



**LGPA 2020/21**

Ibanda Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 791)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	72%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	76%
Educational Performance Measures	86%
Health Performance Measures	74%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

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 infrastructure project of Construction of a drainage channel along Kibubura road and installation of three poles and solar lights along main street were in use. The assessors observed that the installation of bigger culverts had greatly helped in channeling the water down the stream. However, it was recommended that areas along the drainage should be covered and install guard rails against possible accidents.</p>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LLGs performance assessment was not conducted.</p>	0

2

Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

The Municipality DDEG funded investment projects implemented for FY 2019/2020 were two (1. Construction of Drainage Channel along Kibubura Road (30 Meters) and 2. Installation of new poles and repair of existing solar lights along the main street, Solar Street lights installed and repairs). The impletion was 100% complete by year end as confirmed by the Assistant Engineering Officer' s report dated 26th July, 2020 addressed to Town Clerk. In the report he stated "projects were implemented as per specifications and illls of quantity and were in good condition and serving the purpose intended .

The projects implemented included;

1. Construction of Drainage Channel along Kibubura Road (30 Meters) listed as Output : 048381 Construction and Rehabilitation of Urban Drainage Infrastructure on page 62 of the 3rd Quarter performance report generated on 24th April, 2020.

2. Installation of new poles and repair of existing solar lights along the main street, Solar Street lights installed and repairs made listed as Output : 048380 Street Lighting Facilities Constructed and Rehabilitated on page 61 of the 3rd Quarter Performance report generated on 24th April, 2020

3

3

Investment Performance

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0.

The municipal Council budgeted and spent the DDEG funds during FY 2019/2020 on eligible projects as noted on page 9 of the Guidelines and as below:

1. Construction of Drainage Channel along Kibubura Road (30 Meters) at a budget of US\$66,479,000 and actual US\$49,121,501

2. Installation of new poles and repair of existing solar lights along the main street at a budget of US\$52,000,000 and actuals US\$24,325,100.

2

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 variations in the contract price and Engineers estimates for the DDEG projects were:  • Construction of Drainage Channel along Kibubura Road UShs.66,479,000-49,121,501 =  -17,357,499/66,479,000 = -26.1%%,  • Installation of new poles and repair of existing solar lights along the main street, shs.52,000,000-24,325,100 = -27,674,900/52,000,000 = -53.2%  The variations were far greater than the +/- 20% provided in the Manual.	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### 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	There was evidence that information on staffing was accurate in LLGs for instance in the 3 sampled Divisions;  • Bisheshe division had 10 staff posted at HRM office,  • Kagongo division had 13 staff posted and  • Bufunda had 15 staff posted in division,  All sampled Divisions had staff lists corresponding with the list from HRM office at the Municipality.	2
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 infrastructure constructed using DDEG funding as noted from the Report on DDEG Project Implementation dated September, 2020 for FY 2019/2020, the two (Construction of Drainage Channel along Kibubura Road (30 Meters) and the Installation of new poles and repair of existing solar lights along the main street) planned activities as per the AWP for the same period, were implemented and were in place. i.e. (2/2)*100 = 100% completion.	2

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;  If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs  score 4 or else 0	Not applicable because LLGs were not assessed	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	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.  Score: 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because LLGs were not assessed	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because LLGs were not assessed	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	Ibanda Municipality submitted its staffing requirements for FY 2021/22 to MoPS whose receipt was acknowledged via letter  ARC 6/293/05 of 14th September, 2020.	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The analysis report of 30th December, 2019 on daily attendance to duty from the staff attendance book for all the FY under review was in place signed by Deputy Town Clerk.</p> <p>The analysis report on daily attendance to duty was presented for assessment. It indicated that the attendance was generally over 85% for any single day of work.</p> <p>The failure to hit the 100% attendance was attributed to cases of sick leave and deaths .</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Heads of departments were appraised for instance,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kato Christopher the Procurement officer was appraised on 2nd July, 2020 by Monday Bagonza Town clerk.</li> <li>• Abankunda Johnson Principal Education Officer was appraised on 2nd July, 2020 by Town clerk.</li> <li>• Sunday Gordon the Physical Planner was appraised by Town clerk on 2nd July,2020</li> <li>• Mujuni John Baptist the Senior internal Auditor was appraised by Monday Bagoza on 2nd July,2020 by Town clerk</li> <li>• Twinomujuni Claire the PCDO on 7th July,2020 was appraised by Monday Bagoza Town clerk.</li> <li>• Natuhwerera K. Juliet Principal Engineer was appraised on 1st July,2020 by Monday J. Bagonza Town clerk</li> <li>• Ambrose Muhumuzathe PHRO was appraised on 3rd July,2020 by Town Clerk.</li> </ul>	1
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>There were no disciplinary cases that were forwarded to the attention of the Committee. The assessment observed that the Committee was started on 23rd January, 2020</p>	1

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	On 15th September, 2020 the Consultative Committee was established under Ref:CR/IMC/152/1 with 5 members that included; Twesigye Rosety, Ndyanabo William, Kato Christopher, Tumusiime Josephat and Amana Maclean.	1
8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	Staff recruited during previous FY accessed salary payroll beyond 2 months from the date of appointment.  For instance;  • Mugisha Robert IPPS No. 1051061 Assistant Engineer officer recruited on 9th February, 2020 accessed in May 2020  • Stella Kobusinge IPPS No. 1057243 recruited on 24th February,2020 accessed May, 2020  • Julius Kamagara IPPS No.1022194 recruited on 24th February, 2020 accessed May, 2020.	0
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	There was evidence that all the retired staff in previous FY 2019/2020 accessed pension payroll as indicated below;  • Katwesigye John an Education assistant IPPS no. 525544 retired on 10thMay 2020 and accessed in 1st June 2020,  • Agaba Juliet an Education Assistant IPPS No. 526001 retired on 30thJune, 2020 and accessed in July, 2020,  • Nyangoma Bonny IPPS No. 525109 retired on 30thJune,2020 and accessed in July, 2020.	1

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

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	The direct DDEG transfers to the three Divisions were executed in line with the budget requirements as follows:  On 13th August, 2019, 1st quarter disbursement was made where by all the Divisions received UShs.34,520,335 per quarter.  The total budget of UShs.103,561,005 was divided into three equal transfers and the same amounts were disbursed in 2nd and 3rd quarters on 15thOctober, 2019 and 18th January, 2020 respectively.	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):	The Municipality failed to retrieve from IFMS the dates when the warrants for direct DDEG were made by the Accounting Officer. For this reason, the team could not establish the timeliness of verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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:	The Municipality communicated all the DDEG transfers for FY 2019/2020 to LLGs as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter on 13th August, 2019,</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter on 15th October, 2019 and</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter on 18th January, 2020.</li> </ul> However, timeliness of transfers could not be established because date of release of funds from MoFPED was not available on the IFMS.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	The Municipal Council mentored all the Divisions in FY 2019/2020, for only 1st and 2nd Quarters as follows: 1st Quarter on 26th September, 2019 and subject matter was Measurable indicators for preparation of the Development Plan 2020/2021 to 2024/2025. 2nd Quarter 3 mentoring sessions were conducted on 13th November, 2019, and on 4th December, 2019 and subject matter was Budgeting and Planning and Reporting. The third session was on 19th December, 2019 and was on Project selection and planning. The reports were compiled by the District Planner and addressed to CAO However, there was no mentoring conducted during the 3rd and 4th Quarter. The argument being Covid-19 pandemic resulted into total lockdown.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		



11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal TPC discussed the monitoring reports in their meetings held as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter Report on 25th November, 2019 under Min.06/11/2019. The TPC recommended that payments for projects done should be based on certificates issued by the Municipal Engineer.</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter Report discussed on 11th February, 2020 under Min. 05/02/TPC/2020. The Committee noted that project implementation in Divisions had not stated due to lack of sufficient funds.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter Report was handled on 23rd June, 2020 under Min.05/06/2020 and recommended that during project implementation, BoQs should be in line with IPFs as required by the Guidelines.</li> </ul>	2
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### 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>The Municipality was uploaded on the IFMS, including the Assets Register on 1st July, 2019. However, at the time of this assessment, the Register Module could not be accessed on the system. For this reason, the assessment team could not review the Register.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipality compiled a Board of Survey Report for FY 2019/2020 dated July, 2020. The Report could be used to make Asset Management decision. For example, the following were recommended for boarding off: i. Motorcycle registration No. UG 1665A ii. Motorcycle No. UG 2540 M iii. Tractor (no longer in use).</p>	1

