



LGMSD 2021/22

Nansana Municipal
Council

(Vote Code: 779)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 90% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 73% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 59% |
| Health Performance Measures | 66% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 0% |

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that the following infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s) as per design/profile</p> <p>The following are the projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Staff House at Nabutiti Health Centre III was 100% complete and functional as per Completion Certificate No.2 of 27th Apr. 2022 and on Pg. 68 of the Performance Contract . It costed UGX 99,921,000. 2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi skilling centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.2 dated 27th Apr. 2022 and on Pg. 110 of the Performance Contract. 3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.1 dated 27th Jan. 2022 and Pg. 84 of the Performance Contract. | 4 |

Service Delivery
Performance

Maximum 6 points on
this performance
measure

a. If the average score
in the overall LLG
performance
assessment increased
from previous
assessment :

o by more than 10%:
Score 3

o 5-10% increase:
Score 2

o Below 5 % Score 0

Assessment of LLGs was began
in 2021/2022 in Nansana M/C
which provided baseline average
of 79.5% For the 4 LLGs

The indicator will be scored in
2022/2023 when comparative
figures are available

The baseline scores are as
follows:

1. Nansana Division 81%
2. Busukuma Division 80%
3. Gombe Division 78%
4. Nabweru Division 79%

Average 79.5%

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

There was evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were 100% completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.

The following are the projects:

1. Construction of Staff House at Nabutiti Health Centre III was 100% complete and functional as per Completion Certificate No.2 of 27th Apr. 2022 and on Pg. 68 of the Performance Contract . It costed UGX 99,921,000.

2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi skilling centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.2 dated 27th Apr. 2022 and on Pg. 110 of the Performance Contract.

3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.1 dated 27th Jan. 2022 and Pg. 84 of the Performance Contract.

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.

There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

The annual budget for DDEG capital development budget for the Municipal H/Q was 326,839,000 (Pg. 6 of the approved budget) which was completely spent as follows:

1. Construction of Staff H. Construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre III at UGX 99,921,000;
2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi skilling centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000; and
3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000

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

There was evidence that the variations in priced projects funded under DDEG for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the Engineers estimate. The sampled projects were:

Project 1: Project: Refurbishment of Council toilets system (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00019.

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 26,000,000
- Contract sum: UGX 25,987,063
- Percentage variation: - 0.05%

HEALTH

Project 1: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006.

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 99,921,000
- Contract sum of UGX 109,651,700
- Percentage variation: + 9.74%

NATURAL RESOURCE

Project: Supply, Planting and maintenance of tree seedlings within identified health centres, identified road sections and school facilities (DDEG funding). NANS779/SUPLS/2021-22/00024.

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 48,912,495
- Contract sum: UGX 48,901,560
- Percentage variation: 0.02%

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 the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is not accurate.

The three LLGs of Nabweru, Nansana and Gombe Divisions were sampled to establish the accuracy of information on filled positions.

1. Nabweru Division. The staff list from HR division provided matched the list of 21 staff presented by the Town Clerk at the Division with key positions of extension staff filled.

2. Nansana Division staff list from the HR division had 25 staff though there was no extension staff since the one in placed had just retired.

3. Gombe Division. The HR division provided a list of 30 staff matching the number displayed at the notice board at the Division with key position of extension staff filled.

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.

Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0

There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG were in place as per reports produced by the LG:

1. Construction of Staff H. Construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre III was 100% complete and in place as per Completion Certificate No.2 of 27th Apr. 2022 (at UGX 99,921,000 and on Pg. 68 of the Performance Contract

2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi skilling centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.2 dated 27th Apr. 2022 and Pg. 110 of the Performance Contract.

3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000 was 100% complete and functional as Completion Certificate No.2 dated 27th Jan. 2022 and Pg. 84 of the Performance Contract.

Human Resource Management and Development

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY 2023/2024 for different sectors amounting to UGX 21,125,043,226= to MoPS by September 30th, as per letter Ref CRM/152/1 dated 27th/9/2022 with copies to respective MDAs and MoFPED.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the Municipal LG had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as guided by MoPS CSI. Presented for verification were the tracking and analysis for the following months:-

- May,2022; April,2022; March,2022; February,2022; January,2022; December,2021; November,2021; October,2021; September,2021 and August,2021.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

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

FY: Score 1 or else 0

Evidence provided showed that some HODs had been appraised late as per dates indicated below;

- Principal Treasurer Finance department was appraised on the 20th/7/2022
- Senior Planner Planning unit no appraisal report presented
- Principal Engineer works department was appraised on the 1st/8/2022
- Senior Environment Officer Natural resources department was appraised on the 9th/7/2022
- Senior Veterinary Officer Production and marketing department was appraised on the 7th/7/2022
- Principal Community Development Officer Community based services department no date of appraisal indicated
- Senior Internal Auditor Audit section was appraised on the 8th/11/2022
- Municipal Education Officer Education department appraised on the 4th/11/2022
- Principal Medical Officer appraised on the 7th/7/2022

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 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 was evidence that the administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented on time. The committee was constituted on the 15th/3/2020 as per letter Ref CRM/112/8.</p> <p>The committee in the FY being assessed sat for one quarter on 25th/2/2022 to handle mostly issues of abscondment and absenteeism from duty by staff in the departments of health and education.</p> | 1 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Consultative Committee for staff grievance was constituted on 29th/4/2022 as per letter Ref. CRM/212/3 appointing 10 members. The committee was functional as per minutes regarding complaints for overtime work dated 14/7/2021.</p> | 1 |

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.

The Municipal Council recruited 55 staff for various sectors. A sample of 5 newly recruited staff was taken to verify whether 100% accessed salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. All the 5 sampled had accessed payroll within two months.

NAME. IPPS No. Post Name.
Date of App Date of accessing payroll.

