous FY. The reports included recommendations with budgets for mitigation measures for the three WSS projects implemented in the previous FY. ***Environment and social mitigation certification forms were availed for the three (03) projects implemented in the previous FY. The forms provided evidence that the contractor implemented the actions that arose from site meetings.***

Note: Contracts were signed in the 3rd/4th quarters with contract periods of not more than 3 months.

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG Water Officer verified, certified, and initiated payments to contractors implementing water projects in FY2022/23 within specified timeframes.

#### **Evidence**

Payments to contractors are recommended within 30 days from certification of works.

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Hemo Engineering Services Ltd on 25 May 2023 for the overhaul and extension of Katoojo-Katooma-Kyahi-Kigarama Seed School piped water supply system Phase 1 in Kigarama/Masheruka Sub County for UGX 130,840,760. The payment was recommended by the District Water Officer on 30 May 2023. Payment Certificate One was prepared on 30 May 2023, signed by Ag. District Water Officer, and approved by the Accounting Officer on 1 June 2023. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839253. The payment was made within 11 days after the certification of works.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mkron Company Limited on 3 May 2023 for the construction of 3 protected springs in Kitagata Sub County for UGX 24,382,812. The District Water Officer recommended payment on 5 May 2023. Payment Certificate One was prepared on 5 May 2023 signed by the Ag. District Water Officer, and approved by the Accounting Officer on 15 May 2023. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839238. The payment was made within 28 days after the certification of works.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Hemo Engineering Services Ltd on 5 May 2023 for the Feasibility study of Mabare HCII and extension of Migyeri-Ibiri-Muzira-Kakindo piped water supply system for UGX 68,986,046. The District Water Officer recommended payment on 8 May 2023. Payment Certificate was prepared on 8 May 2023, signed by the Ag. District Water Officer, and approved by the Accounting Officer on 15 May 2023. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839253. The payment was made within 28 days after the certification of works.

12

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

*There was 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. The projects were as follows:*

>>> Overhaul and extension of Katojo - Katoma - Kyahi - Kigarama seed water supply system Phase I in Kigarama and Masheruka S/Cs. The contract agreement was available and dated 9/05/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 129/CC/2022-2023.

>>> Feasibility study of Mabare HC II and extension of Migyera to Ibiri to Muzira to Kakindo piped water supply system in Sheema district. The contract agreement was available and dated 16/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 130/CC/2022-2023.

>>> Construction of three (03) protected springs in Kitagata S/C. The contract agreement was available and dated 17/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 135/CC/2022-2023.

All files were complete.

## 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

*Maximum 3 points this performance measure*

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

There was no 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.

0

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer had disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all WSS projects of FY 2022/2023 were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent and the land had on lodged encumbrances. Presented as evidence was consent agreement signed between M/S Daniel Arinaitwe and the Ag.LG Water Officer representing Sheema LG. The agreement was witnessed by three people.</p> <p>Formal consent agreement signed between the LG and M/S Jovanice Kyobutungu of Nyakabirizi LC for the construction of Nyakabirizi protected spring in Kitagata sub-county. The public stand tap posts were mainly constructed on public institution land where the Government had control and ownership.</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;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:</p>	<p>The LG Environment Officer and Community Development Officer completed and signed E&amp;S Certification forms after payments were made to Contractors for Water Projects implemented in FY2022/23.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Review of a sample of 3 payment vouchers</p> <p>1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Hemo Engineering Services Ltd on 25 May 2023 for the overhaul and extension of Katoojo-Katooma-Kyahi-Kigarama Seed School piped water supply system Phase 1 in Kigarama/Masheruka Sub County for UGX 130,840,760. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839253. E&amp;S Certifications were completed on 16 June 2023, i.e. 4 days after payments were made to contractors.</p> <p>2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mkron Company Limited on 3 May 2023 for the construction of 3 protected springs in Kitagata Sub County for UGX 24,382,812. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839238. E&amp;S Certifications were completed on 16 June 2023, i.e. 4 days after payments were made to contractors.</p> <p>3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Hemo Engineering Services Ltd on 5 May 2023 for the Feasibility study of Mabare HCII and extension of Migyeri-Ibiri-Muzira-Kakindo piped water supply system for UGX 68,986,046. The payment was made on 12 June 2023 EFT NO. 5839253. E&amp;S Certifications were completed on 16 June 2023, i.e. 4 days after payments were made to contractors.</p>	
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the CDO and environment Officer undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports</p>	0
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>		

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Yes, there was evidence that the LG had up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs.</p> <p>As per a report titled “Irrigated Data for FY 2022/2023” total land under irrigation was 47.5 acres, 2.5 acres was under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 45 acres under non beneficiaries.</p> <p>According to the same report for FY 2021/2022 there was 43 acres of land entirely under micro-scale irrigation non beneficiaries.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, there was evidence that the LG had increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous fiscal year.</p> <p>In the fiscal year 2022/2023, the total land under micro-scale irrigation was 47.5 acres whereas in the fiscal year 2021/2022, there was 43 acres of land under micro-scale irrigation.</p> <p>Therefore increased acreage of newly irrigated land was 4.5 acres, hence more than 5% increase.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the Micro-scale Irrigation LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 87%</p>	4



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>As per the grant guidelines of previous FY, the LG was allocated a total of 117,930,056/-, of which 35,379,017/- (30%) was meant for establishment of <b>two</b> micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites.</p> <p>And as per the budget performance report for the previous FY, 25,300,000/- (21.45%) was used for establishment of <b>one</b> micro-scale irrigation demonstration site. The balance 9,965,089/- (8.55%) was used for procurement of field equipment and safety gears for technical staffs.</p> <p>LGs were guided by MAAIF in a letter dated 28th April 2022 signed by the Permanent secretary to procure field equipment and safety gears for technical staffs using part of the funds earmarked for irrigation demonstration sites under complementary services. So it means that out of the 35,379,017/- (30%) meant for irrigation demonstration sites, LGs should use part of it as complementary services for procurement of field equipment and safety gears</p> <p>Therefore, the LG used the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant in accordance with the MAAIF guidance and grant guidelines</p>	2
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>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</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that an approved farmer's acceptance form signed confirming that equipment was working well same day payments were made to suppliers in FY2022/23.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Request for Payment was made by M/s Pelmug Holdings Uganda Ltd on 18 June 2023 for the construction of the Demonstration Site for Small Scale Irrigation in Kigarama Sub County for UGX 24,970,000. Payment was made on EFT No. 6439749 on 28 June 2023. Mr. Samwiri Biraro, Demo Host Farmer endorsed the Acceptance Form on 28 June 2023.</p>	1