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 Municipality did not have a full functional Physical Planning Committee. In his letter dated 5th July, 2016, the Town Clerk appointed the following "Offices" to membership of a Physical Planning Committee: 1. Ag. Assistant Town clerk, Chairperson 2. Physical Planner, Secretary 3. Principal Health Inspector 4. Assistant Engineering Officer 5. District Surveyor. The Committee lacked two other members one of who is Physical Planner in Private Practice. However, during the year under review, the committee met four times and their minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows: 1 Quarter Minutes were submitted on 16th September, 2019, 2nd Quarter on 17th December, 2019 3rd Quarter on 23rd March, 2020 and for the 4th Quarter on 13th August, 2020.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality appointed a team made up of the Deputy town Clerk, Health Officer, Assistant Engineering Officer, and a Senior Planner who conducted a Desk Appraisal for the projects implemented during FY 2019/2020. The team compiled a Report on the exercise dated 10th January, 2019. The team checked on the statics, their inclusion in the Municipal Development Plan and the eligibility of the expenditure in the Local Government Budgeting Guidelines which were all in affirmative. For this reason, they all agreed on their implementation during the FY under review.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality conducted a Field Appraisal of the projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 and produced a report on the exercise dated 12th November, 2019. The team was spearheaded by the Municipal Engineer, and included Education Officer, Health Officer, and Senior Assistant Town Clerks. The Team observed that the volume of waters along the drainage channel across Kibubura Road had increased compared to the size of the culverts in use. They therefore recommended installation of 900m culverts to accommodate the volume of waters. However, the assessment team noted that work done had made that section of the road dangerous. The drainage needed covers and walk rails to protect the road users.</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>Project profiles and costing for FY 2020/2021 were developed for the investments in the AWP. The formats were in line with the Guidelines as noted in Section 5 on page 16. The profiles were presented to the TPC for discussion in their meeting held on 19th August, 2020 under Min. 07/8/2020. The following are examples among other: 1. Construction of a Mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV at UShs.38,882,000 2. Uplift and Maintenance of Tourist site and construction of Equator line at a cost of shs.40,000,000 3. Construction of a 3 stance VIP pit latrine at Nyakahama Primary School at shs.15,000,000.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the MC had screened projects for the current FY for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV in Kagongo division was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Completion of a 4-stance pit latrine at Nyakaturu primary school in Bufunda division was screened on 16th September, 2020 by the Environment Officer and .CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine at Kashangula primary school in Kagongo division was on 28th September, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ul>	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>The DDEG infrastructure projects for current FY 2020/21 included projects under Production, Education, Roads, Natural resources, Planning, Trade and industry worth 171,697,926 were incorporated in LG procurement plan pages 6-7 , with a cover letter Ref. CR/IMC/105/1 that was submitted to PPDA on 10th August, 2020</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>DDEG infrastructure projects to be implemented were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction of the drainage channel along Kibubura road, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00002 was contracted to M/S ASK Unique Enterprises limited at Ugx 49,121,501</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation report approval was on 6th December, 2019</p> <p>The contracts' committee approval of award on 6th/ December 2019; Min. 019/12/2019-20</p> <p>Date of agreement signing was on 28th January, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Installation and repair of solar lights in MC, Ref. IMC/971/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to M/S Broadways Technical Engineering Services Ltd at Ugx. 24,325,100.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation report was approved on 5th December, 2019</p> <p>The contracts committee approval of award was on 6th December 2019 under min. 015/12/2019/20</p> <p>The contract agreement was approved on 28th January, 2020.</p>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	<p>The PIT to monitor and supervise LG DDEG projects was established and appointed by AO on 3rd December, 2019 comprised of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AO/TC- Chairperson</li> <li>2. EO- MrBarigye H</li> <li>3. PCDO- MsTwinomujuni C</li> <li>4. Head of user department</li> <li>5. Assistant Engineer</li> </ol>	1
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	<p>The Municipality Engineer's design by the BoQs for the Drainage channel system at Kibubura road, had the following items;</p> <p>The 3-line culverts with Diameter (0.9), The channel was (0.6x0.5)</p> <p>The field visit indicated the diameter of culverts (0.9) m, while the channels width at (0.64) yet the height kept varying based on the slope between (0.7-0.9) m</p>	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	<p>There was evidence that the LG had provided supervision by the relevant technical officers, for example;</p> <p>The Completion certificate on the construction of drainage channel in Kagongo Division was certified on 20th June 2020 by PCDO, EO, ME, and TC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environment monitoring report on implementation ESIA mitigation measure for construction of drainage channel dated 29th April 2020</li> </ul>	2
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>The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors, for example;</p> <p>The certificate of Environment and Social compliance for the construction of drainage channel was issued by EO and PCDO on 3rd May, 2020</p> <p>The MC Engineers' report clearing the contractor for payment for construction of drainage project was dated on 20th June 2020.</p> <p>The Environment report on the implementation of ESIA mitigation measures for construction of drainage channel was dated 29th April, 2020.</p> <p>The certification on completion of drainage channel was approved by ME, PCDO, EO, and TC ON 26TH May, 2020.</p> <p>The certification on solar installation project was verified on completion by EO, PCDO, ME, and TC on 4th March, 2020</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

The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA for example;

- The construction of the drainage channel along Kibubura road, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00002 was contracted to M/S ASK Unique Enterprises limited at Ugx 49,121,501 had the following records:

Roads and Works requisition approval and submission to PDU on 29th July 2019

The evaluation report on 6th December 2019

The contracts' committee award on 6th/ December 2019

Date of agreement signing on 28th January

Completion certificate on 26th May, 2020

Contractor's payments were done on 25th June 2020.

- The Installation and repair of solar lights in MC, Ref. IMC/971/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to Broadways Technical Engineering Services Ltd at Ugx. 24,325,100.

Roads and Works requisition approval and submission to PDU on 29th July 2019

The evaluation report dated on 5th December, 2019

The contracts committee award dated on 6th December 2019

The award committee minute 015/12/2019/20

The contract agreement on 28th January, 2020.

Certificate of completion on 4th March, 2020

Contractor payment details on 10th March, 2020.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

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

There was evidence the MC had designated a person to coordinate and respond to complaints.

Amanya Maclean was assigned the duty of tracking all complaints by the Town clerk on 11th August, 2019.

A five Grievance Redress committee comprising of Twesigye Rosety, Ndyanabo William, Kato Christopher, Tumusiime Josephat and Amanya Maclean was appointed on 15th September, 2020 by the Town clerk via letter: CR/IMC/152/1.

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	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.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence the MC had a centralized complaints log inform of untitled counter book where grievances were recorded and responded to . On review of the Log, there were no grievances relating to project implementation. The grievances seen were relating to human resource management like delayed payment.	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.  If so: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the Municipal council had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms on the notice board dated 1st July, 2019 showing where the aggrieved parties should go and 1st July, 2020 showing the five phases of complaints handling process.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	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	There was evidence of integrating the Environment, social and climate change interventions in the MC Development for example; projects to be implemented and their mitigation measures were on page 42 to page 64 in the MC development plan.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management  score 1 or else 0	The visit to the Divisions; Bisheshe, Kagongo and Bufunda discovered the physical presence of the DDEG guidelines for FY 2020/21 which emphasized tree planting on page 34 under Community Livelihood Improvement Component.. The LLGs had been given the Guidelines by the Environment Officer Akwankwasa Confidence on 5th August, 2019 At Kagongo Division Council, the was tree planting in the Compound as the guidelines require.	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>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:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of incorporation of ESMPs into BoQs for DDEG projects for the previous FY for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement No IMC791/wrks/2019-2020/00001 was for Construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine at Bufunda and St. George's primary schools indicated that item No A-5 in the BoQs was for planting 5 fruit trees and 5 hard wood trees at UGX 300,000.</li> <li>• Procurement No IMC791/Wrks/2019/2020/00005 was for Construction of ferro-cement water tanks at Nyakatokye HC II and Ireme primary school indicated that item No I was for Environmental mitigation measures at UGX 200,000.</li> </ul>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change because it is new and they haven't yet started practicing it.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal consent signed on 12th May, 2020 between MC and Bufunda C.O.U concisely giving land for the construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Bufunda primary school in Bufunda division.</li> <li>• Formal consent signed on 6th May, 2020 between MC and Nyakatooye health management team concisely giving out land for the construction of a fero-cement water tank at Nyakatooye HC II in Kagongo division.</li> </ul>	1



15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of monthly monitoring reports prepared by the Environment officer and CDO for example;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Bufunda primary school had support supervision reports dated 11th March, 2020 and 28th April, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at St. George's Demo 12th February, 2020 and 28th April, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a drainage channel along Kibuhura road had support supervision reports dated 9th March, 2020 and 29th April, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ul>	1
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of the Environmental officer and CDO certified projects before payments were done for example;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Bufunda primary school was certified on 25th June, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO and actual payment for the project was made on 29th June, 2020.</li> <li>• Construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine at St. George's Demo primary school was certified on 25th June, 2020 and actual payment for the project was made on 29th June, 2020.</li> </ul>	1
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**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	Ibanda Municipal Council had IFMS installed on 1st July, 2019. For this matter, examples of three Bank Accounts of the Municipality were successfully reconciled on 30th June, 2020 as follows: 1. The General Fund Account at shs.12,205,330 2. Property Tax Account at shs.582,2000 3. Treasury Single Account with Bank of Uganda at zero balance. For July, August and September 2020, the General Fund Account was reconciled at the following balances 2,495,730; 37,006,460; 66,704,360 respectively. The Treasury Single Account at zero balances for all these periods.	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>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 Municipality LG produced all the four quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY2019/2020 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st quarter report produced and submitted on 31/10/2019</li> <li>• 2nd quarter produced and submitted on 31/01/2020</li> <li>• 3rd quarter on 29/5/2020</li> <li>• 4th quarter on 31/07/2020</li> </ul> <p>All reports were addressed to the Municipal Speaker and copied to the PS/ST, MoFPED, Mayor, IMC, Secretary, Ibanda District PAC, among others.</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 Municipal Internal Auditor compiled a report addressed to the Internal Auditor General, MoFPED ref. CR/IMC/101/3 dated 3rd December, 2020 and copied to the Mayor, Chairman District PAC informing them of the status of implementation of internal Auditor's findings for FY 2019/2020.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Internal Audit Reports for all the four Quarters of FY 2019/2020 were received by the Ibanda District Public Accounts Committee and discussed as follows: 1st Quarter Report handled in a meeting held on 19th December, 2019 under Min. 14/DPAC/12/2019. 2nd Quarter Report on 4th June, 2020 under Min. 20/DPAC/06/2020. 3rd and 4th Quarterly Reports on 28th September, 2020 under Minutes 8/DPAC/09/2020 and 9/DPAC/09/2020 respectively.</p>	1