Nakandi Bridget 1150671 Town Agent 19/1/2022 Date of assumption of duty 2/3/2022 April, 28 2022

Brian Sseruuma 1150678 Town Agent 19/1/2022 assumption of duty 11/3/2022 access to payroll April, 28 2022

Otukene Patrick 1150680 Town Agent 19/1/2022 date of assumption of duty 28/2/2022; access to payroll April, 28 2022

Nsubuga P Desire 1150659 Educ Officer 28/2/2022 date of assumption of duty 9/3/2022 access to pay April, 28 2022

Nakintu Grace 1150657 Stenographer secretary 3/3/2022 date of assumption of duty 5/3/2022 access to payroll April, 28 2022

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.

Twelve (12) staff of the local
government retired in FY
2021/2022. None of those who
retired accessed pension payroll
within two months.

No Name Date of retirement
Month appeared

1 Sserubambula Ronald 2/9/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

2 Natume Juliet 14/2/2022
Appeared in June Payroll

3 Mayanja 5/5/2019 Appeared in
June Payroll

4 Okwakol Patrick 21/1/2022
Appeared in June Payroll

5 Ddungu Gogfrey 4/10/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

6 Mulondo Michael 28/1/2022
Appeared in June Payroll

7 Apeduno Loyce 2/9/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

8 Dhikusooka Mary 2/9/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

9 Babirye Mouren Estate of the
late Juuko David 8/7/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

10 Kagwire Robert 1/9/2021
Appeared in June Payroll

11 Ddamba Samuel 7/6/2020
Appeared in June Payroll

12 Kiige 23/4/2021 Appeared in
June Payroll

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY.</p> <p>The annual DDEG budget for the district was UGX 1,011,974,000 (Pg. 6 of the approved budget) out of which UGX 524,139,000 was allocated to LLGs and disbursed in-full as follows: Quarter-1 Cash Limits were received on 6th Jul. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was transferred to LLGs on 5th Aug. 2021; and Q2 funds were received on 20th Oct. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was transferred to LLGs on 22nd Oct 2021; Q3 funds were received on 25th Jan 2022 and UGX 174,713,042 was transferred to LLGs on 26th Jan. 2022.</p> <p>A total of UGX 524,139,000 was disbursed representing 100% remittance.</p> <p>The following LLGs benefited during the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Nansana Division UGX 189,881,000 2 Nabweru Division UGX 147,581,000 3 Gombe Division UGX 114,808,000 4 Busukuma Division UGX 71,869,000 <p>Total UGX 524,139,000 (100%)</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on</p> | <p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the</p> | <p>The LG did not do timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget</p> | 0 |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| this Performance Measure | requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED): | The annual DDEG budget for the district was UGX 1,011,974,000 (Pg. 6 of the approved budget) out of which UGX 524,139,000 was allocated to LLGs and warranted as follows: |
|--------------------------|---|---|

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Score: 2 or else score 0 | <p>Quarter-1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was warranted (Warrant No.779AW-2022-4) to LLGs on 22nd Jul. 2021 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was warranted (Warrant No.779AW-2022-10) to LLGs on the same day on 20th Oct 2021 (within 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and UGX 174,713,042 was warranted (Warrant No.779AW-2022-16) to LLGs on the same day 25th Jan. 2022 (within 5 working days).</p> |
|--------------------------|---|

A total of UGX 524,139,000 was disbursed representing 100% remittance.

The following LLGs benefited during the year:

1 Nansana Division UGX 189,881,000

2 Nabweru Division UGX 147,581,000

3 Gombe Division UGX 114,808,000

4 Busukuma Division UGX 71,869,000

Total UGX 524,139,000 (100%)

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

The LG did not invoice or communicate ALL DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each

0

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:

Score 2 or else score 0

quarter, this was analyzed as follows:

The annual DDEG budget for the district was UGX 1,011,974,000 (Pg. 6 of the approved budget) out of which UGX 524,139,000 was allocated to LLGs and transferred in-full as follows:

Quarter-1 Cash Limits were received on 6th Jul. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was invoiced to LLGs on 5th Aug. 2021 (beyond 5 working days);

Quarter-2 funds were received on 20th Oct. 2021 and UGX 174,713,042 was invoiced to LLGs on 22nd Oct 2021 (within 5 working days);

Quarter-3 funds were received on 25th Jan 2022 and UGX 174,713,042 was invoiced to LLGs on the same day 25th Jan. 2022 (within 5 working days).

A total of UGX 524,139,000 was disbursed representing 100% remittance.

The following LLGs benefited during the year:

1 Nansana Division UGX
189,881,000

2 Nabweru Division UGX
147,581,000

3 Gombe Division UGX
114,808,000

4 Busukuma Division UGX
71,869,000

Total UGX 524,139,000 (100%)

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG had supervised and mentored all LLGs at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:

The following reports were verified in the Planners Officer;

Quarter-1: the mentorship and supervision report dated 20th Sep. 2021 was available;

Quarter-2. the mentorship and supervision report dated 2nd Nov. 2021 was available;

Quarter-3. the mentorship and supervision report dated 11th Mar. 2022 was available; and

Quarter-4. the mentorship and supervision reports dated 13th/June/2022 and 17th/June/2022 were in place

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the district to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up

-Quarter-1 there were no field visits, support supervision or monitoring visits conducted;

-Quarter-2 Monitoring Report dated 2nd Nov. 2021 had not been discussed by TPC

-Quarter-3 Monitoring Report of 11th Mar. 2022 was not discussed by TPC

-Quarter-4 Monitoring Report of 13th Jun. 2022 was discussed in the TPC of 21st Jun. 2022 under Agenda No. 6, Minute No. 071/06/2022

Matters discussed included:

-need for grading and spreading of gravel on slippery section of Wamala Road

-recommend stone pitching on Maganjo – Jinja Karoli Road

-recommended construction of staff quarters at Kabonge P/S

-Stop the construction of fecal sludge at Mmenvu Solid Waste land

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0

There was evidence that The District maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual.

Below is an extract derived from the summary of the register:

Land UGX 11,892,463,900.00

Non-Residential buildings UGX 6,049,982,162.00

Roads and bridges UGX 57,333,731,740.00

Transport equipment – motor UGX 2,434,488,960.00

vehicles

Machinery and equipment UGX 14,450,000.00

Furniture and fittings UGX 227,047,590.00

ICT Equipment UGX 356,329,546.00

Medical Equipment UGX 120,572,500

Office Equipment UGX 20,100,000

Other Assets UGX 0.00

Total value of physical assets UGX 78,449,166,398.00

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the Municipality had 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.