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>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>As per the supplier contracts, M/S Pelmug Holdings Uganda Ltd, the irrigation equipment supplier signed a contract on 17th March 2023 and installed one micro-scale irrigation demonstration site at a cost of 24,970,000/-.</p> <p>The agricultural engineer's cost estimates was 24,920,000/-</p> <p>Hence the percentage variation in the contract price = +0.2%, hence within +/-20%.</p>	<b>1</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Pelmug Holdings Uganda Ltd (micro-scale irrigation equipment supplier) signed a contract on 17th March 2023 and installed one micro-scale irrigation demonstration site, and work was completed on 18th June 2023.</p> <p>Also a certificate of completion issued to the supplier indicated that work was accomplished by 30th June 2023.</p> <p>Therefore, the planned micro-scale irrigation demonstration site where a contract was signed during the previous FY was installed/completed within the previous FY.</p>	<b>2</b>

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

Sheema DLG recruited LLG extension staff as per minimum staffing standards. The minimum standards for the LLG extension staff according to the approved and costed staff establishment is (a) sub-counties 5No.- (Veterinary officer, Agricultural Officer, Fisheries Officer, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Assistant agricultural officer) and (b) Town Council 3No, - (Agricultural Officer, Assistant Veterinary Officer, Assistant agricultural officer). The average staffing levels for the four sampled LLGs were found to be 47%.

### **1. Shuuku TC - 2/3(67%)**

(i) Ninsiima Rachel, Agricultural Officer, appointed 26th November 2015, Min No. 109/2015(b)(6), posting instruction 2nd December 2015, appraised 30th June 2023. (ii). Kaihura Collins, Assistant Veterinary Officer, appointed 3rd May 2018, Min No. 33/2018(i), posting instruction 10th May 2018, appraised 30th June 2023.

### **2. Kitagata SC- 2/5(40%)**

(i) Kugumizamu K Peninah, Agricultural Officer, appointed 2nd June 2017, Min No. 74 (iii) (4) of 2017, posting instruction 5th June 2017, appraised 30th June 2023. (ii) Akibawe Peter, Assistant Veterinary Officer, appointed 28th September 2018, Min No. 25/2018(ii), posting instruction 10th October 2018, appraised 20th June 2023.

### **3. Rugarama SC -2/5(40%)**

(i)Ojok Francis, Agricultural Officer appointed 26th November 2015, Min No. 109/2015(b)(8), posting instruction dated 15th June 2017, appraised 15th June 2023. (ii) Turinawe Barnabas, Animal production officer, appointed 2nd June 2017, Min No. 74(ix)(7) of 2017, posting instruction dated 5th June 2017, appraised 30th June 2023.

### **4. Masheruka SC -2/5(40%)**

(i) Kanyonza Julius, Assistant Veterinary Officer, appointed 3rd May 2018, Min No. 33/2018(xix), posting instruction 10th May 2018, appraised 15th June 2023. (ii) Atiwijukire Moses, Agricultural Officer, appointed 3rd May 2018, Min No. 26/2018(vi), posting instruction 10th My 2018, appraised 15th June 2023.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Key items observed at the Kigarama irrigation demonstration site installed included:</p> <p>Petrol engine powered pump (50m head, Qmin=3m<sup>3</sup>/h; Low pressure sprinklers, 4lts/hr (25); Sprinkler stand 2 inch (25); PE pipe 50mm PN 6; PE end cap 50mm (13); PE elbow 50mm (8); PE TEE 50mm (6); PE female connector 50mm (2); Tank connector (1); drip line tubing blank 16mm; drip line emitter pressure compensating, 4lts/hr; drip line end caps 16mm (60); 2,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on 1m high reinforced brick wall tank base; Delivery hose (30m flexible).</p> <p>These features were in conformity with the inventory.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The installed Kigarama irrigation demonstration site had the following irrigation systems installed at each site:</p> <p>Petrol engine powered drip, sprinkler and drag hose pipe systems.</p> <p>Every irrigation system was switched on and was functioning, field photos were captured at the time of assessment.</p>	2

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on the position of extension workers filled was found inaccurate in Shuuku TC as shown here under thereby not meeting the score requirements.</p> <p><b>Shuuku TC</b></p> <p>The following were found in at the LLGs, (i) Ninsiima Rachel, Agricultural Officer (ii) Kaihura Collins, Assistant Veterinary Officer while HRM division staff list had Aruho Apollo as the Assistant Veterinary Officer.</p> <p><b>Kitagata SC</b></p> <p>The following were found in both the HRM division staff lists and at the LLGs, (i) Kugumizamu K Peninah, Agricultural Officer. (ii) Akibawe Peter, Assistant Veterinary Officer,</p> <p><b>Rugarama SC</b></p> <p>The following were found in both the HRM division staff lists and at the LLGs, (i) Ojok Francis, Agricultural Officer. (ii) Turinawe Barnabas, Animal production officer.</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The key information obtained from the Kigarama irrigation demonstration site was:</p> <p>Petrol engine powered pump (50m head, <math>Q_{min}=3m^3/h</math>; Low pressure sprinklers, 4lts/hr (25); Sprinkler stand 2 inch (25); PE pipe 50mm PN 6; PE end cap 50mm (13); PE elbow 50mm (8); PE TEE 50mm (6); PE female connector 50mm (2); Tank connector (1); drip line tubing blank 16mm; drip line emitter pressure compensating, 4lts/hr; drip line end caps 16mm (60); 2,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on 1m high reinforced brick wall tank base; Delivery hose (30m flexible).</p> <p>These observed features at the site were complete, functioning and conforms to the inventory.</p>	2

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

As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter one report, the LG did not provide any services. The key reason availed at the time of assessment was that there were no funds for carrying out activities.

However as per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter two activity report, there were awareness raising events on micro-scale irrigation carried out at District level. It captured 97 attendees, no EOIs collected, and no farm visits conducted.

In micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter three report, the LG conducted awareness raising events on micro-scale irrigation at District level (239 attendees), at LLGs level (239 attendees) and at farmer level (2,609 attendees). A total of 480 EOIs captured in the MIS and 120 farm visits conducted.

In quarter four report, the LG had 89 farmer EOIs and 165 farm visits conducted. So by the end of previous FY, the LG had a total of 285 farm visits out of 569 farmer EOIs captured in the MIS.

One micro-scale irrigation demonstration site was successfully installed and was functioning.

Therefore, there was evidence that the LG collected information quarterly on; newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services and farmer EOIs.

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

At the time of assessment, MIS/Irritrack information contained 569 farmer EOIs and 285 farm visits conducted as compared to the targeted 137 EOIs and 69 farm visits set by the MAAIF.

Screenshot of MIS/Irritrack was captured.

Therefore, the LG had entered up to-date LLG information into MIS/Irritrack.

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter one report, the LG did not provide any services. There were no funds for carrying out activities.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>However as per the quarter two activity report, there were awareness raising events on micro-scale irrigation carried out at District level. It captured 97 attendees, no EOIs collected, and no farm visits conducted.</p>	
			<p>In quarter three report, the LG conducted awareness raising events on micro-scale irrigation at LLGs level (239 attendees) and at farmer level (2,609 attendees). A total of 480 EOIs captured in the MIS and 120 farm visits conducted.</p>	
			<p>In quarter four report, the LG had 89 farmer EOIs and 165 farm visits conducted. One micro-scale irrigation demonstration site was successfully installed and was functioning.</p>	
			<p>Therefore, the LG had prepared quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS/Irritrack</p>	
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed and approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs (Kasaana sub-county and Kitagata town council.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>The plan focused on enhancing the report writing skill and also to train extension staffs on the current updated methods of delivering services to farmers.</p>	
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the implementation of Performance Improvement Plan report dated 28th June 2023, LG implemented the Performance Improvement Plans. Some of the key items captured in the report included:</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>Training extension workers on techniques of good report writing (first understand the report format required), then prepare the content as per the format etc). Further training of extension workers was on techniques of installing Irritrack App on the mobile phones and using the App to capture farmer EOIs, farm visits, awareness events, etc.</p>	

## 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

As per the approved Budget for production Department FY 2023/2024, there was Ugx 731,000,000/- allocated for general staff salaries, which incorporated 22 extension staffs deployed at 11 LLGs. It also includes the 10 staffs who sit at the District Head quarter and other 5 (office attendants and security guards).

This means that two extension workers were deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG.

Therefore, the LG budget for extension workers was not in accordance with staffing norm.

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

As per the production Department deployment register, deployment of extension workers was as follows;

11 Agricultural Officers, 9 Assistant Veterinary Officers and 2 Animal Production Officers.

Therefore 22 extension workers were deployed and currently engaged in implementation activities across 11 LLGs.

This means that two extension workers were deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG, hence the deployment is not in accordance with the guidelines.

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

The extension workers were found working in two LLGs namely Kitagata SC and Rugarama SC where they are deployed as found in the Staff lists posted at the notice boards at the sampled LLGs as shown hereunder. However, in Shuuku TC the Assistant Veterinary Officer deployed as per HRM Division staff list was not consistent with the one found at the LLG.

**Shuuku TC**

The following were found in at the LLGs, (i) Ninsiima Rachel, Agricultural Officer (ii) Kaihura Collins, Assistant Veterinary Officer while HRM division staff list had Aruho Apollo as the Assistant Veterinary Officer.

**Kitagata SC**

The following were found in both the HRM division staff lists and at the LLGs, (i) Kugumizamu K Peninah, Agricultural Officer. (ii) Akibawe Peter, Assistant Veterinary Officer,

**Rugarama SC**

The following were found in both the HRM division staff lists and at the LLGs, (i) Ojok Francis, Agricultural Officer. (ii) Turinawe Barnabas, Animal production officer.

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

The LG had publicized and disseminated to LLGs notice boards extension workers deployment. The following information was obtained from the three LLGs visited.

Kakindo town council (AO is Musimire Eunice and AVO is Muhwezi Maclister.

Kitagata sub-county (AO is Ojok Francis and AVO is Kanyonza Julius)

Kigarama sub-county (AO is Tayebwa Perez and APO is Mirembe Monica)

2

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

A review of all the twenty-two extension workers files revealed that the DPO conducted appraisal of all the extension workers as illustrated by these hereunder.

#### **Shuuku TC**

1. Ninsiima Rachel, Agricultural Officer appraised 30th June 2023.
2. Kaihura Collins, Assistant Veterinary Officer appraised 30th June 2023.

#### **Kitagata SC**

1. Kugumizamu K Peninah, Agricultural Officer, appraised 30th June 2023.
2. Akibawe Peter, Assistant Veterinary Officer, appraised 20th June 2023.

#### **Rugarama SC**

1. Ojok Francis, Agricultural Officer, appraised 15th June 2023.
2. Turinawe Barnabas, Animal production officer, appraised 30th June 2023.

#### **Masheruka SC**

1. Kanyonza Julius, Assistant Veterinary Officer, appraised 15th June 2023.
2. Atiwijukire Moses, Agricultural Officer, appraised 15th June 2023.