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>For FY 2019/2020 local revenue planned for collection shs.233,705,000 as noted on page 4 of approved budget 2019/2020.</p> <p>Local revenue collected as per verified Financial Statements FY 2019/2020, shs.215,189,321 (tax revenue 93,798,129 +121,391,192 non-tax revenue) as seen on page 5 of the Draft Financial Statements 2019/2020.</p> <p>Performance was <math>(215,189,321/233,705,000) * 100 = 92.07\%</math> i.e. -7.93% uncollected. This was within the range of +/- 10% set in the manual for a score.</p>	2
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>OSR for FY 2018/2019 (Audited) shs.562,046,404 (page 7) Less OSR for FY 2019/2020 (Draft) shs.215,189,321 = shs.346,857,083. There was a reduction registered of 61.7%.</p> <p>The poor performance was attributed to the Covid-19 lockdown which resulted into closure of markets and other businesses which were the main sources of local revenue.</p>	0
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence in form of payment vouchers that the Municipality remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenue during FY 2019/2020.</p>	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>The Municipal Procurement Plan for FY 2020/2021 was published on the Public Notice Board through a notice ref. CR/IMC/105/1 dated 5th August, 2020. Likewise awarded contracts were also pinned up the Notice Board and indicated information such as” 1. Completion of a 2 classroom Block at Kishangura Primary School awarded to M/S Batvari Kitagwenda Engineering Ltd at shs.26,561,900. 2. Renovation of a staff house at Ruhoko HC IV awarded to M/S Seedwel Friends at shs.45,073,828 3. Construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Kishanga Primary School awarded to ButosireTechni.cal Services at shs.18,768031</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 Municipal Performance results were published through aa copy of an Annex No.9 to Assessment Report sighted on a Notice Board at the Reception titled “Ranked and Compared Combined LGPA Results 2017-2019. It indicated that Ibanda Municipal Council was ranked in 19th position with an overall score of 81%.</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>During FY 2019/2020 Municipality conducted two Baraza discussions with the public. The first was held on 15th February, 2020 and was attended by 60 participants according to the attendance lists annexed to the Minutes. The objectives of the Baraza were i. to inform the citizens on the ongoing Government programs such as wealth creation, ii. To give accountability on the progress of project implementation, iii. To get issues from the citizens on the emerging development challenges. Another Baraza conducted by the Mayor of the IMC on 8th May, 2020 at which the guest of Honour was the RDC. Examples of issues discussed were: 1. Property tax defaulters where Administration was directed to take further action with them. 2. Sensitization of communities on zero waste management strategy. 3. Securing land for garbage disposal.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality published the best evaluated bidders through a Notice dated 20th December, 2019 which appeared in New Vision of 5th November, 2019 an extract of which was pinned up for public consumption. However, on tax rates and appeals procedures there was no evidence of publication availed to the team for review.</p>	0

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

It was claimed that, the LG did not experience any such cases during the period under review and therefore the Municipality did not prepare any IGG Report on cases of fraud and corruption tendencies in the Municipality during FY 2019/2020.

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>School Year 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total No. of Candidates registered = 2325</li> <li>• Total absentees = 54</li> <li>• Total Grades (1, 2 &amp; 3) = 2006</li> <li>• Pass rate = <math>2006 \times 100 / (2325 - 54) = 88.3\%</math></li> </ul> <p>School Year 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total No. of Candidates registered = 2447</li> <li>• Total absentees = 19</li> <li>• Total Grades (1, 2 &amp; 3) = 2212</li> <li>• Pass rate = <math>2212 \times 100 / (2447 - 19) = 91.1\%</math></li> </ul> <p>The PLE pass rate increased by <math>(91.1 - 88.3) = 2.8\%</math></p>	2

1

0

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

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

School Year 2018

- Total No. of Candidates = 1082
- Absentees = 10

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

• Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = 847

• Pass rate =  $847 \times 100$   
(1082-10)

= 79.01%

School Year 2019

• Total No. of Candidates = 1314

• Total absentees = 7

• Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = 1012

• Pass rate =  $1012 \times 100$

(1314-7)

= 77.4%

The UCE pass rate decreased by 1.58% from 79.01% to 77.4%

2

0

Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.

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

Was not applicable because LLGs were not assessed.

Maximum 2 points

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

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The Education development grant was used on eligible activities as it was presented in the budget performance report FY 2019/20. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 2-classroom block with an office at Kyembogo Primary School captured on page 53 of MDP II and page 53 of the FY 2019/20 AWP.</li> <li>• Completion of a 3-classroom block at Nsasi Secondary School captured on page 53 of the MDP II and page 54 of the FY 2019/20 AWP.</li> <li>• Completion of a 3-classroom block at Mukala Primary School captured on page 53 of MDP II and page 54 of the FY 2019/20 AWP.</li> </ul>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence of certification of works by the Environment officer and the CDO before payment was made as showed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M/s Multiple Enterprises Services Limited on 11th September, 2019 claimed payment of UGX 30,698,675 for works on construction of a 2-classroom block with an office at Kyembogo Primary School. Engineer's certification of works was on 18th June, 2019. The Environment Officer and MCDO too certified the works on 18th June, 2019 and the payment was made on 14th October, 2019 of UGX 15,986,000 and on 25th June, 2020 of UGX 9,980,274.</li> <li>• M/s SSAC Civil Uganda Limited on 30th March, 2020 claimed payment of UGX 54,000,000 for works on completion of a 3-classroom block at Mukala Primary School. Certificate of works by the Municipal Engineer worth UGX 36,544,340 was on 14th May, 2020. The Environment Officer and the MCDO certified the works 14th May, 2020 and payment of UGX 36,900,172 was made on 15th June, 2020.</li> <li>• M/s Sky Limit Engineering Limited on 14th January, 2020 claimed payment of UGX 3,545,526 for retention and completion certificate for works of construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Nyamirima Primary School. The practical completion Certificate No. 2 by the Engineer was endorsed by the Environment Officer and the MCDO on 14th January, 2020 and payment was made on 16th March, 2020.</li> </ul>	2



3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	The sector set out to implement 3 projects. The assessment noted that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates, indicated the following;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		The completion of 3 classroom block at Mukara p/s Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00004 was contracted to SSAC Civil Engineering Ug Ltd, at Ugx. 59,919,950, while the planned and budgeted was 60,000,000.  • Var- (60,000,000-59,919,950)/ 60,000,000x100= 0.13%	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There was evidence that education projects were completed as per work plan in the previous FY, for example;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	There was a practical completion certificate for Mukara p/s dated 15th June, 2020 approved by ME, MEO, and EO indicated projects complete.  Also, on 11th June 2020, there was inspection report indicated Completion of Mukara P/s signed by MEO, EO, ME, CDO. Therefore, the project was 100%	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The LG Teacher's staff ceiling was 415 and the UPE teachers in post were 385 serving in 42 Primary Schools.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	This implied that the LG was 92.8% compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.  $\frac{385}{415} \times 100$ $= 92.8\%$	

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

The total number of UPE registered Schools were 42

The total number of USE registered schools were 4

The total number of Government but non-USE Schools were 2

All the 42UPEand 4USE Schools plus 2 non-USE Government Schools compiled and submitted Assets register to the MEO

The Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;

$48 \times 100$

48

= 100%

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG deployment staff list November, 2020 at the MEO's office accurately reported on teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving. From the three visited Schools of Bubaare, Nyakatukura and Royanza C. O. U, the assessment verified from the teacher's attendance books, the displayed teachers' list and the duty roster the actual presence of the teachers as per the deployment list at the MEO's office. The assessment further verified from the physical roll calling of the Primary Seven teachers that were found present on the assessment day for instance;

- At Bubaare Primary School, Tugume David the Headteacher and teachers; Muhabuzi Wilfred, Atuhaire Godiano, Byamukama J. B, Ronald Masereka, Tugume David and Amusiima Pankalasio were present. On review of the duty roster and teachers staff list both posted on the walls of the Head teachers' officer against the deployment list at the MEO's office with a total of 13 teachers deployed to that school.

- While at Nyakatukura Primary School, Head teacher Kebirungi Maude and teachers; Akatukwasa Moses, and Nkwasiibwe Dennis were present. The MEO's deployment list had nine teachers posted at the School and this was proved by the reviewed Staff list and duty roster for 2020 that were found posted on the walls of the Head teacher's office and the GoU teacher's daily attendance book.

- At Royanza C. O. U Primary School, Mwesigwa Geoffrey the Headteacher and teachers; Kekirabo Moreen and Bwesigye Andrew were present on the assessment day. The MEO's deployment list had six teachers posted to Royanza C. O. U and this was proved by the reviewed Staff list and duty roster that were found posted on the walls of the Head teacher's office.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The Consolidated School Asset register at the office indicated accurate reporting on the 46 Primary and 6 Secondary Schools assets. On aggregate, the LG had a total of 422 classrooms, 297 latrine stances, 5271 desks zero library and 25 staff houses for Primary Schools. The Municipal Council further had 76 classrooms, 53 latrine stances, 2148 desks, 10 laboratories and 43 staff houses for Secondary Schools. The assessment sampled three Primary Schools for field visit and one Secondary School for desk review to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below; This was verified from the three schools visited for example;

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Bubaare Primary School had; 13classrooms, 16stances of pit latrines and 185 desks and 1 staff house. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets statistics was presented by the Head teacher.

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Nyakatukura Primary School had; 8classrooms, 2 stances of pit latrines, 113desksand 1 teacher house. A comparison of the field findings with the consolidated asset register, the assessment observed that they were the same.

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Royanza C. O. UPrimary School had; 10 classrooms, 2 stances of pit latrines and67 desks. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets statistics was presented by the Head teacher.

- The desk review of the consolidated Assets register indicated that Ibanda Secondary School had 16 classrooms, 14 latrine stances, 448 desks, 05 laboratories and 24 staff houses.