A copy of BoS survey produced on 29th Aug 2022 was available and was verified (Ref. CR/108/01 signed by three members)

The report contained 7 recommendations on Pg 5 (including disposals) and one had been implemented,

The recommendation that the MC should process the transfer all its land titles; the current status was that land titling had begun as evidenced by a requisition letter dated 18th/Oct/22 request to facilitate lease title for Mattuga Health Centre and Maganjjo in Gombe Division and Nabweru respectively.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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.

There was evidence that LG had a functional physical planning committee in place which had submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD during the previous FY

-The LG had submitted only 4-sets of minutes for meetings conducted on the following days:

-Q1 minutes for the meeting held on 21st Aug. 2021;

-Q2 minutes for the meeting held on 21st Oct. 2021 and 9th Dec. 2021;

-Q3 minutes for the meeting held on 23rd Feb 2022; and

-Q4 minutes for the meeting held on 17th Jun. 2022 were all submitted to MoLHUD, Kampala on 8th Nov. 2022 vide forwarding letter of the Town Clerk of 7th Nov. 2022 (unreferenced).

The physical planning committee was fully composed with all the 7-Members in place (7 appointment letters were verified)

Building Plans Registration book was in place and verified. The register It was opened on 1st Jul. 2020, and was last updated on 14th Oct 2022

The committee has never submitted any Physical Development Plan that was approved by Council to the National Physical Planning Board ON 29th Aug. 2019 Ref. CRM/202/2.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d. For DDEG financed projects;

Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the M/C has conducted a desk appraisal for all DDEG projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and DDEG funding source.

Nansana M/C had only three development projects under DDEG in that FY:

1. Construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre III at UGX 99,921,000 was desk appraised on 4th Feb. 2020 and derived from Pg. 276 of the LGDP-III

2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi Skilling Centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000 was desk appraised on 4th Feb. 2020 and derived from Pg. 293 of the LGDP-III

3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000 was desk appraised on 4th Feb. 2020 and derived from Pg. 181 of the LGDP-III

All appraisal reports were signed off by the members including: Senior Planner, MEO, Supervisor of works, Natural Resources Officer, CDO and MHO

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

For DDEG financed projects:

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was 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.

A field appraisal report dated 24th Jun. 2021 prepared by the Municipal Engineer and signed by the CDO, Environmental Officer and three others was available and verified for the following projects:

1. Construction of Staff H. Construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre III at UGX 99,921,000
2. Completion of (Phase-II) construction works at Kasozi Skilling Centre in Busukuma Division at UGX 200,000,000
3. Renovation of the Nansana Municipal H/Q at UGX 26,918,000

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0.

There was 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

The projects for FY 2022/23 included the following:

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with furniture at Buso Muslim P/S in Busukuma Division and renovation of Kanyange P/S at UGX 85,000,000 derived from Pg. 35 of the approved budget and discussed by the TPC on 22nd Feb. 2022, Agenda No. 6, Minute No. 044/02/2022
2. Construction of staff quarters at Nabitale P/S -Busukuma Division, Jinja Karoli P/S -Nabweru Div, Kijuude P/S -Busukuma Div. at UGX 95,000,000 from Pg. 35 of the approved Budget
3. Construction of 5-Stance Pit Latrines in Nansana CoU P/S and Nabinene P/S at UGX 48,000,000 derived from Pg. 35 of the approved Budget

These were all discussed by the TPC on 22nd Feb. 2022, Agenda No. 6, Minute No. 044/02/2022

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 12 | 2 | <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>There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before projects funded by the DDEG are approved for construction for the current FY (2022-2023 as exemplified by a letter of submission of ESMP for proposed construction of the following projects to the Town Clerk by the DSEO, dated 16/8/2022.</p> |
| | | | <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of energy saving stoves in in Kabonge P/S, Kabonge village, Busukuma division. 2. Construction of energy saving stoves at Nansana SDA P/S, Nansana division; and 3. Upgrading of Gombe headquarters road to bitumen. |
| 13 | 1 | <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>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the approved procurement plan. There were a total of 4 projects. These included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply and planting of tree seedlings on page 22/28 of procurement plan 2. Supply and construction of energy saving stoves on page 22/28 of procurement plan 3. Titling of municipal assets on page 22/28 of procurement plan 4. Consultancy services for the design of Gombe HQ road on page 16/28 of procurement plan |
| | | | <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | |

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence the contracts committee approved all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG funding as follows:

Project 1: Consultancy services for the design of Gombe HQ road. The CC sat on 31st October 2022 under the 2nd CC sitting under minute number 052/CC/002/2022-2023. This was signed on 1st November 2022. Chairperson – Mrs. Sengendo Hadijah Mukasa and Lukwago Charles as secretary.

Project 2: Construction of 4 institutional energy saving stoves in selected Govt aided schools . The CC sat on 31st October 2022 under the 2nd CC sitting under minute number 053/CC/002/2022-2023. This was signed on 1st November 2022. Chairperson – Mrs. Sengendo Hadijah Mukasa and Lukwago Charles as secretary.

Project 3: Improvement of aesthetic view by planting trees along Kiryangonja-Kasalirwe-Nasse-ssanga Road 4.3 km . The CC sat on 31st October 2022 under the 2nd CC sitting under minute number 056/CC/002/2022-2023. This was signed on 1st November 2022. Chairperson – Mrs. Sengendo Hadijah Mukas and Lukwago Charles as secretary.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

There no was evidence on file that the LG fully established the required Project Implementation team for the various projects in the different sectors as listed below: In all the sectors assessed there was no Clerk of Works included on the list.

NATURAL RESOURCE DEPARTMENT

Project: Supply, Planting and maintenance of tree seedlings within identified health centres, identified road sections and school facilities (DDEG funding).