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

The DPO was found to have conducted corrective action arising from appraisal of the extension workers as evidenced by a report dated 6th December prepared by the Veterinary Officer ( Dr. Joseph Amany) that focused on the activities of technical backstopping in areas of monitoring of pig slaughter, mobilization and monitoring of lumpy skin disease vaccination amongst others. There was capacity building engagement for both public and private veterinary staff in the district which focused on sharing new technology, refresher on antibiotic use and use of on farm rapid test kits as seen in a report dated 3rd April 2023.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the production Department work plan for FY 2022/2023, the LG mainly planned for the following:</p> <p>Training on the use and application of fertilizers, training on the use of clean planting materials, parasite and disease identification and control, training on soil and land use management, training on post-harvest handling and value addition, etc.</p> <p>As per a report dated 19th June 2023, titled "Production report for fourth Quarter 2022-2023", farmers were trained on post-harvest handling and value addition. Key training content included; benefits of proper post-harvest handling to maintain crop quality, techniques of carrying out proper drying especially coffee, threshing, cleaning, etc. Over 300 farmers were trained.</p> <p>Also as per a training report dated 15th June 2023, farmers were trained on parasite and disease identification and control on animals.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG conducted training activity as per the plans at the District level.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had training database for the training activities conducted. Some of the key features captured in the training database were; number of beneficiaries trained, training content, training duration and when training was conducted, etc.</p>	1

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

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>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</p>	<p>The LG was a phase 2 LG that received Micro-Scale Irrigation Grant for the first time in FY2022/23 and allocated 100% of the fund appropriately to complimentary services.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise Awareness Local Leaders UGX 17,385,000</li> <li>• Procurement &amp; Monitoring UGX 8,306,500</li> <li>• Raising Awareness Farmers UGX 36,938,556</li> <li>• Farm Visits UGX 20,000,000</li> <li>• Irrigation Demo UGX 35,300,000</li> <li>• Total Complimentary Services UGX 117,930,056</li> </ul>	
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>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</p>	<p>The LG did not make budget allocations towards complimentary services in line with sector guidelines for implementation in FY2022/23.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Raise Awareness Local Leaders UGX 17,385,000 i.e. 15% as per guidelines</p> <p>Procurement &amp; Monitoring UGX 8,306,500 i.e. 7%</p> <p>Raising Awareness Farmers UGX 36,938,556 i.e. 31% less than 40% stipulated in the guidelines</p> <p>Farm Visits UGX 20,000,000 i.e. 17% more than the 15% stipulated in the guidelines</p> <p>Irrigation Demo UGX 35,300,000 i.e. 30% as stipulated by guidelines</p> <p>Total Complimentary Services UGX 117,930,056</p>	
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>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG is a phase 2 LG that received micro-scale irrigation grant for the first time in FY2022/23. The LG did not provide for the component of farmers co-funding in FY2023/24 at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>		<p>The DLG wrote to the PS/ST and requested for a supplementary budget to incorporate farmer co-funding VIDE: Requesting Supplementary Budget Worth Sixty Seven Million Shillings as Co-funding to UGiFT Micro-Scale Program dated 30 October 2023. Received by MoFPED Registry on 1 November 2023.</p>	

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>The LG is a phase 2 LG that received micro scale irrigation grant for the first time in FY2022/23. The LG did not provide for farmers co-funding in FY2022/23. The co-funding element in the micro-scale irrigation funding arrangement will apply in FY2023/24.</p>	2
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>As per a report dated 8th June 2023, the LG disseminated information on the use of farmer co-funding (cost sharing of the irrigation equipment where by a farmer contributes 25% of the total cost), brochures were given out to the leaders and farmers.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site technical monitoring and supervision reports dated 2nd May 2023, 28th May 2023 and 29th June 2023, the DPO and SAE did monitoring and supervision of the irrigation demonstration site. Some of the key findings included:</p> <p>Digging trenches for laying pipes; pump house construction and pump installation; installation of water tank; installation of sprinklers; training of host farmer on operation, service and maintenance; etc.</p> <p>Therefore, DPO did monthly monitoring of irrigation demonstration site.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the monitoring report dated 29th June 2023, the host farmer was trained on operation, repair and maintenance of micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG did oversee approved farmer training and support to the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site host farmer.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The extension workers were trained on the use of Irritrack App to capture farmers' expression of interest for micro-scale irrigation, farm visits, awareness raising events, etc. This was according to the micro-scale irrigation Quarter three and four reports dated 6th April 2023 and 27th June 2023 respectively.</p> <p>Some of the respondents were; Musimire Eunice, AO from Kakindo town council. Kanyonza Julius, AVO from Kitagata sub-county and Mirembe Monica, APO from Kigarama sub-county.</p> <p>Therefore, LG did provide hands-on support to LLGs.</p>	2
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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per a report on carrying out farmer field day at the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site dated 8th July 2023, LG established and run farmer field schools.</p> <p>Some of the key content captured in the report included; sharing experience of irrigated agriculture with the host farmer, benefits of practicing irrigation, various types of irrigation, etc.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the awareness raising on micro-scale irrigation as captured in the Quarter three report dated 6th April 2023, and also an awareness raising report dated 15th March 2023, LG sensitized farmers on micro-scale irrigation programme. Key information shared included; definition for micro-scale irrigation and its benefits, how one would register for the program, farmer co-funding for irrigation equipment etc.</p>	2

11

Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.

b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0

Maximum score 4

As per the Quarter three report dated 6th April 2023, the LG did awareness raising and sensitized political leaders at District and LLG levels (mobilizing farmers to participate on irrigation and irrigated agriculture).

Also according to the report on stakeholders' sensitization for District councilors and District technical planning committee dated 12th December 2022, the LG sensitized councilors and TPC on micro-scale irrigation

Some of the key information captured included; farmers and staff were taught about key types and components of irrigation systems, requirements for an irrigation system, benefits of practicing irrigation, etc. key participants included; District chairperson, District councilors and LLGs.

### Investment Management

12

Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines

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

Maximum score 8

The register of micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment supplied to the host farmer was as follows;

Petrol engine powered pump (50m head,  $Q_{min}=3m^3/h$ ; Low pressure sprinklers, 4lts/hr (25); Sprinkler stand 2 inch (25); PE pipe 50mm PN 6; PE end cap 50mm (13); PE elbow 50mm (8); PE TEE 50mm (6); PE female connector 50mm (2); Tank connector (1); drip line tubing blank 16mm; drip line emitter pressure compensating, 4lts/hr; drip line end caps 16mm (60); 2,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on 1m high reinforced brick wall tank base; Delivery hose (30m flexible).

Therefore, LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to the host farmer in the previous FY.