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>The Municipal Council had 42 registered Primary Schools. By the assessment time, 38 Schools had complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines by compiling and submitting the annual reports for the FY under review. The reports assessed were authenticated by the Headteachers and Chairpersons SMC and had attachments like the highlights of school performance, a reconciled cash flow statement stamped by the auditor, an annual budget and expenditure report, and an asset register.</p> <p>38 X 100</p> <p>42</p> <p>= 90.5%</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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>There was evidence of the SIPs existence from the sampled schools prepared and posted on the walls of the Headteacher’s office. The SIPs that were prepared basing on inspection findings were being implemented according to the agreed timeframes between the School managers and the Inspectors. The inspectors made follow-up inspections to monitor the implementation of the SIPs for example on the inspection of RuyonzaC. O. U Primary on 16th July, 2019 noted that learner’s absenteeism was high and recommended strict roll calling. The follow-up inspection on 24th September, 2019 noted an improvement in the student’s attendance arising out of the strict roll calling. The assessment further visited the Schools of; Butaare and Nyakatukura and from the interface with Headteachers and observations, the following were evident that the LG supported Schools to implement the SIPs through;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The timely release of School Capitation Grants by the MEO was noted as one of the ways the LG assisted Schools in implementing their SIPs since UPE is the main source of funds for the day to day management of the School</li> <li>• Thorough discussion of inspection finding between the inspectors and the School Administrations and agreeing on the way forward.</li> </ul>	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>Ibanda Municipal Comprehensive list of all the 42 Primary Schools and 6 Secondary Schools, their enrollment was submitted to MoES on 16th March, 2019.</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>The LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2020/21 generated on 10th June, 2020 on page 50 indicated that UGX 2,850,354,000 was allocated as wage for Education department for 385 UPE teachers.</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>From the three sampled Schools of Bubaare, Nyakatukura and Ruyonza C. O. U Primary Schools, the names and number of teachers displayed in the Headteacher's office matched perfectly with what was on the teacher's deployment List in the MEO's office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bubaare Primary School, had a total of 13 teachers deployed to that school.</li> <li>• Nyakatukura Primary School, had nine teachers in post.</li> <li>• Ruyonza C. O. U Primary School, list had six teachers in post.</li> </ul>	3
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0

The DEO had posted the Teacher's list at the Education Notice Board at the District. The Head teachers of the visited schools; Bubaare, Nyakatukura and Ruyonza C. O. U had too posted their respective teacher's lists at the receptions of and within the Headteacher's office.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence of Headteacher's appraisal by the respective Senior Assistant Town Clerks (SATC) from the eight sampled schools. For example;

- Tugume David the Headteacher Bubaare Primary School was appraised by Kebiita Lillian Tracy the Senior Assistant Town Clerk Bufunda Division on 10th December, 2019,
- Kebirungi Maude the Headteacher Nyakatukura Primary School was appraised by Kebiita Lillian Tracy the Senior Assistant Town Clerk Bufunda Division on 16th December, 2019
- Mwesigwa Geoffrey the Headteacher Ruyonza C. O. U was appraised by Kebiita Lillian Tracy the Senior Assistant Town Clerk Bafunda on 16th December, 2019.
- Atwijukye Julius the Headteacher Kashambya Primary School in Kagongo Division was appraised by SATC Kebirungi Rose on 31st December, 2019
- Turyamureeba Samuel the Headteacher Nyamirima Primary School was appraised by SATC Bufunda Division Kebiita Lillian Tracy on 18th December, 2019
- Magara John the Headteacher Nyakateete Primary School in Bisheshe Division was appraised by SATC Kebirungi Rose on 20th December, 2019
- Katalihwa Hope N the Headteacher Nyabuhikya C. O. U Primary School in Bufunda Division was appraised by SATC Kebiita Lillian Tracy on 18th December, 2020.
- Tusiime Bridget the Headteacher Nyakatoockye Primary School was appraised by Kagongo Division Senior Assistant Town Clerk Kebirungi Rose on 13th January, 2020
- Atuzariwe Benon Kaamu the Headteacher Ibanda Kibubura Integrated Primary School was appraised by SATC Kagongo Division Kebirungi Rose on 5th December, 2019
- Musinguzi Benon the Headteacher Bufunda Primary School in Bufunda Division was appraised by SATC Kebiita Lillian Tracy on 16th December, 2020.



8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of appraisal for only two out of six Headteachers of Secondary Schools of Ibanda Municipal Council presented for assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kunihira Gladys the Headteacher Nyabuhikya S. S in Bufunda Division was appraised by DEO Ndimu the Town Clerk Ibanda Municipal Council on 16th December, 2019.</li> <li>• Amanya Celis the Headteacher Kibubura S. S was appraised by Deo Ndimu the Town Clerk Ibanda Municipal Council on 16th December, 2019.</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of appraising the Education department staff for their performance for FY 2019/20 as showed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ag. MEO Abakunda Johnson was appraised by the Town Clerk on 8th September, 2019.</li> <li>• Twimukye Robert the Municipal Inspector of Schools was appraised by the Principal Education Office (MEO) on 10th July, 2020</li> <li>• Twesigye Rosety the Assistant Inspector of Schools was appraised by MEO for the six months' probation on 26th March, 2020.</li> </ul>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG education department had prepared a training plan for School Year 2020 on 20th February, 2020.</p> <p>The training plan targeted six activities to be achieved by end of Term III, 2020. The activities included; sanitation and handwashing training, records keeping, environmental workshop, performance improvement, guidelines on Covid-19 outbreak and Income generating projects in Schools.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>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>The LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) on 5th November, 2020.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>During the Planning and Budgeting for FY 2020/21, US\$26,937,000 on page 25 of the MEO's budget of UGX 29,428,000 on page 28 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates was allocated to inspection and monitoring functions in line with sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of US\$4 million per LG, plus US\$336,000 (6 inspections at US\$56,000) per school for the 3 terms.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was declaration of sector funds for the three releases of FY 2019/20;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1stQtr on 29th July, 2019</li> <li>• 2ndQtr on 18th October, 2019</li> <li>• 3rdQtr on 17th January, 2020</li> <li>• 4thQtr on 21st April, 2020</li> </ul> <p>The interaction with the CFO however revealed that the IFMIS only shows the month and not the actual date when the money is released hence making it difficult to establish whether it was within 5 working days.</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>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>There was evidence to show that the district had invoiced and that the DEO had communicated capitation releases.</p> <p>There was declaration of sector funds for the three releases of FY 2019/20;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term III, 2019 on 15th July, 2019</li> <li>• Term I, 2020 on 19th January, 2020</li> <li>• Term II, 2020 on 10th May, 2020</li> </ul>	2
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> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The Education had prepared the FY 2020/21 Inspection Plan dated 13th August, 2020. The plan targeted 42 GoU Primary Schools, 6 GoU Secondary Schools, 1 tertiary School, 37 Primary Private Schools, 14 Secondary Private Schools and 4 Private Tertiary Schools.</p> <p>During the FY under review, the LG education department had prepared termly inspection plans and meetings were conducted prior to school inspections for example;</p> <p>The Term III, 2019 Inspection plan was prepared and endorsed by Municipal Inspector on 6th September, 2019 and MEO plus the Treasurer on 9th September, 2019. The plan targeted 93 Schools at a Cost of UGX 2,050,000.</p> <p>The Term III Plan was discussed in a meeting held on 13th August, 2019 and under Min. 3/2019 the tool for inspection was discussed and Min. 4/2019 allocated Divisions to the different inspectors; Bisheshe to Robert Twimukye, Bufuda to Rwabutoomize Peter (Associate Assessor) and Kagongo to Tibenderana John Jones (Associate Assessor).</p> <p>The Term II, 2019 Inspection Plan was prepared on 12th July, 2019 costing 1,580,000 and the prior meeting to inspection was held on 6th May, 2019</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The three termly inspection reports reviewed indicated that all the UPE registered Schools were inspected at least once a term during the FY under review. The reports submitted to DES had an appendix of Schools inspected and the review observed that all the 46 GoU Schools had been inspected;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term III, 2019 submitted to the Commissioner Basic Education Standards on 17th January, 2020. The list of Schools inspected attached indicated that 92 Schools including all the 42 Primary and 6 Secondary GoU Schools inspected plus Private Schools.</li> <li>• Term II, 2019 was submitted to DES on 19th September, 2019 had 57 Schools inspected and they included both GoU and Private</li> <li>• Term I, 2019 was also submitted to DES on 19th September, 2019 had 57 Schools inspected and they included both GoU and Private.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, one can infer that there was 100% inspection of UPE Schools during the FY under review.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>T</p> <p>The LG discussed only Term II and III inspection reports on 4th June, 2019 under Min. 11/2019 and 3rd October, 2019 under Min. 04/2019/2020 respectively.</p> <p>The Assessment team however failed to prove the discussion of Term I inspection findings.</p> <p>The reviewed visitors' books at the Municipal Schools indicated that the Inspectorate followed up the implementation of the inspection recommendations e. g at Ruyonza C. O. U Primary on 16th July, 2019 the inspection noted high level of learner's absenteeism and recommended strict roll calling.</p> <p>The follow-up inspection on 24th September, 2019 noted an improvement in the student's attendance arising out of the strict roll calling.</p> <p>LG did not score on this indicator because Term I, 2019 Inspection findings were not discussed</p>	0

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>The inspectors were using carbonated inspection templates and were leaving the original copies at Schools and moving away with the carbon copies. The school visit at Bubaare P/S saw the inspection records of; 25th February, 2019, 20th June, 2019, 10th October, 2019, 18th April, 2020, 26th August, 2020 and a monitoring by the Ag. MEO on 10th October, 2020.</p> <p>The DES Matrix for submission of inspection Work plans, Reports and Accountabilities for 2019 indicated that Ibanda Municipal Inspector of Schoolshad submitted the inspection reports for the three terms of School Year 2019.</p> <p>The DIS had Acknowledgement letters for submission of the reports with;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term III, 2019 submitted to the Commissioner Basic Education Standards on 17th January, 2020.</li> <li>• Term II, 2019 was submitted to DES on 19th September, 2019</li> <li>• Term I, 2019 was also submitted to DES on 19th September, 2019.</li> </ul>	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>There was evidence that the issues of Education department were presented to and discussed by the Social Services Sectoral Committee for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 29th October, 2019, under Min. No. IMC/SOC/MIN. 16/10/2019 discussed the Quarter 1 activity report for FY 2019/20 with a key focus on the structures of Nyahooru Primary School that needed urgent repair.</li> <li>• On 25th February, 2020 under Min. No. IMC/SOC/Min. 24/2/2020, Mr. Katwesigye John presented the Half Year Development Performance report FY 2019/20. He called upon members to appropriating money for structural establishment at Bugarama Primary School. The delay in the UPE and USE funds release was too discussed.</li> </ul>	2

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,

*score: 2 or else score: 0*

There was evidence of activities done to mobilize, attract and retain children at Schools in Ibanda Municipal Local Government. These included;

- The Headteacher of Bubaare Primary School preaches the gospel of importance of Education during the Church Services at Bubaare Catholic Church like on 13th October, 2019.
- Improving the learning environment through greening the School compounds by planting grasses and trees. In the three visited Schools; Ruyonza, Nyakatukura and Bubaare, the Headteacher had planted grasses and made clear walk ways in the compound to prevent stepping on grasses. They further put sign posts with messages like “keep off the grass”. This was concretized with grass guard rails made from eucalyptus trees that were defining the walk ways.
- Having talking compounds with inspirational messages like “stay at School” was another way the LG was mobilizing, attracting and retaining Children in Schools.
- Renovation of old classroom structures like at Bubaare Primary has also improved the learning environment and subsequently attracted learners into the Schools
- Improved feeding programs through encouraging parents to bring food in kind like maize flour or pay some little amounts of Money to buy food and prepare it at Schools.