The letter dated 11th May 2022 from the Town Clerk (Byabagambi Francis) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

GENERAL (Administration Department)

Project: Refurbishment of Council toilets system (DDEG funding)

The letter dated 26th September 2021 from the Town Clerk (Byabagambi Francis) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

HEALTH

Project: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding)

- The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;
- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian

- Environment officer:
Nalumansi Stella

EDUCATION

Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S (SFG funding)

The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer:
Nalumansi Stella

Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom block and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/& school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding)

The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer:
Nalumansi Stella

Project 3: Completion of 4 staff house modified with a store and shade at Kanyange Primary School under Nabweru Division

The letter dated 4th April 2022 from the Town Clerk (Byabagambi Francis) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng.

- Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
 - Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

**TRADE, INDUSTRY AND
LOCAL ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT**

Project: Construction of a skilling centre/shelter for vulnerable youths and temporary shelter for domestic violence victims at Kasozi in Busukuma Division (DDEG funding)

The letter dated 25th September 2021 from the Town Clerk (Byabagambi Francis) appointed the following PIT members;

- Superintendent of Works: Mukasa Wilber Herman
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that projects implemented using DDEG funds followed the technical designs by the Municipality Engineer. The sampled and visited projects was:

Project 1 : Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding)

External building dimensions:
15.7m x 11.0m

Lounge (Sitting room): 5.19m x 3.6m

The building was under construction at the time of assessment. Poor workmanship was observed resulting in honeycombs on beams and columns.

Project 2: Construction of a skilling centre/shelter for vulnerable youths and temporary shelter for domestic violence victims at Kasozi in Busukuma Division (DDEG funding).

External building dimensions:
15.8m x 14.1m

Selected room dimensions

Training area: 5.0m x 4.1m

Director's Office: 3.25m x 3.28m

Windows dimensions/size: 1.5m x 1.5m

Immunisation room size: 3.1 m by 2.45m

Minor defects noted are soaked wall at the front, peeling of paint on the wall in the training room and broken manhole cover.

The measured dimensions were as per the drawings provided by the Municipal Engineer.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence on file that the relevant technical officers supervised each project prior to verification of the works. Sample site meeting minutes found on file are listed below;

1. The Construction of a staff house at Kabonge CoU P/S which took place on April 14, 2022 at 11:00 am and was attended by Principal Assistant Town Clerk, ME, MEO, Principal CDO, EO and Contractor's representative.

2. The Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kanyange P/S which took place on May 18, 2022 at 10:00 am and was attended by Principal Assistant Town Clerk, ME, MEO, Principal CDO, EO, Headteacher of Kanyange P/S and Contractor's representative.

3. The Construction of a skilling centre at Kasozi which took place on March 18, 2022 at 11:00 am and was attended by Principal Assistant Town Clerk, ME, Principal CDO, EO, and Contractor's representative.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG has verified some works (certified) and initiated payments of some of the contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement) for previous FY as follows:

ADMINISTRATION

Project 1: Project: Refurbishment of Council toilets system (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00019. Contract signed on 6th January 2022.

Contractor's requisition: BAMJA INVESTMENTS LIMITED request was on 27th January 2022

amounting to UGX 25,987,063. This was signed and forwarded by Municipal Engineer (27th January 2022); Town Clerk (1st February 2022); Internal Auditor (8th February 2022) and Municipal Engineer (8th February 2022)

Certificate No.1: provided on 27th January 2022 was signed by the Municipal Engineer, Ag. Deputy Town Clerk and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 24,687,710 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 25,987,062 (including VAT) was initiated on 22nd February 2022 and payment was made on 3rd March 2022 under voucher No. 42069069 . This lies within the required contract period for payment.

EDUCATION

Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 (SFG funded). Contract signed on 20th January 2022.

Contractor's requisition: SKYLIGHT GENERAL SERVICES LIMITED request was on 4th April 2022 amounting to UGX 50,000,00. This was signed and forwarded by Engineering Assistant (12th April 2022); Municipal Engineer (21st April 2022), Municipal Education Officer (26th April 2022) and Town Clerk.

Certificate No.1: provided on 11th April 2022 was signed by the Assistant Engineering Officer, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Principal CDO and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 53,639,514 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 47,457,627 (including VAT) was initiated on 9th May 2022 and payment was made on 13th June 2022 under voucher No. 43886196 . This lies within the required contract period for payment.

Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom blocks and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/7 school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00001. Contract signed on 23rd May 2022

Contractor's requisition: P&D TRADERS AND CONTRACTORS LTD request was on 6th June 2022 amounting to UGX 82,415,300. This was not signed by either Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer and Town Clerk.

Certificate No.1: provided on 2nd June 2022 was signed by the Assistant Engineering Officer, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Environment Officer, Principal CDO and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 78,294,535 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 77,572,940 (including VAT) was payment was made on 24th June 2022 under voucher No. 44529976 . This lies within the required contract period for payment

TRADE, INDUSTRY AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Project: Construction of a skilling centre/shelter for vulnerable youths and temporary shelter for domestic violence victims at Kasozi in Busukuma Division (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00004. Contract signed on 5th November 2021

Contractor's Requisition: BESTIE HOSTELS LTD request was on 28th February 2021 amounting to UGX 100,639,368. This was signed and forwarded by Municipal Engineer (3rd March 2022); Town Clerk 4th March 2022); Principal CDO, Environmet Officer, Senior Internal Auditor and Town Clerk (7th March 2022) forwards for processing.

Certificate No.1: provided on 2nd March 2022 was signed by the, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Production Officer and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 95,607,400 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 90,746,007 (including VAT) was initiated on 9th March 2022 and payment was made on 11th March 2022 under voucher No. 42138949 . This lies within the required contract period for payment.

13

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

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

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file in place for all contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law for the previous FY projects below as follows:

1

GENERAL: ADMINISTRATION

Project 1: Project: Refurbishment of Council toilets system (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00019. Contract signed on 6th January 2022.