2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</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>At the end of previous FY 569 EOIs were captured in the database and 285 were visited, whereas during current FY 86 EOIs were captured and 26 farm visits made.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>		<p>So at the time of assessment the LG had 655 EOIs and 311 farm visits captured in the MIS.</p>	
			<p>Therefore, the LG had up-to-date database of applications (EOIs) in the MIS/Irritrack for the current and previous FYs at the time of the assessment.</p>	
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</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>As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter four activity report dated 27th June 2023, a total of 285 farm visits were made out of 569 EOIs captured in the database.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>		<p>Therefore, LG did not visit all farmers who submitted complete EOIs.</p>	
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</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>Sheema DLG through the District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards and as found on file in the DAE's office. This was evidenced by the list of sixty-two paid up farmers found displayed on notice boards dated 31st August 2023,</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the previous FY, dated 30/09/2022, received by PPDA on 10/10/2022.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>		<p><i>Item included in the plan as,</i></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a demonstration site for small scale irrigation scheme, budgeted for UGX 25,000,000/=.</p>	



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>The LG was enrolled on the list of micro-scale irrigation systems beneficiaries in the current FY. The LG is now in cluster 7.</p> <p>The previous FY demonstration site installation contractor was procured through national bidding.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The bid opening record for Construction of a demonstration site for small scale irrigation in Kigarama S/C, dated 30/01/2023, had two (02) bidders, that is,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Perumag Holdings (U) Limited, offer amount UGX 24,970,000/=</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Macron Co., Limited, offer amount UGX 24,885,000/=.</p> <p>Macron Co., Lt did not have a complete submission sheet, so they failed at preliminary stage. Perumag Holdings (U) Limited passed the administrative and technical requirements and was within budget of UGX 25,000,000/=, as seen from the procurement plan dated 30/09/2022, received by PPDA and MoFPED on 10/10/2022 and 17/140/2022 respectively.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>The failure of Macron Co., Lt to have a complete submission sheet was an automatic disqualification and Perumag Holdings (U) Limited passed the administrative and technical compliance.</i></p>	2
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>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee on 1/03/2023 under minute number: 136/CC/2022-2023.</p>	1

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>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</p>	<p>There was 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.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Perumag Holdings Limited, with an offer of UGX 24,970,000/= was technically responsible and the farmer consent to the installation of equipment.</p>	2
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>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</p>	<p>Key items observed at the installed irrigation demonstration site included:</p> <p>Petrol engine powered pump (50m head, Qmin=3m<sup>3</sup>/h; Low pressure sprinklers, 4lts/hr (25); Sprinkler stand 2 inch (25); PE pipe 50mm PN 6; PE end cap 50mm (13); PE elbow 50mm (8); PE TEE 50mm (6); PE female connector 50mm (2); Tank connector (1); drip line tubing blank 16mm; drip line emitter pressure compensating, 4lts/hr; drip line end caps 16mm (60); 2,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on 1m high reinforced brick wall tank base; Delivery hose (30m flexible).</p> <p>Since there were no technical designs availed at the time of assessment, there was no evidence that these features were in conformity with the designs.</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>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</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site technical monitoring and supervision reports dated 2nd May 2023, 28th May 2023 and 29th June 2023, the SAE did monitoring and supervision of the irrigation demonstration site.</p> <p>Some of the key findings included: digging trenches for laying pipes, pump house construction, installation of water tank, installation of sprinklers, training of host farmers on operation service and maintenance, etc.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG conducted regular technical supervision of the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site till completion</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	The LG had overseen the supply, installation and testing of the irrigation demonstration equipment for functionality as indicated in the field monitoring and supervision report dated 29th June 2023.  The report further indicated that the equipment was in good working condition before handing over to the host farmer.	1
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that LG had overseen handover of irrigation demonstration site to the host farmer as indicated in the irrigation demonstration site hand over report dated 28th June 2023. The equipment were delivered to host farmer in good working conditions.	1
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	The LG provided evidence confirming that payments to suppliers in FY2022/23 were made within specified timeframes in contracts subject to the presence of an approved farmer's signed acceptance form.	2
	Maximum score 18		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Payments to suppliers are recommended 30 days after the supplier has delivered and invoiced for the supplies.</p> <p>Request for Payment was made by M/s Pel mug Holdings Uganda Ltd on 18 June 2023 for the construction of the Demonstration Site for Small Scale Irrigation in Kigarama Sub County for UGX 24,970,000. Payment was made on EFT No. 6439749 on 28 June 2023. Mr. Samwiri Biraro, Demo Host Farmer endorsed the Acceptance Form on 28 June 2023. The payment was made within 10 days after the payment request was made by the supplier.</p>	

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>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of demonstration site for small scale irrigation in Kigarama S/C.</b></p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

The contract agreement was available and dated 17/03/2023; Evaluation report approved by CC available (date of approval 1/03/2023); Minutes of Contracts Committee decision available (dated 1/03/2023) - contract approved under minute number: 136/CC/2022-2023.

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>LG did not display on the LLGs notice boards the details of the nature and avenues to address grievance at the time of assessment. The notice boards of the three LLGs (Kakindo town council, Kitagata sub-county and Kigarama sub-county) were visited.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances under micro scale irrigation had been recorded.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances under micro scale irrigation had been investigated.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances under micro scale irrigation had been responded to.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances under micro scale irrigation had been reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>DLG did disseminate micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agro-chemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers as indicated in the demonstration site monitoring and supervision report dated 29th June 2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening had been carried out and ESMPs developed, prior to the installation of irrigation equipment.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

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	There was no evidence that monitoring of irrigation impacts was conducted for the one micro-scale irrigation project.	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	There was no evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	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	There was no evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	0

**Crosscutting Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<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>Sheema DLG does not have a substantive Chief Finance Officer- Tubenawe Rosebel the Senior Accountant holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties as Ag. CFO dated 3rd July 2023. Appointed as SA 27th November 2019, Min No. 40/2019(t). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>Sheema DLG does not have a substantive District Planner - Tuhairwe Doreen the Principal Planner( next postion in the approved MOPS staff establishment) holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties 12th September 2022 and letter of appointment dated 12th November 2021, Min No. 41/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>Sheema DLG does not have a substantive Distrrict Engineer - Mwebembezi Mbagala Allan the Senior Engineer (Roads and Buildings) holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties as Ag. DE dated 23rd July 2015 and letter of appointment dated 28th March 2018, Min No. 5/2018(f). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>Sheema DLG has a substantive District Natural Resources Officer- Turyatunga Patrick Boaz as evidenced by the letter of appointment as District Natural Resources Officer dated 27th January 2021 referenced under Min No. DSC/07/2021(r). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated <u>30th June 2023.</u></p>	<b>3</b>