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Education department Consolidated Asset register was in place. The LG asset register incorporated all the School assets for instance;</p> <p>The Consolidated School Asset register at the office indicated set out school facilities from the 46 Primary and 6 Secondary Schools assets. On aggregate, the LG had a total of 422 classrooms, 297 latrine stances, 5271 desks zero library and 25 staff houses for Primary Schools. The Municipal Council further had 76 classrooms, 53 latrine stances, 2148 desks, 10 laboratories and 43 staff houses for Secondary Schools. The assessment sampled three Primary Schools for field visit and one Secondary School for desk review to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bubaare Primary School had; 13 classrooms, 16 stances of pit latrines and 185 desks and 1 staff house.</li> <li>• Nyakatukura Primary School had; 8 classrooms, 2 stances of pit latrines, 113 desks and 1 teacher house.</li> <li>• Royanza C. O. U Primary School had; 10 classrooms, 2 stances of pit latrines and 67 desks.</li> <li>• Ibanda Secondary School had 16 classrooms, 14 latrine stances, 448 desks, 05 laboratories and 24 staff houses.</li> </ul>	2
<p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</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>There was evidence of Desk appraisal for the Education sector implemented projects FY 2019/2020. The sector projects were well incorporated into the LG Development Plan for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of a 2-classroom block at Kamabare Primary School captured under appendix 3, Chapter 7 on page 79 of DDP II and page 74 of the FY 2019/20 AWP generated on 10th July, 2019.</li> <li>• Construction of a 2-classroom block Phase I at Kyabandara Primary School captured under appendix 3, chapter 7 on page 89 of DDP II and page 75 of the FY 2019/20 AWP</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Nyamiyaga Primary School captured under appendix 3 on page 90 of DDP II and page 90 of the FY 2019/20 AWP.</li> <li>• Completion of a 2-classroom block at Kazigangure Primary School captured under appendix 3, Chapter 7 on page 79 of DDP II and page 74 of the FY 2019/20 AWP generated on 10th July, 2019</li> </ul>	1
12	<p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

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, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of environmental and social screening forms for projects implemented under the Education sector;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of a 2-classroom block at Kamabale primary school in Sheema central was seen screened and dated 13th May, 2019 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kyabandala primary school was seen screened and dated 17th May, 2019 by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Nyamiyaga primary school in Kabwohe division was seen screened and dated 17th May, 2019 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ul>	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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that education sector plan FY 2020/21 as was submitted to PDU on 5th Feb, 2020 comprising 7 infrastructure projects was incorporated into LG Plan page 1 that was submitted to PPDA with cover letter Ref. SMC/CR/105/2 on 15th July, 2020, approved by council; Min.45/COU/SMC/2019-20 (d) indicated inclusion of all projects.</p>	1



Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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, *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee for example;

- The completion of 2 classroom block at Kamabare P/s Ref. SHMC/ 786/WRKS/2019-20/00002 contracted to HEMO Engineering services at Ugx. 32,927,000.

- o The evaluation report was approved on 6th September, 2019;

- o Approval of award by contracts committee on 9th September, 2019 Min.17/CC/2019-20.

- o Contract agreement was signed on 7th October, 2020.

- The construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Nyamiyaga p/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00005 was awarded to MISTCHEL & ABEL-K supplies ltd at Ugx 23,774,500.

- o Evaluation report was approved by committee on 6th September, 2019;

- o Contracts committee approval on 9th September, 2019 Min. 19/CC/2019-20;

- o And contract agreement signing 7th October, 2019

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Kyabandara Madarasati p/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00008 contracted to SPOTON E.A ltd at Ugx. 38,482,184.

- o The evaluation report approval of bids, method, and notice were approved o 6th September, 2019;

- o While approval of award by contacts committee was done on 9th September, 2019 under min.07/CC/2029-20;

- o And the agreement finally signed on 8th October, 2019.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG MC had properly established the Project Implementation team that was appointed by Town clerk on 29th September 2019 to include;

1. ME- Mr. Byabashaija A as contract manager.

2. Members: CDO- Mr Bright J, MEO- Ms Tushemereirwe Z, Clerk of Work- Aruho B, EO – Mr Musiime S.

3. Town Clerk- as Chairperson

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>The LG works department and Contractors followed MoES technical designs when implementing school projects, for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction of 2 classroom block at Kyabandara Madarasat and the contractors had the following measurements against the LG engineers plan respectively:</li> </ul> <p>The internal classroom measured (6x7.14) versus (6x7.8)</p> <p>Doors opening (1.08x2.52) versus (0.9x2.4)</p> <p>Windows opening (1.2x1.48) versus (1.5x2.35)</p> <p>Wall thickness (230) versus the same</p> <p>The door and window shutters of the structure had not been fixed, but was roofed with brick red/maroon ordinary corrugated iron sheets, Gauge 28 as indicated in BoQs element 5 (f)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Site monthly meetings' minutes were not availed for assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs, for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report dated 6th November, 2019 for the launch of the construction of infrastructures at Kyabandara, Nyamiyaga, and Kamabare primary schools was held on 28th October 2019, and participants included: Schools stakeholders, MEC members, MC technical staff.</li> <li>• Joint TPC monitoring team report on 4th December, 2019 for the construction of Kyabandara p/s, construction of latrine stances at Nyamiyaga p/s, and completion of Kamabare classroom block held on 20&amp;22 November 2019.</li> <li>• The commissioning of 5 stance latrine at Nyamiyaga p/s, Kyabandara and Kamabare classroom blocks report dated 17th June, 2020 was held on 12th June 2020 included SMC, MC staff, Education&amp; Health standing committee.</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made in time; for example;</p> <p>The LG had complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as evident below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The completion of 2 classroom block at Kamabare P/s Ref. SHMC/ 786/WRKS/2019-20/00002 contracted to M/S HEMO Engineering services at Ugx. 32,927,000. Contract agreement was signed was on 7th October, 2020 and completed on 21st February 2020. The Payments were made on 22nd February, 2020</li> <li>• The construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Nyamiyaga P/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00005 was awarded to M/S MISTCHEL &amp; ABEL-K supplies ltd at Ugx 23,774,500. The Contract agreement signing was 7th October, 2019 and the Date of completion was on 3rd January, 2020. The Contractors' claim was approved by AO on 6th January 2020. The Payments were made on 28th January 2020.</li> <li>• Construction of 2-classroom block at Kyabandara MadarasatP/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00008 contracted to M/S SPOTON East Africa Limited at Ugx. 38,482,184. The agreement was signed on 8th October, 2019 and the date of completion was on 2nd January, 2020. Contractors' claim was approved by AO on 6th January, 2020. The payments were effected on 28th January, 2020.</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements on 25th February 2020</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG had complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as evident below;

The completion of 2 classroom block at Kamabare P/s Ref. SHMC/ 786/WRKS/2019-20/00002 contracted to HEMO Engineering services at Ugx. 32,927,000 had the following records:

The Project requests were initiated and submitted to PDU on 22nd July, 2020.

The evaluation report was approved on 6th September, 2019;

Approval of award by contracts committee on 9th September, 2019 Min.17/CC/2019-20.

Contract agreement was signed on 7th October, 2020.

Date of completion on 21st February 2020

Payments were made on 22nd February, 2020

The construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Nyamiyaga p/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00005 was awarded to MISTCHEL & ABEL-K supplies ltd at Ugx 23,774,500.

The Project requests were initiated and submitted to PDU on 22nd July, 2020.

Evaluation report was approved by committee on 6th September, 2019;

Contracts committee approval on 9th September, 2019 Min. 19/CC/2019-20;

Contract agreement signing 7th October, 2019.

Date of completion on 3rd January, 2020.

Payments were made on 28th January 2020.

Construction of 2 classroom block at Kyabandara Madarasati p/s Ref. SHMC796/WRKS/2019-20/00008 contracted to SPOTON E.A ltd at Ugx. 38,482,184.

The Project requests were initiated and submitted to PDU on 22nd July, 2020.

The evaluation report approval of bids, method, and notice were approved on 6th September, 2019; While approval of award by contacts committee was done on 9th September, 2019 under min.07/CC/2029-20;

The agreement finally signed on 8th October, 2019.

Date of completion on 2nd January, 2020

And payments were effected on 28th January, 2020.

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 to show that the MC had recorded, investigated, responded and reported on Education grievances as per the grievance redress framework. The projects implemented under the Education sector never attracted any grievances hence no recording of grievances during the FY under review.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The visited Primary Schools of; Bubaare, Nyakatukura and Ruyonza C. O. U Primary School had in possession titles of land for their premises and had green compounds with clearly planed hedges and water sources.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of incorporation of Environment and social management plans into the BoQs for example;</p> <p>Procurement No IMC791/Wrks/2019-2020/00004 was for Completion of a 3-classroom block and office at Mukara primary school indicated that BoQs item No H was for channeling of storm water from the upper site of the school and planting of 10 trees and grass in the compound at UGX 20,000.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There wasevidence of land ownership where planned school construction projects were implemented for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal consent between Ibanda MC and Nyakatukura school management committee dated 4th December, 2020 concisely giving land for the Completion of a 4- stance pit latrine at Nyakatukura primary school.</li> <li>• Formal consent between Ibanda MC and Nyakahaama catholic Centre signed on 4th December, 2020 concisely giving land for the construction of a 3- stance latrine.</li> </ul>	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of monitoring monthly reports prepared by the Environment Officer and CDO for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of a 3-classroom block and office at Mukara Primary School in Kagongo division had reports dated 11th March, 2020 and 27th April, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ul>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence projects were certified before payments were done by the Environment Officer and CDO for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of a 3-classroom block at Mukara primary school was certified on 14th May, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO and payment was 15th June, 2020.</li> </ul>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>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 OPD attendance, and 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>At the time of assessment, there were no health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for financial years 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 of the sampled health facilities for the AT to review and calculate the annual OPD attendance and deliveries.</p> <p>The MMOH attributed the above to the district reporting system. He explained that such report (HMIS 107) were directly submitted to the DHO's office for entry into the District Health Information System (DHIS). The reporting system did not cater for submission of HMIS reports through the MMOH's office.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	Was not applicable	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</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>The RBF quarterly quality facility assessment reports were not available for review. The MMOH explained that the accounting officer for RBF was the CAO who signed the agreements with the MOH and that the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment reports are directly submitted to the DHO's office by the facilities for onward submission to the MOH. The reporting system did not cater for submission of such reports through the MMOH's office.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The LG budgeted and spent UGX 21,992,000 health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities, including renovation of the inpatient ward at Bisheshe HC III worth UGX 18,850,000, monitoring, appraisal and supervision of works worth UGX 992,000, and ICT (lap top) worth 2,150,000) as per the health grant and budget guidelines (page 20).</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that MHO, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors, for example;</p> <p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe H/CIII, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to M/S BAFA and Sons establishment ltd at Ugx. 18,081,470.</p> <p>The MHO started the process by initiating and submission of plan and requests to PDU by 29th July 2019.</p> <p>Then the MHO along with other certifying officers like PCDO, EO, ME, and TC approved payments certificates on 26th March, 2020</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments were within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, for example;</p> <p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe H/CIII, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to M/S BAFA and Sons establishment ltd at Ugx. 18,081,470 while the budget was 18,850,441.</p> <p>The var- <math>(18,850,441 - 18,081,470) / 18,850,441 \times 100 = 4.1\%</math></p>	2