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 26,000,000 LG PP Form 1
- Works Contract signed on 6th January 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 25,987,063 (VAT Inclusive)
- Evaluation Report signed on 30th November 2021.
Chairperson – Eng. Mukasa

Wilber Herman and
Lukwago Charles as
Secretary

- Contracts Committee minutes signed on 2nd December 2021 under Min No: 074/CC/006/2021-2022. Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary

EDUCATION

- Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 (SFG funded). Contract signed on 20th January 2022. Engineer's Estimate: UGX 110,000,000 LG PP Form 1
- Works Contract signed on 20th January 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 94,022,400 (VAT Inclusive) Evaluation Report signed on 2nd December 2021. Chairperson – Eng. Mukasa Wilber Herman and Lukwago Charles as Secretary
Contracts Committee minutes signed on 2nd December 2021 under Min No: 076/CC/006/2021-2022. Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary
-
- Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom blocks and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/7 school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00001. Contract signed on 23rd May 2022
- Engineer's Estimate: UGX

- 85,000,000 LG PP Form 1
- Works Contract signed on 23rd May 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 82,415,300 (VAT Inclusive)
 - Evaluation Report signed on 2nd December 2021. Chairperson – Eng. Mukasa Wilber Herman and Lukwago Charles as Secretary
 - Contracts Committee minutes signed on 2nd December 2021 under Min No: 075/CC/006/2021-2022. Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary
 -
 - Project 3: Completion of 4 staff house modified with a store and shade at Kanyange Primary School under Nabweru Division. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00040. Contract signed on 21st June 2022

Engineer's Estimate: UGX
102,720,500 LG PP Form 1

Works Contract signed on 21st June 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 101,872,350 (VAT Inclusive)

Evaluation Report signed on 17th June 2022. Chairperson – Eng. Mukasa Wilber Herman and Lukwago Charles as Secretary

Contracts Committee minutes signed on 17th June 2022 under Min No: 239/CC/016/2021-2022 . Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary

HEALTH

Project 1: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006. Contract signed on 25th May 2022

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 99,921,000 LG PP Form 1
- Works Contract signed on 25th May 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 109,651,700 (VAT Inclusive)
- Evaluation Report signed on 20th May 2022 .
Chairperson – Eng. Mukasa Wilber Herman and Lukwago Charles as Secretary
- Contracts Committee minutes signed on 23rd May 2022 under Min No: 193/CC/012/2021-2022 .
Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary

NATURAL RESOURCE

Project: Supply, Planting and maintenance of tree seedlings within identified health centres, identified road sections and school facilities (DDEG funding). NANS779/SUPLS/2021-22/00024.

- Engineer's Estimate: UGX 48,912,495 LG PP Form 1
- Works Contract signed on 17TH January 2022. With a contract sum of UGX 48,901,560 (VAT Inclusive)
- Evaluation Report signed on 13th May 2022 .
Chairperson – Kiguli Simon and Lukwago Charles as Secretary
- Contracts Committee minutes signed on 15th June 2022 under Min No: 221/CC/014/2021-2022 .
Chairperson – Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| 14 | 2 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. | There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had designated a person to coordinate response to feedback on grievances/complaints as exemplified by a letter by the Town Clerk, dated 29/4/2021, designating the Senior Community Officer as the Focal Point Person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints). |
| Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | Score: 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) as evidenced by a letter of appointment on the GRC, date 29/4/2021, prepared by the CAO and addressed to 9 committee members. | | |
| 14 | 2 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. | b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. | There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances and had a defined complaints referral path and public display of information at LG offices as the Grievance Redress Complaints Book, opened on 4/6/2021 was available. The notice on Community Grievance and Redress Committee, dated 17/5.2021 and prepared by Chairperson and endorsed by the Town Clerk was displayed on the Municipal Office Noticeboard. |
| Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | If so: Score 2 or else 0 | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties would know where to report and get redress as exemplified by a letter on Communicating Grievance Redress Strategies, dated 23/6/2021, prepared by the GRC Focal person and addressed to all Town Clerks of all divisions.</p> | 1 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence on Pg. 82 and (Appendices on Pages 349-368) that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets these included, modern farming methods, tree planting, wetland demarcation and adoption of energy conservation technologies</p> | 1 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>-A distribution list of DDEG Guidelines to the 4 SA-TCs (Gombe, Nansana, Busukuma & Nabweru) on 10th Mar. 2022</p> | 1 |

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):

c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:

score 3 or else score 0

There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY (2021-2022) as exemplified by the following projects.

1. The ESMP for the construction of out-patient ward (OPD) in Buwambo village, Buwambo parish, Gombe division dated 20/9/2021, endorsed by the SEO and PCDO was reflected in the BoQs no 1.4 on page 38: Environmental aspects - installation of water harvesting tank to adapt to climate change impacts; proper disposal of generated waste, and landscaping and tree planting; and

The ESMP for the construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III, Nabutiti village, Busukuma Division dated 22/9/2021, signed by the SEO and PCDO was reflected in the BoQs no. 3.3 on page 30, Item D: Rain harvesting tanks and in Item I: Fire extinguishers.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.

Score 3 or else score 0

There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had infrastructure projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change for the FY 2021-2022 as the costing of additional climate change impacts was absent in the Costed ESMPs and in the Bills of Quantities (BoQs) of Bidding and Contractual Documents of Successful Bidders for all infrastructure projects..

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that all DDEG projects in Nansana Municipal Council were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability as exemplified by the following Certificates of Titles.

1. Nabutiti Health Centre located at Nabutiti, Mengo district, Kyadondo county, Busukuma sub county, Block 132, Plot 209, Private Mailo land, measuring 1.617 hectares, endorsed by the Registrar of Titles on 15/7/2014; and

2. Rehabilitation and Skilling centre located at Kasozi, Kyadondo, Wakiso District Council, Block 141, Plot 11, Freehold Register Volume WAK 230, Folio 7, Measuring 4.59 hectares, endorsed by the Registrar of Titles on 30/5/2016.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports for the previous FY 2021/2022 as exemplified by Environment and Social monitoring reports for the following projects. The reports were endorsed by the SEO and the PCDO.

1. Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Migadde CoU P/S in Gombe Division, dated 25/5/2022;

2. Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Kanyange P/S in Busukuma Division, dated 24/5/2022; and

3. Rehabilitation and construction of skilling centre of Kasozi Health Centre II, dated 16/3/2022.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that the E & S compliance certification forms at Nansana Municipal Council are completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects as exemplified by the following payment certificates.