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>Sheema DLG has a substantive District Production Officer- Kansiiime Robertson as evidenced by the letter of appointment as District Production Officer dated 9th May 2019 referenced under Min No. 10/2019(i)(2). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 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>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive District Community Development Officer- Mugaririrwe Justine Lenah as evidenced by the letter of appointment as District Community Development Officer dated 12th November 2021 referenced under Min No. 34/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 28th June 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>Sheema DLG does not have a substantive District Commercial Officer – Asasira Winson Kafurembe the Senior Commercial Officer holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties dated 15th August 2023 and letter of appointment dated 12th November 2021, Min No. 42/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.</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. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Procurment Officer-Behangana Innocent as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Senior Procurement Officer dated 1st June 2015 referenced under Min No. 60/2015(a)(2). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.</p>	2



1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Sheema DLG has a substantive Procurement Officer-Arinaitwe Andrew as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Procurement Officer dated 23rd February 2010 referenced under Min No. 01/2010(1). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 24th June 2023.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	Sheema DLG has a substantive Principal Human Resource Officer - Bamwine Duncan as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Principal Human Resource Officer dated 5th December 2014 referenced under Min No. 52 of 2014. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Sheema DLG does not have a substantive Senior Environment Officer - Twesigye Gilbert, Forestry Officer holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties dated 3rd June 2023 and letter of appointment dated 22nd March 2022, Min No. 58/2022(3). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Sheema DLG has a substantive Senior Land Management Officer - Komujuni Barbra as evidenced by the letter of appointment dated 3rd November 2016, Min No. 41(b)(1) of 2016). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 24th June 2023.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Sheema DLG has a substantive Senior Accountant - Tubenawe Rosebel as evidenced by the letter of appointment dated 27th November 2019, Min No. 40/2019(t). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Sheema DLG does not have a Principal Internal Auditor- Mujatsi Fokworora David, Senior Finance Officer holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties dated 17th October 2023 and letter of appointment dated 14th April 2011, Min No. 17/2011a (8) 58/2022(3). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Principal Human Resource Officer(Secretary DSC)- Abimanya Ruth as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Principal Human Resource Officer dated 4th July 2023 referenced under Min No. 136/2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 28th June 2023.</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has eleven LLGs. Senior Assistant Town Clerk/ Senior Assistant Secretary staff were recruited and deployed as shown hereunder. Not all the LLGs had substantive staff e.g. Kakindo TC, Masheruka SC, Rugarama SC and Kitagata SC.</p> <p><b>Town Councils:</b></p> <p>1. <b>Kakindo TC</b></p> <p>Mwesigye Robert appointed as Assistant Town Clerk evidenced by the letter of appointment 23rd May 2022 referenced under Min. No. DSC 87/2022(3), transfer letter dated 1st August 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 28th June 2023.</p> <p>2. <b>Masheruka TC</b></p> <p>Atuhire Annet appointed as Principal Township Officer evidenced by the letter of appointment 29th June 2017 referenced under Min. No. 1 of 2017 (d), posting instruction dated 26th July 2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.</p> <p>3. <b>Bugongi TC</b></p> <p>Mugabe Arthur appointed as Principal Township Officer evidenced by the letter of appointment 29th June 2017 referenced under Min. No. 81 of 2017(e), posting instruction dated 1st June 2016.</p>	0

At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **4. *Kitagata TC***

Namara Diana Jackline was appointed as Principal Township Officer evidenced by the letter of appointment 12th November 2021 referenced under Min. No. 39/2021, posting instruction dated 1st August 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **5. *Shuuku TC***

Asiimwe Elly, appointed as Principal Township Officer evidenced by the letter of appointment 4th July 2023 referenced under Min. No. 114/2023, posting instruction dated 12th April 2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

### **Sub Counties:**

#### **1. *Kyangyenyi SC***

Beijuka Robert, appointed as Sub County Chief/ Senior Assistant Secretary evidenced by the letter of appointment 30th May 2019 referenced under Min. No.20/DSC/2019(a) posting instruction dated 20th May 2019. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **2. *Kigarama SC***

Tashobya Daniel Kamugisha, appointed as Sub County Chief/ Senior Assistant Secretary evidenced by the letter of appointment 9th May 2019 referenced under Min. No.10/2019(ix)(4) posting instruction dated 20th May 2019. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **3. *Masheruka SC***

Kunguvu Hassan, appointed as Assistant Secretary evidenced by the letter of appointment 27th November 2019 referenced under Min. No. 40/2019 (i) (3) posting instruction dated 25th November 2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **4. *Kasaana SC***

Kabigumira Frumentius appointed as Sub County Chief/ Senior Assistant Secretary evidenced by the letter of appointment 21st July 2011 referenced under Min.

No.29/06/2011(xxiv)2 posting instruction dated 22nd July 2015. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### 5. **Rugarama SC**

Beyongera Julius was appointed as Information Officer evidenced by the letter of appointment 26th July 2011 referenced under Min.

No.29/06/2011(xxvi)1 posting instruction and assignment of duties as SAS dated 14th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 24th June 2023.

#### 6. **Kitagata SC**

Mugenyi Julius appointed as Parish Chief evidenced by the letter of appointment 8th June 2018 referenced under Min.

No.5/2018(s)(11) transfer on assignment letter dated 30th November 2020. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 28th June 2023.

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.

Sheema DLG has eleven LLGs. Senior Accounts Assistant / Accounts Assistant staff were recruited and deployed as shown hereunder. Three subcounties namely Kiatagata, Rugarama and Kigarama had no information availed for assessment.

0

#### **Town Councils:**

##### **1. Kakindo TC**

Nabassa Edison, appointed as Senior CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 9th March 2020 referenced under Min. No. 24/2020(3), posting instructions dated 9th March 2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

##### **2. Kitagata TC**

Migumya Amos was appointed as Senior CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 8th January 2015 referenced under Min. No. 68/2014(b) posting instructions dated 9th January 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

##### **3. Shuuku TC**

Twesigye Moses appointed as Senior CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 9th March 2020 referenced under Min. No. 24/2020(1) posting instructions dated 9th March 2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

#### **4. Masheruka TC**

Komugisha Doreen was appointed as Senior CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 9th March 2020 referenced under Min. No. 24/2020(5) posting instructions dated 30th June 2016. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **5. Bugongi TC**

Kyomuhendo Annet was appointed as Senior CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 28th March 2018 referenced under Min. No. 5/2018(p) posting instructions dated 23rd May 2018. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

### **Sub-Counties**

#### **1. Kasaana SC**

Asimwe Ambrose, appointed as CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 30th June 2020 referenced under Min. No. 52/2020(9g) posting instructions dated 15th November 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 1st July 2023.