3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed, for example,	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>	A Report by ME on the renovation of Busheshe H/CIII General maternity ward dated 26th March, 2020 approved works of the contractor complete without defects and therefore should be paid.	
			Also, from the Annual budget performance report FY 2019-20 approved by MAO 31st July, 2020 pages 52-53 indicated 100% complete.	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	The LG had recruited staff for all HC IIIs and HC IVs as per staffing structure	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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>No. filled X 100</p> <p>No. approved</p> <p><math>69/87 * 100 = 79\%</math></p>	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	The assessment team visited Busheshe H/C III (the only project of the year in assessment) to assess the works under rehabilitation; however, it was one of the long-existed facilities before 2018 when the current designs were in force.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	However, the work included Replacing wooden pillars with concrete, splash apron, ceiling boards, glasses, Painting etc. The ward was well completed, painted with smoke gray skirt and off-white paint on the upper wall; The work had not developed any defects. The measurement for the main entrance door was (1.1x2.0) m, Windows (1.17x145) The ramp was 1.4m wide.	

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The positions of Health workers as indicated on the staff list matched with the record of Health facility staffing level as seen below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ruhoko HC IV had 41 staff out of 48 staffing norm</li> <li>2. Bisheshe HC III had 13 staff out 19 staffing norm</li> <li>3. Nyamirima HC II had 02 staff out of 09 staffing norm</li> </ol>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the MMOH, it was established that the department had no upgraded or constructed health facility in the FY 2019/2020 and the review of the Annual Budget Performance report 2019/2020 revealed the same.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities 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>The annual work plans and budgets for 2020/2021 for the 3 sampled health facilities were reviewed and the submissions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruhoko HC IV: submitted on 24th March 2020</li> <li>• Bisheshe HC III: submitted on 20th March 2020</li> <li>• Nyamirima HC II: submitted on 20th March 2020</li> </ul> <p>The health facility annual work plans and budgets were submitted by 31st March in the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was no evidence that the health facilities submitted Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines.

The health facilities Annual Budget Performance Reports for the 3 sampled facilities were submitted as follows:

- Ruhoko HC IV: 6th July 2020
- Bisheshe HC III: 5th July 2020 Nyamirima HC II: 6th July 2020

However, the submitted reports did not follow the prescribed format which should include highlights of performance, a reconciled cash flow statement, and an asset register among others, as per the assessment manual.

0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring.

For instance, the AT reviewed the Performance Improvement Plan for Ruhoko HC IV (dated 1st July 2020) and established that the facility had planned to address a challenge of long waiting hours by mothers in antenatal care (ANC) clinic through engaging the volunteers and Village Health Teams (VHTs) to support the available staff in ANC activities like taking vital observations (page 8). The above challenge was identified during monitoring and supervision (report dated 19th September 2020, page 2).

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%, • score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there were no monthly and quarterly reports (HMIS 105 and 106a) for FY 2019/2020 for the sampled health facilities for the AT to review and timeliness of submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MMOH attributed the above to the district reporting system. He explained that HMIS reports were directly submitted to the DHO's office for entry into the District Health Information System (DHIS). The reporting system did not cater for submission of such reports through the MMOH's office.</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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  Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices to the MMOH for onward submission to the district.</p> <p>The MMOH attributed the above to the fact that the district signed the agreements with the MOH and that the RBF invoices were directly submitted to the DHO's office by the facilities for onward submission to the MOH. The reporting system did not cater for submission of such reports through the MMOH's office.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to MOH facility RBF invoice submission system, Ibanda MC was not required to submit any invoices to MOH. Municipalities submit to Districts.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The AT reviewed quarterly Budget Performance report submission to the Planner. The submissions were as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: 10th November, 2019</p> <p>Quarter 2: 31th January, 2020</p> <p>Quarter 3: 15th April, 2020</p> <p>Quarter 4: 29th July, 2020</p> <p>From the above, only quarter 1 Budget Performance Report submitted late (after end of the first month of the following quarter).</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>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 no evidence that the LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence that the LG developed and implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities.

0

**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 MC wage allocation for the Primary health care workers for FY 2020/2021 was UGX 1,180,315,000 (Approve Performance Contract FY 2020/2021, page 14). According to the staff list (dated 1st December 2020) with 93 health workers in post for FY 2020/2021, all the health workers had their salaries indicated. Hence, there was evidence that the LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.

2

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

The review of the deployment list dated 1st December 2020 indicated that health workers were deployed as per the guidelines in accordance with the staffing norms.

From the deployment list, the 3 sampled health facilities were as follows:

1. Ruhoko HC IV had 41 staff out of 48 staffing norm
2. Bisheshe HC III had 13 staff out 19 staffing norm
3. Nyamirima HC II had 02 staff out of 09 staffing norm

Therefore, the average staffing of the sampled facilities =  $41+13+03 = 58$

Staffing norm was  $49+19+09 = 77$

Hence,  $56 \times 100 = 74\%$

76

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The AT reviewed the health workers' deployment list dated 26th October 2020 from the MMOH's office and checked the duty rosters and work attendance registers at each of the 3 sampled health facilities that were visited. The health workers at the health facilities were as follows:

1. Ruhoko HC IV: 41 staff (in-charge was Dr. Baguma Herbert)
2. BishesheHC III: 13 staff (in-charge was Atuhaire Emily)
3. Nyamirima HC II: 02 staff (in-charge was Namara Monic)

The health workers' deployment list was in tandem with records of staff working at each of the visited health facilities.

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 lists of deployed health workers on health facilities' notice boards. The displayed lists indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, gender, phone number among others. The list that was displayed at each of the visited health facilities (Ruhoko HC IV, Bisheshe HC III and Nyamirima HC II) was in tandem with the deployment list from the MMOH's office, dated 1st December 2020.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

There was evidence that health facility in-charges were appraised in all health facility for instance,

- Ekaro Bernard Senior Clinical Officer was appraised on 30th June 2020 by Dr. Kwikiriza B. Darlson medical officer.
- Tunanwire Ewen Senior clinical officer was appraised by Kebiita Lillian Tracy Senior Assistant Clerk on 02nd July,2020
- Atuhaire Emily appraised by Senior clinical officer was appraised by Musinguzi Robert Senior Assistant Town council on 2nd July,2020
- Nyehangane Jackline enrolled Nurse was appraised on 1st June,2020 by Tunanwire Ewen.
- Atuhaire Saturina enrolled nurse was appraised on 2nd June,2020 by Atuhaire Emily
- Kekiruga Nancy enrolled Nurse was appraised by Atuhaire Emily on 2nd July,2020.
- Mbonimpa Teopista Karemera Nursing officer was appraised by Kebirugi Rose on 30th June, 2020.
- Tumuranze Denis enrolled midwife was appraised by Senior Assistant Town clerk on 25th June,2020
- Kemigisha Medrine enrolled midwife appraised by Nusinguzi Robert Senior Assistant Town clerk on 29th June ,2020
- Mujuni B. Henry Nursing Assistant was appraised by Kebiita Lillian on 10th June,2020



8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. 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</p>	<p>There was evidence of appraising the HC in-charges for the FY under review as seen below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kyakuhaire Evangelista was appraised by Tunanirwe Ewen on 30th June, 2020.</li> <li>• Ganda Proscovia Nursing officer was appraised by Tunanirwe Ewen on 30th June,2020</li> <li>• Ayebazibwe Suzan enrolled Midwife was appraised by Tunanirwe Ewen on 30th June, 2020.</li> <li>• Namara Monica Nursing officer was appraised by Tunanirwe Ewen on 30th June,2020</li> <li>• Kyohaire Judith enrolled Midwife was appraised by Ganda Proscovia on 9th June,2020</li> <li>• Kyarisima Jane Nursing officer was appraised by Atuhaire Emily on 25th June,2020</li> <li>• Nabalindwa Dorothy was appraised by Atuhaire Emily on 29th June,2020</li> <li>• KasandeSylvia enrolled midwife was appraised by Kemigisha Medrine on 29th June,2020.</li> </ul>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was corrective action taken on appraised reports because the remarks for appraisers were positive and educative like;Twinomugisha Irene was appraised by Emily Atuhaire who advised her to ask for study leave on time in order to continue with her Study on 19th June,2020.</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Whereas there was no training plan in place, there was evidence that the LG conducted training of health workers as evidenced by the training report (dated 28th February 2020) by the HRO on training of in-charges on accountability of health facility PHC Grants, health unit management and administration.</p>	1