1. Interim payment certificate no. 2 for the construction of rehabilitation and skilling centre at Kasozi village, Busukuma Division, endorsed on 20/4/2022;

2. Substantial Completion certificate no. 2 for the construction of box culverts at Kamanya Drainage Channel on Kamanya-Ttula-Kabogozza road under works department, endorsed on 3/11/2022; and

3. Substantial Completion certificate for construction of Nansana-Wamala-Katooke-Jinja Kalooli-Maganjo road to paved standards (1.5 km) under works department, endorsed on 3/11/2022.

Financial management

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

There was no evidence that the
LG makes monthly bank
reconciliations and are up to-date
at the point of time of the
assessment.

By the time of the assessment, no
reconciliations had been made
since July 2022 reportedly
because of systems challenges of
the IFMS.

Bank reconciliations for 30th Jun.
2022 were performed on 11th
Nov. 2022; prepared by Nakabugo
Agnes (Accounts Assistant) and
verified by Sendegeya Habib (an
accountant) on 11th Nov. 2022.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG had produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY

Quarter-I report was produced on 13th Dec. 2021;

Quarter-II report was produced on 30th Jan. 2022;

Quarter-III report was produced on 29th Apr. 2022; and

Quarter-IV report was produced on 29th Jul. 2022.

Some of findings included:

-Non remittance of UGX 17,185,412 local revenue share for Gombe Division

-report on poorly installed culverts at Jinja Karoli Road

-Classroom Block at Nabutiti P/S handed over without electrical installation and lightening arrester

-inconsistencies in performance of local service tax of UGX 24,475,000 between the council register and the IRAS

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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.

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG had provided information to the Council/ chairperson (but not to 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

Quarter-I report was produced on 13th Dec. 2021 and submitted to the Mayor on the same day;

Quarter-II report was produced on 30th Jan. 2022 and submitted to the Mayor on the same day;

Quarter-III report was produced on 29th Apr. 2022 and submitted to the Mayor on the same day; and

Quarter-IV report was produced on 29th Jul. 2022 and submitted to the Mayor on the same day

There was no evidence the the reports had been submitted to LG PAC

All the reports contained status of implementation of previous internal audit findings and recommendations

17

0

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer but NOT to PAC, and had never been discussed PAC

Quarter-I report was produced on 13th Dec. 2021 and submitted to the Town Clerk on the same day;

Quarter-II report was produced on 30th Jan. 2022 and submitted to the Town Clerk on the same day;

Quarter-III report was produced on 29th Apr. 2022 and submitted to the Town Clerk on the same day; and

Quarter-IV report was produced on 29th Jul. 2022 and submitted to the Town Clerk on the same day

All these reports had not been reviewed/discussed by PAC

Local Revenues

18

0

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

The local revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) was -12% which was beyond - 10 %

From Pg 11 of the final accounts - Statement of Appropriations, the district planned to collect UGX 6,175,036,000.00 and only UGX 5,412,194,554.00 was eventually collected representing 88% implying a variance of -12% which is beyond -10%.

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

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

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

- If more than 10 %: score 2.

- If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.

- If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

There was evidence that The LG has increased LG own source revenues by more than 10% in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one) . From Pg. 19 of the final accounts -Statement of Appropriations:

The local revenue performance in FY 2020/2021 was UGX 3,958,940,292.00 and increased by UGX 1,453,254,262.00 to UGX 5,412,194,554.00 representing 37%age increase which is more than 10%

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

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

There was evidence that LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY

The total local revenue realized during the year was UGX 5,412,194,554 (Pg.11 of the Annual Financial Statements) out of which UGX 2,370,544,056 was the component of the sharable revenues:

During the year, the district disbursed the entire UGX 2,370,544,056 (100%) to LLGs representing as follows:

1 Nansana Division UGX
761,362,143

2 Nabweru Division UGX
638,077,554

3 Gombe Division UGX
610,761,498

4 Busukuma Divisiion UGX
360,342,861

Total UGX 2,370,544,056 (100%)

Transparency and Accountability

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that all projects were put on notice boards and have since been pinned over with existing copies in the Procurement files to show; Procurement Reference Number, Subject of Procurement, Method of Procurement. Name of Best Evaluated bidder and Total Contract Price, Date of Display and Date of Removal

GENERAL: ADMINISTRATION

Project 1: Project: Refurbishment of Council toilets system (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00019.

- Contract sum of UGX 25,987,063
- Date of Display: 6th December 2021
- Date of Removal: 17th December 2021

EDUCATION

Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 (SFG funded).

- Contract sum of UGX 94,022,400
- Date of Display: 6th December 2021
- Date of Removal: 17th December 2021

Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom blocks and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/7 school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00001

- Contract sum of UGX 82,415,300
- Date of Display: 6th December 2021
- Date of Removal: 17th December 2021

Project 3: Completion of 4 staff house modified with a store and shade at Kanyange Primary School under Nabweru Division. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00040

- Contract sum of UGX 101,872,350 (Direct Procurement)
- Date of Display: 17th June 2022
- Date of Removal: 20th June 2022

HEALTH

Project 1: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006

- Contract sum of UGX 109,651,700
- Date of Display: 23rd May 2022
- Date of Removal: 24th May 2022

21

2

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications were published for the previous year

The results were placed on notice board on 20th Mat 2022 by the Municipal Planner, the Municipality had scored 56%

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted a radio talk to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation

The district conducted a radio talk shows on accountability and service delivery programs on 88.8 CBS FM Radio during the FY on 18th Mar. 2022. A copy of the audio recordings was verified and the the talk shows were attended by Senior Veterinary Officer, Municipal Health Officer and The Commercial Officer

-Issues discussed included:

-Parish development Model (PDM)

-Emyoga Program

-Property Tax

The M/C also provided feedback on social media and online platforms like twitter, Facebook and Instagram:

-Like progress report on Kalunga – Butiko bridge

-Public followed live the budget conference 10th Nov. 2021

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 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>There was no evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal:</p> <p>Whereas the council passed Local Revenue Enhancement Plan on 5th May 2021 under Agenda No. 5, Minute No. 25/CM/20/21, there was no signed copy in file or placed on the notice board ever since it was approved. The approved draft included the tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal.</p> | 0 |
| 22 | <p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG has not prepared any status log or a list of cases being investigated by IGG</p> <p>The IGG File from Central Registry CRM 251/2 revealed one outstanding allegation of irregularities in collection and handling of local revenue Case Ref. HQT/06/11/2020 of 23rd Feb. 2021; there was no evidence that the matter had been resolved.</p> | 0 |

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|---|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>1a. PLE performance 2019</p> <p>The number of candidates who registered for PLE in 2019 was 10458</p> <p>The number of candidates who sat for UCE in 2019 = (number registered - absentees) 10458 - 134 = 10324 candidates</p> <p>Div 1: Number of candidates was 1938</p> <p>Div 2: Number of candidates was 5786</p> <p>Div 3: Number of candidates was 1340</p> <p>Number of candidates that passed in Div 1 to Div 3 was 9064 = 88%</p> <p>1b. PLE performance 2020</p> <p>The number of candidates who registered for PLE in 2020 was 12897</p> <p>The number of candidates who sat for PLE in 2020 = (number registered - absentees) 12897 - 98 = 12799 candidates</p> <p>Div 1: Number of candidates was 2591</p> <p>Div 2: Number of candidates was 7082</p> | 2 |

Div 3: Number of candidates was 2275

Number of candidates that passed in Div 1 to Div 3 was

11948 = 93%%

There was an improvement of 5.00%

1

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

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

From UCE results downloaded from UNEB, no UCE results are reflected under Nansana Municipal Council LG.

0

2

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

Comparative figures could not be determined since the LG has only conducted the first baseline assessment in 2022/23; this indicator will be scored next year when comparative's are available.

The scores were as follows:

1 Nansana Division 70%

2 Busukuma Division 70%

3 Gombe Division 70%

4 Nabweru Division 100%

Average Average 77.5%

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>From Nansana MC LG Approved Budget estimates for FY 2021/2022 (page 26) the LG allocated Shs 341,617,000 as education sector development grant and there is evidence that this grant was used on eligible activities as shown below;</p> | 2 |
| | | | <p>1. Construction of a one unit staff quarters, a 2-stance pit latrine and a 10,000 litre water tank at Kabonge CU PS in Busukuma division at Shs. 94,022,400.</p> | |
| | | | <p>2. Construction of a two classroom block and provision of 36 three seater desks at Kanyange Mixed PS Nabweeru division at Shs. 82,415,300.</p> | |
| | | | <p>3. Construction of 5 stance line VIP pit latrines at;</p> | |
| | | | <p>a. Migadde RC PS at Shs 23,809,000</p> | |
| | | | <p>b. Migadde CU PS at Shs 23,809,000</p> | |
| | | | <p>c. Kirolo UMEA PS at Shs 23,842,040</p> | |
| | | | <p>d. Kanyange PS at Shs 24,280,034</p> | |
| 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 no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors:</p> | 0 |
| | | | <p>The following projects were sampled:</p> | |

1. VN 44464270 of 22nd Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 18,015,212 to M/S Moserena Investments Ltd for the construction of 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Migadde CoU P/S

Certificate No.1 of 13th Apr. 2022

Certificate was NOT signed by both CDO & Environment Officer

Payment requested 12th Apr. 2022 and executed on 22nd Jun. 2022 (beyond 10 working days)

2. VN 44529976 of 24th Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 77,572,940 to M/S P&D Traders & Contractors Ltd for the construction of 2-Classroom Blocks at Kanyange P/S

Certificate No.1 of 6th Jun. 2022

Certificate was signed by both CDO & Environment Officer

Payment requested 6th Jun. 2022 and executed on 24th Jun. 2022 (beyond 10 working days)

3. VN 43886196 of 13th Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 47,457,627 to M/S Sky Light General Services Ltd for the construction of 1-Unit Staff House and 2-Stance Pit Latrine and a Water Tank at Kabonge CoU P/S

Certificate No.1 of 21st Mar. 2022

Certificate was signed by the CDO but not Environment Officer

Payment requested 4th Apr.
2022 and executed on 13th
Jun. 2022 (beyond 10
working days)

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

There was evidence that the
contract price variations were
within +/-20% of the
engineer's estimates as
follows:

Project 1: Construction of 1
(one) unit of staff quarters, 2
(two) stances lined latrine
and supply of 1 (one) 1,000
litres capacity of HDPE water
tank at Kabonge CoU P/S.

- Engineer's Estimate:
UGX 110,000,000
- Contract sum: UGX
94,022,400
- Percentage variation: -
14.53%

Project 2: Construction of 2
(two) classroom blocks and
supply of 36 (thirty six) school
desks at Kanyange P/7
school in Nabweru Division.

- Engineer's Estimate:
UGX 85,000,000
- Contract sum: UGX
82,415,300
- Percentage variation: -
3.04%

Project 3: Completion of 4
staff house modified with a
store and shade at Kanyange
Primary School under
Nabweru Division.

- Engineer's Estimate:
UGX 102,720,500
- Contract sum of UGX
101,872,350
- Percentage variation: -
0.83%

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY | There was no seed secondary school in the Previous FY | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | | |
| 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 Municipal LG recruited 55 staff for various sectors in FY 2021/2022 including 2 teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. The approved staff establishment structure for primary school teachers was 761, position filled was 500 showing 65.7% filled staff position which was below average. | 0 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines, | The LG has an updated school asset register for 49 registered UPE and 5 USE schools for the FY 2021/2022. During this assessment the following basic requirements and minimum standards as set out in the DES guidelines have been considered as follows; | 0 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 3 permanent classrooms complete with a classroom ratio of 1:53 pupils. 2. A desk pupil ratio of 1:3 pupils. 3. A latrine stance pupil stance ratio of 1:40 pupils | |

4. Teacher accommodation; that at least 4 teachers accommodation facilities per school.

Based on the above basic requirements, the LG had the following;

A. Number of UPE schools in the LG is 49 with a total pupil enrollment of 22,521

1. Classrooms: The LG has a total of number of 394 permanent classrooms and a total pupil population of 22,521. At a ratio of 1:53 this puts the percentage achievement for the LG at 107.82%