#### **2. Kyanjenyi SC**

Ampiire Madinah appointed as CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 26th July 2011 referenced under Min. No. 29/06/2011(i)3 posting instructions dated 28th June 2017. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **3. Masheruka SC**

Byiringiro Hillary appointed as CDO evidenced by the letter of appointment 3rd May 2018 referenced under Min. No. 32/2018(vi)(a) posting instructions dated 15th February 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found duly appraised as evidenced by APR dated 30th June 2023.

#### **4. Kitagata SC**

Not provided with information.

#### **5. Rugarama SC**

Not provided with information.

#### **6. Kigarama SC**

Not provided with information.

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

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

Sheema DLG has eleven LLGs. Not all Senior Accounts Assistant / Accounts Assistant staff were recruited and deployed as shown hereunder, e.g. some LLGs like Bugongi TC, Kakindo TC did not have these cadre in post.

### **Town Councils:**

#### **1. Masheruka TC**

Rugambana Aggrey appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 9th March 2020, referenced under Min. No. 23/2020(3), posting instructions dated 14th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 21st November 2023.

#### **2. Bugongi TC**

Muhganguzi Obed was appointed as Senior Finance Officer evidenced by letter of appointment dated 13th March 2020 referenced under Min. No. 40/2019(x)(5), posting instructions dated 14th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

#### **3. Kakindo TC**

Natukunda K Phiona appointed as Finance Officer evidenced by letter of appointment dated 9th May 2019, referenced under Min. No. 15/2019(b), posting instructions dated 14th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

#### **4. Kitagata TC**

Ayebazibwe Fred appointed as Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 27th January 2021, referenced under Min. No. DSC/07/2021(r), posting instructions dated 5th February 2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.

#### **5. Shuuku TC**

Twesigye Winston, appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 9th March 2020, referenced under Min. No. 23/2020(6), posting instructions dated 17th October 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was not duly appraised.

### **Sub-Counties**

#### **1. Kyanjenyi SC**

Aijuka Damiel appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 15th June 2020, referenced under Min. No. 46/2020(i), posting instructions dated 4th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.

## **2. Kitagata SC**

Kansiimwe Benard appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 17th November 2023, referenced under Min. No. 23/2020(3), posting instructions dated 11th October 2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

## **3. Kasaana SC**

Taremwa Gift, appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 12th November 2021, referenced under Min. No. 50/2021(3), posting instructions dated 17th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 5th June 2023.

## **4. Kigarama SC**

Namanya Erasi, appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 6th June 2023, referenced under Min. No. 94/2023(1), posting instructions dated 17th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 5th June 2023.

## **5. Rugarama SC**

Kamarika Maclean, appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 6th June 2023, referenced under Min. No. 94/2023(3), posting instructions dated 17th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 5th June 2023.

## **6. Masheruka SC**

Kareebi Jason Albert, appointed Senior Assistant Accountant evidenced by letter of appointment dated 6th June 2023, referenced under Min. No. 94/2023(2), posting instructions dated 17th July 2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 5th June 2023.

## Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0	A review of LG Draft Financial Statements for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG released 99% of funds allocated to the Department of Natural Resources for FY2022/23.  <b>Evidence</b>  Draft Reports and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30 June 2023. Received by the Office of the Auditor General on 09 August 2023  Page 22  Amount Warranted for FY2022/23 was UGX 273,461,012  Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 276,226,471  <b>Calculation</b>  Amount Warranted/Revised Budget*100= 273,461,012/276,226,471*100= 98.9%	0
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.	A review of LG Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG released 96% of funds allocated to the Department of Community-Based Services for FY2022/23.  <b>Evidence</b>  Amount Warranted for FY2022/23 was UGX 177,353,615  Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 184,669,511  Calculation  Amount Warranted/Revised Budget*100= 177,353,615/184,669,511*100= 96%	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>Sheema LG did not implement any DDEG-funded project for the previous FY. The DDEG funds were spent on the design and documentation of the Sheema district administration block.</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>Sheema LG did not implement any DDEG-funded project for the previous FY. The DDEG funds were spent on the design and documentation of the Sheema district administration block.</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>Sheema LG did not implement any DDEG-funded project for the previous FY. The DDEG funds were spent on the design and documentation of the Sheema district administration block.</p>	0

**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>The list of LG audit opinions for FY 2022/23 released by OAG confirms that LG's financial statements for FY 2022/23 was unqualified.</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>The LG submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of recommendations in the Auditor General's Report for FY2021/22 after 28 February 2023.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE: Reponses to the Issues Raised in the Auditor General's Report for Sheema District Local Government FY 2021/22 dated 12 April 2023. Received by MoFPED Registry on 13 April 2023.</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>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Contract for FY2023/24 before 31 August 2023. However, the copy presented at the time of assessment was not countersigned by the PS/ST.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>CR/D/213/2: Submission of Sheema District Local Government Vote 928 Performance Contract for 2023/24 Financial Year dated 4 August 2023. Received by MoFPED Registry on 11 August 2023. Not Endorsed by PS/ST.</p>	0
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>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before 31 August 2023.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE: CR/D/213/2: Submission of Sheema District Local Government Vote:928 Quarter Four 2022/2023 Progress Report to MoFPED dated 7 August 2023. Received by MoFPED Registry on 11 August 2023.</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.

The LG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPR) for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before 31 August 2023.