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence the LG documented training activities in the training/CPD database.</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**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>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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 a letter from the Town Clerk (dated 12th September 2019) to the Permanent Secretary MOH (received on 13th September 2019) validating a list 15 health facilities (GOU and PNFP) receiving PHC NWR grants for the FY 2019/2020.</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 9 points on this performance measure</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>The assessment team reviewed the 4th quarter report (page 15) for FY 2019/2010 and established that the allocations made towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health services was 100% of the total PHC NWR Grant, contrary to the health sector grant guidelines.</p> <p>Total allocation towards monitoring and management of health care services was UGX 15,367,000 (page 50 of the Annual Budget Performance report, FY 2019/2020).</p> <p>The total PHC NWR Grant was UGX 92,683,000 (page 15 of the Annual Budget Performance report)</p> <p>The percentage allocation = <math>\frac{15367,000}{92,683,000} \times 100 = 16.6\%</math></p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

92,683,000

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. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality failed to retrieve from IFMS the dates when the warrants for Health sector Development Grant were made by the Accounting Officer. For this reason, the team could not establish the timeliness of verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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>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</p>	<p>The Municipality communicated all the sector transfers for FY 2019/2020 to LLGs as follows: 1st Quarter on 13th August, 2019, 2nd Quarter on 15th October, 2019 and 3rd Quarter on 18th January, 2020. However, timeliness of transfers could not be established because date of release of funds from MoFPED was not available on the IFMS.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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>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</p>	<p>The LG had publicized all the quarterly releases to the health facilities for the FY 2019/2020 on the LG notice board, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk. The total for each quarter was UGX 19,328,996. Each release circular had a list of 15 health facilities and amount for each facility. The dates for quarterly releases were as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: 20th July 2019</p> <p>Quarter 2: 28th October 2019</p> <p>Quarter 3: 30th January 2020</p> <p>• Quarter 4: 24th April 2020</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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>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>From the review of the minutes for quarter 1 performance review meeting for FY 2019/2020, held on 30th August 2019, a recommendation was made that the dilapidated inpatient ward for Bisheshe HC III be renovated. In quarter 4 performance review meeting (held on 22nd June 2020), it was noted that the renovation was implemented and almost complete and the meeting agreed to complete it in the next FY.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assessment Team reviewed the minutes of the quarterly performance review meetings and the attendance lists from the MMOH's office.</p> <p>For instance, the attendance lists of the review meeting for quarter 4, FY 2019/2020, held on 22nd June 2020, showed that the meeting involved health facilities in charges, Senior Planner, Senior Internal Auditor, MHT among others.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The Assessment Team reviewed the supervision reports for all the quarters for FY 2019/2020 and established that Ruhoko HC IV was 100% supervised.</p> <p>The supervision was as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: supervision report dated 19th August 2019</p> <p>Quarter 2: supervision report dated 16th December 2019</p> <p>Quarter 3: supervision report dated 8th May 2020</p> <p>Quarter 4: supervision report dated 23rd July 2020</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that MHT ensured that HSDs carried out support supervision of lower-level health facilities within the previous FY.</p> <p>The supervision of Lower-level facilities was as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: supervision report dated 30th September 2019</p> <p>Quarter 2: supervision report dated 27th December 2019</p> <p>Quarter 3: supervision report dated 25th March 2020</p> <p>Quarter 4: supervision report dated 28th June 2020</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The review of the 4th quarter performance review meeting minutes (MIN.03/06.2020: Presentation of quarter 3 reports) showed that the MHT noted that there was a non-functioning fridge and vaccines stock outs at Bisheshe HC III. During the field visit at Bisheshe HC III, the AT established that the facility's fridge for vaccines was repaired and was functional.</p> <p>During field visit at Kyabandara HC II, a hand washing facility with soap and water were seen at the entrance to the health HC.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies. This was evidenced by a report (dated 23rd June 2020) by the Principal Health Inspector on medicine utilization, health supplies and medical waste management, following monitoring and supervision of health units in FY 2019/2020.</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of District Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities.</p> <p>Review of the Annual Budget Performance report and Approved Annual Budget, FY 2019/2020 for Ibanda MC revealed that there was no allocation made towards health promotion and prevention activities (outputs 088101, 088105 and 088106), pages 19 and 20 of the LG Approved Annual Budget for the FY 2019/2020 and page 50 of the Annual Budget Performance report, FY 2019/2020</p>	0
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.</p> <p>The review of the minutes of MHT performance review meeting held on 3rd October 2019 showed that under MIN.04/10/2019: Way forward, the meeting recommended that the HMT should carry out monitoring of outreach sites, schools and health units for child days.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</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 of follow—up actions taken by the MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues.</p> <p>The evidence was established in the minutes of performance review meeting, held on 30th August 2019 (MIN.01/08/2019: communication from the Ag. MMOH)) revealed that garbage truck was grounded and garbage was becoming a problem.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report on garbage collection, health education, disease prevention and social mobilization in Ibanda MC showed that information dissemination on proper solid waste management was done by the Principal Health Inspector.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				

**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>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 Assets register for 2019/2020.</p> <p>The AT reviewed the Board of Survey report for 2019/2020 (July 2020) which set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. For instance, the following were indicated: asset description, facility/ location, quantity, condition and remarks.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>No records were presented pertaining to desk appraisal of projects implemented under the Health sector.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>		
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Environment and Social screening of projects before implementation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of staff houses at Ruhoko HC IV in Kagongo division was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer and 6th October, 2020 by the CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV in Kagongo division was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> </ul> <p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe H C III, was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer and 6th October, 2020 by the CDO</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of site reports prepared by the Environment officer and CDO.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The sector submitted its procurement plan for projects FY 2020-21 to PDU worth 80,595,646 for rehabilitation of staff houses.</p> <p>The projects were incorporated the LG procurement plan that was submitted further for approval to PPDA on 10th August 2020 by a cover letter Ref. CR/IMC/105/1 . The projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of a staff house at Ruhoko HC IV had a report dated 3rd October, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV had a report dated 3rd October, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> </ul>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>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>The procurement requisition for the sector FY 2020-21 was submitted to PDU in time by 13th August 2020</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee for example;</p> <p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe H/CIII, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to BAFA and sons establishment ltd at Ugx. 18,081,470.</p> <p>The project evaluation report was approved on 5th December 2019</p> <p>The contracts committee approved the award 6th Dec, 2019 under CC/02/6/12/2019</p> <p>The contract agreement was signed on 28th of Jan, 2020</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The PIT for health projects for the rehabilitation of Busheshe H/C III general ward was appointed by TC on 3rd Dec, 2019. The members include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Town clerk- Monday JB</li> <li>2. EO- Mr Barigye A</li> <li>3. PCDO- Mr Twinomujuni</li> <li>4. Assistant Engineer- Mr Mugisha Robert</li> </ol> <p>Head of department - Mr Barebereho JB</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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The assessment team visited Busheshe H/C III (the only project of the year in assessment) to assess the works under rehabilitation; however, it was one of the long-existed facilities before 2018 when the current designs were in force.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, the contractor adhered to the engineers' specifications in BOQs, the work included replacing wooden pillars with concrete, splash apron, ceiling boards, glasses, Painting etc. The ward was well completed, painted with smoke gray skirt and off-white paint on the upper wall; The work had not developed any defects. The measurement for the main entrance door was (1.1x2.0) m Windows (1.17x145) The ramp was 1.4m wide.</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The TC appointed the Assistant engineer as clerk of works for rehabilitation of Busheshe general ward. But there was only one report dated 26th March, 2020 indicating the progress and scope of work</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no site meetings minutes or report highlighting the relevant technical officers involved; However, the only joint monitoring report dated 21st September, 2020 indicating mitigation measures that were not addressed</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works health infrastructure projects at least on monthly basis. The project commenced on 28th Jan, 2020 and was completed on 26th March2020.</p> <p>The engineer visited the site on 26th Feb, 2020; again, another technical team visited the site on 26th March, 2020 to inspect on completion.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MHO approved infrastructure investments for the previous FY for example;</p> <p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe HC III, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to M/S BAFA and Sons establishment ltd at Ugx. 18,081,470.</p> <p>The MHO started the process by initiating and submission of plan and requests to PDU by 29th July, 2019.</p> <p>Then the MHO along with other certifying officers like PCDO, EO, ME, and TC approved payments certificates on 26th March, 2020</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The rehabilitation of general ward at Busheshe H/CIII, Ref. IMC/791/WRKS/2019-20/00009 was contracted to M/S BAFA and Sons Establishment Ltd at Ugx. 18,081,470.</p> <p>The user department- MHO started the process by initiating and submission of plan and requests to PDU by 29th July 2019.</p> <p>The project evaluation report was approved on 5th December 2019</p> <p>The contracts committee approved the award 6th Dec, 2019</p> <p>The contract agreement was signed on 28th of Jan, 2020</p> <p>Certificate of completion to authorize payments was approved by MHO, PCDO, EO, ME, and TC and payments were made on 26th March 2020.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The projects implemented under the Health sector never attracted any grievances hence no recording of grievances during the FY under review.. Therefore, there was no evidence to show that the LG had recorded, investigated, responded and reported on health grievances as per the grievance redress framework .</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>			

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 guidelines were disseminated on waste management for example Approaches to Health care waste management and Medical waste management were disseminated on 3rd April, 2020 by the principal health inspector.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a functional system for medical waste management and a registered waste management service provider for example;</p> <p>There was an incinerator at Ruhoko HC IV and a registered service provider Upendo cleaning services limited which collects waste.</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 training was conducted and awareness created on health care waste management for example;</p> <p>Training on solid waste management was held on 20th October, 2020 by the Principal health inspector.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of incorporation of Environment and social management plans into the BoQs for example;</p> <p>Procurement No IMC791/Wrks/2019/2020 /00006 was for Rehabilitation of a general ward at Bisheshe HC III in Bisheshe division indicated that BoQs item No I was for Environmental action plan and mitigation measures at UGX 200,000.</p>	2

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There was evidence of land ownership where the projects were implemented for example:  Formal consent signed between the MC and Ruhoko management health team concisely giving land for the Construction of a mortuary and staff houses at Ruhoko HC IV.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence of monthly monitoring reports prepared by the Environment Officer and CDO for instance Rehabilitation of a general ward at Bisheshe HC III had reports dated 10th March, 2020 and 25th April, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There was evidence projects were certified before payments were done for instance; Rehabilitation of a general ward at Bisheshe HC III was certified on 28th April, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO and actual payment for the made on 13th May, 2020.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	Was not applicable	0
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Was not applicable	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.  If LG average scores is  a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0  (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Was not applicable	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Was not applicable	0

2	<p>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>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <p>o If within +/-20% score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	Was not applicable	0
2	<p>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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	Was not applicable	0
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: 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>	Was not applicable	0
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: 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 5% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	Was not applicable	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>	Was not applicable	0
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>	Was not applicable	0
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>	Was not applicable	0
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>	Was not applicable	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>	Was not applicable	0
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>	Was not applicable	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	Was not applicable	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	Was not applicable	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	Was not applicable	0
8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	Was not applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	Was not applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	Was not applicable	0

9	Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Was not applicable	0
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:  • If funds were allocated score 3  • If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	Was not applicable	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
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	Was not applicable	0
11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:  Score 4 or else score 0.	Was not applicable	0
11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2	Was not applicable	0

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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Was not applicable	0
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:  Score 3, If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Was not applicable	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 2, If not score 0

Was not  
applicable

0

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>	Was not applicable	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	Was not applicable	0
2	<p>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 – 69%; score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%; score 0</li> </ul> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	Was not applicable	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	Was not applicable	0



3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Was not applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Was not applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	Was not applicable	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	Was not applicable	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Was not applicable	0

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

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
	Maximum score 4			

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
	Maximum score 4			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	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	Was not applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

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

### Human Resource Management and Development

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

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0

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

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>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>Was not applicable</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</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>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>Was not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Was not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

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

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Was not applicable	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	Was not applicable	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	Was not applicable	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>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>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0
2	<p>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>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Was not applicable</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</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	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Was not applicable	0

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.

Was not applicable

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



1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	0 Position was vacant but advertised on 16th November,2020 in the New vision
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	20 Ndyanabo William on 20th January, 2014 was appointed under DSC Min. No.63(b)/12/2013(i)

1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was Vacant but advertised on 16th November,2020 in the New vision</p>	0
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence Environmental and social screening was carried out for the current FY projects for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of staff houses at Ruhoko HC IV in Kagongo division was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer, Barigye Haron and 6th October, 2020 by the CDO, Tumusiime Josephat.</li> <li>• Construction of a mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV in Kagongo division was screened on 1st October, 2020 by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> </ul>	15
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of ESIAs reports prepared by the Environment officer and CDO for the projects for example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of a staff house at Ruhoko HC IV had a report dated 3rd October, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• Construction of a mortuary at Ruhoko HC IV had a report dated 3rd October, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ul>	15
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:  <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.	Abakunda Johnson was appointed on transfer of service from Ibanda DLG to Ibanda Municipal Council on 26th February, 2020 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 168 (C)/02/2020) as Education officer. The Acting Municipal Education Officer was assigned duties of Municipal Education Officer on 29th August, 2020 via letter CR/IMC/151/1 by the Town Clerk.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:  <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Ibanda Municipal Local Government had substantively recruited for the Education Inspectorate;  • Twimukye Robert the Municipal Inspector of Schools was appointed on 29th May, 2017 under DSC Min. No. 22 (a)/05/2017 by letter Ref. CR/IMC/156/5.  • Twesigye Rosety the Assistant Inspector of Schools was appointed on 10th September, 2019 under DSC Min. No. 142 (i)/08/2019 by letter CR/IMC/160/2..	40
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)  <i>The Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence Environmental and social screening was carried out for the only one project that was implemented in the previous FY for Education by Environment Officer and CDO for instance;  Completion of a 3-classroom block and office at Mukara primary school was screened on 6th September, 2019 by the CDO and 4th January, 2020 by the Environment Officer.	15

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

If the LG carried out:

b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs), score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence of preparation of the ESIAs report for the implemented projects dated 5th January, 2020 with attachments of the checklist signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Tumwesigye Godie Biita the acting Principal finance officer is a Senior Finance officer who was appointed on 26th February, 2020 under DSC Min. No. 66(a)/02/2020. He was assigned duties of a Principal Finance Officer by the Town Clerk on 17th November, 2020.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Buzabo Mark on 10th September, 2019 was appointed a Municipal Planner under DSC Min. No. 142(c)/08/2019	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Natuhwera K. Juliet the acting Principal Engineer officer is an Assistant Engineer (water) who was appointed on 6th May, 2018 under DSC min. No. 64(y)/02/2018. She was assigned duties of Principal Engineer officer on 17th November, 2020 by Town clerk.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Position was not in the approved staff structure	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	position was not in the approved staff structure	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	Twinomujuni Claire was appointed on 4th June, 2018 as a MCDO under DSC Min. No. 80(n)/05/2018.	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer,  score 3 or else 0	Tugume Deo was appointed on 6th August, 2019 under DSC Min. No. 126/06/2019 as a Principal Commercial Officer	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	Kato Christopher was appointed as a Municipal Procurement Officer on 29th December, 2016 under DSC Min. No. 92(c)/02/2016.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	Position was vacant but had been advertised on 16th November, 2020	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer,  score 2 or else 0	Muhumuza Ambrose was appointed on 29th November, 2016 under DSC Min. No. 92(b)/12//2016.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	Position not in the staff structure	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	Sunday Gordon was appointed on 8th July, 2020 under DSC Min. No. DSC/176(l)/06/2020	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Position was Vacant	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	Mujuni John Baptist was appointed as SIA on 26th February, 2020 under DSC Min. No. 166(b)/02/2020.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Musunguzi David was appointed on 9th May, 2015 under Min No. 23(d)/05/2015	2

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,  
score 5 or else 0

There was evidence of recruiting the Division Senior Assistant Town Clerks as indicated below;

- Musinguzi Robert Tibesesa was appointed on 6th January, 2020 under DSC Min. No. 154(c)/12/2019 as Bisheshe Division Senior Assistant Town clerk
- Kebirungi Rose was appointed on 29th May, 2019 under DSC Min. No. 22(c)(i)/05/2017 as Kagongo Division Senior Assistant Town clerk
- Kebiita Lillian Tracy was appointed on 29th May, 2017 under DSC Min No. 22(c)(iii)/05/2017 as Bufunda Division Senior Assistant Town clerk.

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

There was evidence of recruiting the Division Senior CDO as indicated below;

- Komugisha Annah Komuhangi was appointed on 29th May, 2019 under DSC Min. No. 92(g)/12/2016.
- Kyomuzinga Sharon was appointed on 2nd June, 2017 under DSC Min. No. 32(a)/06/2017.
- Barigye Frank Eliab was appointed on 2nd June, 2017 under DSC Min. No. 32(a)/06/2017



2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of recruiting the Division Senior Accounts Assistants as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mbabazi Sarah was appointed on 8th July, 2020 under Min. No. 176(a)/06/2020.</li> <li>• Tumwetabe Benoni was appointed on 8th July, 2020 DSC Min. No. 176(a)/06/2020</li> <li>• Asimwe Elizabeth was appointed 19th September, 2018 under Min. No. 88(b)/08/2020.</li> </ul>	5
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The cumulative release for Natural Resource was UGX 60,672,604 as at 30th June, 2020 against the same amount as warranted on page 10 of the Ibanda MC draft final accounts.</p>	2
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The cumulative release for Community Based Services was UGX 77,166,878 as at 30th June, 2020 against the same amount as warranted on page 10 of Ibanda draft final accounts.</p>	2

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.

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0

There was evidence Environmental and social screening was carried out for the projects implemented using DDEG for example;

- Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Butanda primary school in Butanda division was screened on 10th September, 2019 by the CDO Tumusiime Josephat and 20th January, 2020 by the Environment Officer BarigyeHaron.
- Construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine at St. George's Demo primary school in Kagongo division was screened on 20th January, 2020 by the Environment Officer and 10th September, 2019 by the CDO.
- Construction of a drainage channel along Kibuhura road was screened on 14th January, 2020 by the Environment Officer and 10th September, 2019 by the CDO.
- Construction of a fero-cement water tank at Nyakatokye HC II in Kagongo division was screened on 8th January, 2020 by the Environment Officer and 4th September, 2019 by the CDO.

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

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

There was evidence ESIAs was carried out for the DDEG projects and reports were signed by the Environment Officer and CDO for example;

- Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Bufunda primary school had a report dated 22nd January, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.
- Construction of a drainage channel along Kibuhura road had a report dated 15th January, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.
- Construction of a ferro-cement tank at Nyakatokye HC II in Kagongo division had a report dated 13th January, 2020 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.

4

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

score 4 or 0

There was evidence that the MC costed ESMPs for the projects implemented using DDEG for example;

- Construction of Bufunda primary school and St. George's primary school had costed for ESMPs at UGX 300,000.
- Construction of a drainage channel along Kibuhura road had costed for ESMPs at UGX 2,737,000.
- Construction of a ferro-cement water tank at Nyakatokye HC II had costed for ESMPs to UGX 100,000.

4

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Awaits for the audit opinion from OAG on the Financial Statements for FY 2019/2020 due by end of December, 2020</p>	0
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>Ibanda Municipality provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2018/2019 on 13th December, 2019 under ref. CR/IMC/106/4 and was acknowledged on 23rd December, 2019 by stamping.</p> <p>For the same period, the Municipality provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Auditor General's findings for the same FY 2018/2019 on 28th February, 2019 and acknowledged on 16th March, 2020 by stamping.</p> <p>Both submissions were made before end of February, 2020 as required by PFMA s.11 2g, for this matter, the Municipality was compliant with the law.</p>	10
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 Municipal submitted its annual performance contract for FY 2020/2021 on 8th June, 2020 to the MoFPED and was acknowledged by the Office of the Commissioner Budget on 21st July, 2020 by stamping on the hard copy.</p> <p>The submission was within the time frame of before 31st August set in the Manual and for this reason it was compliant.</p>	4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Municipal Council submitted online using Program Based System the Annual Performance Report for FY 2019/2020 to MoFPED on 31st July, 2020. The submission was made before 31st August therefore the Municipal was compliant with the time frame set in the Manual for the submission.</p>	4
9	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Ibanda MC submitted all the four Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2019/2020 as follows: 1st Quarter on 28th November, 2019, 2nd Quarter on 5th February, 2020, 3rd Quarter on 24th April, 2020 and 4th Quarter on 31st July, 2020.</p> <p>As all the submissions were made before 31st August, 2020, the Council was compliant.</p>	4