**Evidence**

Q1 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 13 January 2023

Q2 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 28 February 2023

Q3 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 04 May 2023

Q4 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted 11 August 2023

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Sheema DLG does not have a substantive District Education Officer – Mushabe Jennifer the Senior Education Officer holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties as Ag. DEO dated 5th October 2022 and letter of appointment dated 29th June 2017, Min No. 81/2017(0). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.	<b>0</b>
	<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.	Sheema DLG has six Inspectors of Schools positions (Principal Inspector 1No. Senior Inspector of Schools 1No. & Inspector of Schools 4No.) as per the MoPS approved staff establishment structure (May 2023) and met the score requirement as detailed below. <b>In post were three including the Principal Inspector and two Inspectors of School.</b>	<b>40</b>
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>		<b>Principal Inspector of Schools</b>	
			1. Sempa Muzafaru as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 21st November 2022 referenced under Min. No. 151/2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	
			<b>Inspectors of Schools:</b>	
			1. Birihihi Alex as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 26th October 2020 referenced under Min. No. 94/2020(4). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	
			2. Mwijukye Zebedee as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 12th November 2021 referenced under Min. No. 44/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening was carried out for Education projects for the previous FY;</p> <p>Construction of a two-classroom block at Kanengyere primary school was screened on 25/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,100,000 dated 25/07/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a two-classroom block at Nyabwina primary school was screened on 25/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,100,000 dated 25/07/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 2 classroom block at Nyakabirizi primary school was screened on 25/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,100,000 dated 25/07/2022.</p>	<b>15</b>
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The projects under Education did not qualify to undergo an ESIA upon being screened for environmental and social safeguards.</p> <p>The construction of a two-classroom block at Kanengyere Primary School was screened on 25/07/2022.</p> <p>The construction of a two-classroom block at Nyabwina Primary School was screened on 25/07/2022.</p> <p>The construction of a 2 classroom block at Nyakabirizi Primary School was screened on 25/07/2022.</p>	<b>15</b>

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG does not have a substantive District Health Officer – Kebaraza Kedrida the ADHO (Maternal and Child Health) holds the position as evidenced by the letter of assignment of duties as ADHO dated 22nd January 2021 and letter of appointment dated 6th January 2020, Min No. 45/DSC/2019. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 28th June 2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Assistant District Health Officer (Maternal and Child Health) – Kebaraza Kedrida the ADHO (Maternal and Child Health) as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 6th January 2020, Min No. 45/DSC/2019. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Assistant District Health Officer (Environmental Health) – Akankwasa Johnson the ADHO (Environmental Health) as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 19th February 2021, Min No. 12/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 28th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Principal Health Inspector – Mwiine Dickens Richard as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 1st July 2022 referenced under Min No. DSC 119/2022. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 20th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Senior Health Educator – Wandera James as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 3rd November 2016, Min No. 41(d)(1) of 2016. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Biostatistician – Ainomugisha Collins as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 29th June 2017, Min No. 81(q) of 2017. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 27th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Cold Chain Technician – Tumuhimbise Anthony as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 17th June 2013, Min No. 114/2013(v)d. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 6th November 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place 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>		

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## 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 Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening was carried out for Health projects for the current FY;</p> <p>Completion of four stance VIP latrine at Kyeihara HC III was screened on 23/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000 dated 26/07/2022.</p> <p>Construction of the placenta pit at Kyeibanga HC III was screened on 23/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000 dated 26/07/2022.</p> <p>Completion of four-in-one staff quarters at Shuuku HC IV phase II was screened on 26/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000 dated 26/07/2022.</p> | <b>15</b> |
| 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 under Health did not qualify to undergo an ESIA upon being screened for environmental and social safeguards;</p> <p>Completion of four stance VIP latrine at Kyeihara HC III was screened on 23/07/2022.</p> <p>Construction of the placenta pit at Kyeibanga HC III was screened on 23/07/2022.</p> <p>Completion of four-in-one staff quarters at Shuuku HC IV phase II was screened on 26/07/2022.</p>   | <b>15</b> |



**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>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</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Sheema DLG has a substantive Senior Agriculture Engineer - Komugisha Julin as per approved MOPS structure, appointed 27th November 2019, Min No. 40/2019(e)(2). At the time of assessment, the SAE was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 20th September 2023.</p>	<b>70</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>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.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening was carried out for the micro-scale irrigation project.</p>	<b>0</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Sheema DLG has a substantive Senior Civil Engineer (Water) - Nkwasiabwe Abiaz as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Senior Civil Engineer dated 4th July 2023 referenced under Min No. 120/2023. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Sheema DLG has a substantive Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization - Mwesiwa Isaac as evidenced by the letter of appointment as CDO dated 3rd May 2018 referenced under Min No. 32/2018(iv)(b). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 24th June 2023.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Sheema DLG has a substantive Assistant Engineering Officer - Byaruhanga Tarsis as evidenced by the letter of appointment as Assistant Engineering Officer dated 21st July 2011 referenced under Min No. 29/06/2011(xvi)1. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.	<b>10</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Sheema DLG has a substantive District Natural Resources Officer- Turyatunga Patrick Boaz as evidenced by the letter of appointment as District Natural Resources Officer dated 27th January 2021 referenced under Min No. DSC/07/2021(r). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report dated 30th June 2023.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Sheema DLG does not have a substantive Environment Officer and could not be filled due to the moratorium on government wide recruitment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Sheema DLG has a substantive Forestry Officer- Twesigye Gilbert, as evidenced by the letter of appointment dated 22nd March 2022, Min No. 58/2022(3). At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30h June 2023.	<b>10</b>

**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.	There was evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change/ Environment screening was carried out for water infrastructure projects for the previous FY;  Extension of Migyera ebiri piped water supply system to Kakindo- Muzira piped line was screened on 28/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000.  Overhaul and extension of Katogo- Katooma seed school ophase one piped water supply system was screened on 27/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 600,000.  Construction of three medium protected springs in Kitagata sub-county was screened on 25/07/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 430,000.	<b>10</b>
---	---	--	---	-----------

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.	The projects under water did not qualify to undergo an ESIA upon being screened for environmental and social safeguards.  Extension of Migyera ebiri piped water supply system to Kakindo- Muzira piped line was screened on 28/07/2022.  Overhaul and extension of Katogo- Katooma seed school phase one piped water supply system was screened on 27/07/2022.  The construction of three medium-protected springs in Kitagata sub-county was screened on 25/07/2022.	<b>10</b>
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.	The LG Water Office did not obtain abstraction permits from MoWE- Directorate of Water Resources Management despite implementation of piped water supply systems in the FY under review.	<b>0</b>