2. Desks: The LG has a total number of 5538 desks and a total pupil population of 22,521. At a ratio of 1:3 this puts the percentage achievement for the LG at 139.53 %

3. Latrine stances: The LG has a total number of 471 latrine stances and a total pupil population of 22,521. At a ratio of 1:40 this puts the percentage achievement for the LG at 119.53%

4. Teacher accommodation: The LG has 04 out of 49 schools with at least 4 teacher accommodation units. This gives a percentage of 8.16 %

UPE average percentage based on the four basic requirements for the LG;

$$107.82 \% + 139.53\% + 119.53\% + 8.16\% \text{ divide by } 4 = 93.76\%$$

B. Number of USE schools in the LG is 19 with a total

student enrollment of 12,956

There was no evidence that the LG had a school asset register for the secondary schools

00 = 00%

Grand total 93.76% +
00.00% divide by 2 = 47.00%

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

From the staff deployment list at the LG education department and from the staff list and arrival books from the sampled schools there was evidence that the LG accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.

Kazo CU PS (semi urban) had the following teachers;

Namirimu Flavia, Nyende Rachel, Nabulya Ruth, Emokol Esther, Nakidde Judith, Namubiru Dianah, Majanga Jackson, Nakku Judith, Nassolo Josephine, Nambuusi Noelina and Maweje Wilson.

Kiwenda PS (rural) had the following teachers

Namazzi Sophia, Biira Jesca, Nakakande Amina, Muhangi Herbert, Mayanja George, Nantume Edith, Namusoke Florence, Namwiryia Dorothy, Kazaana Ezekiel, Nakiranda Annet, Nakatudde Sanyu Immaculate and Buule Douglas

Nakyesanja PS (Urban) had the following teachers

Kadodi Florence, Nalugya Solome, Nsubuga William, Wampamba Jeosh, Nassuna Miriam, Nabirye Annet, Nakafeero Janat, Namulanda Florence, Mukangwize Jenepher, Nakiboneka Beatrice and Kiirya Christine

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

From the sampled schools of Kazo CU PS (semi urban), Nakyesanja CU PS (urban) and Kiwenda PS (rural), there was evidence that the LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

Kazo CU PS had 11 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 170 desks and 03 teacher accommodation units.

Nakyesanja PS had 9 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 131 desks and 06 teacher accommodation units.

Kiwenda PS had 7 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 99 desks and 01 teacher accommodation units

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | School compliance and performance improvement: | <p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>There was no evidence that the LG department ensured that all registered primary schools complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitted reports to the MEO</p> | 0 |
| 6 | School compliance and performance improvement: | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 | <p>From departmental meeting held on 14/05/2021, agenda item 7 Min. 07/04/2021 there was evidence that the LG supported UPE schools to prepare SIPs in line with inspection recommendations.</p> <p>From sampled schools all the three schools (100%) of Kazo CU PS, Nakyesanja CU PS and Kiwenda PS had SIPs displayed on their respective notice boards.</p> | 4 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | <p>There was no evidence that the LG collected and compiled EMIS data from registered schools</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|----------|

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>From the approved LG budget estimates FY 2021/2022 an allocation of Shs 5,867,000,000 was made and approved for a head teacher and at least one teacher per class for schools with P7</p> | 4 |
|---|--|---|--|----------|

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

From the staff deployment list and from the list of teachers found at the sampled schools there was evidence that the LG deployed staff as per guidelines in the current FY.

Kazo CU PS (semi urban) had the following teachers;

Namirimu Flavia, Nyende Rachel, Nabulya Ruth, Emokol Esther, Nakidde Judith, Namubiru Dianah, Majanga Jackson, Nakku Judith, Nassolo Josephine, Nambuusi Noelina and Maweje Wilson.

Kiwenda PS (rural) had the following teachers

Namazzi Sophia, Biira Jesca, Nakakande Amina, Muhangi Herbert, Mayanja George, Nantume Edith, Namusoke Florence, Namwirya Dorothy, Kazaana Ezekiel, Nakiranda Annet, Nakatudde Sanyu Immaculate and Buule Douglas

Nakyesanja PS (Urban) had the following teachers

Kadodi Florence, Nalugya Solome, Nsubuga William, Wampamba Jeosh, Nassuna Miriam, Nabirye Annet, Nakafeero Janat, Namulanda Florence, Mukangwize Jenepher, Nakiboneka Beatrice and Kiirya Christine

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 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>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p> | <p>From the notice board of LG office for teacher deployment list 2022 and list of teachers displayed at the notice boards of sampled schools.</p> <p>eg at Kazo CU PS the list of following teachers displayed on the school notice board matched with that on the LG notice board;</p> <p>Namirimu Flavia, Nyende Rachel, Nabulya Ruth, Emokol Esther, Nakidde Judith, Nassolo Josephine, Namubiru Dianah, Mayanja Jackson, Nakku Judith, Nambusi Noeline and Mawejje Wilson</p> <p>, there was evidence that teacher deployment data had been publicized</p> | 1 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The Municipal local government had 50 primary schools and all 50 head teachers had filled and signed performance agreements.</p> <p>The sampled 10 appraisal reports of primary Head Teachers were the only ones appraised and most of them late:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nasaba Rogers H/T Nabagereka P/S Busukuma Division appraised on the 12/7/2022 • Nakazibwe Sarah H/T St Ssanga P/S Gombe Division appraised on the 6/1/2022 • Ndagire Eunice H/T Kitungwa P/S Gombe Division appraised on the 31/3/2022 | 0 |

- Kiirya Christine H/T
Nakessanja CoU P/S
Nabweru Division appraised
on the 30/1/2022
- Mugabi Solomon H/T
Kitanda CoU P/S Gombe
Division appraised on the
30/3/2022
- Dongo Dissan H/T Migadde
CoU P/S Gombe Division
appraised on the 20/5/2022
- Gimei William H/T Sam Iga
Memorial P/S Nabweru
Division was appraised on
23/6/2022
- Buheye Joshua H/T
Kanyange P/S Nabweru
Division was appraised on
20/1/2022
- Mutyaba Moses H/T
Maganjo Umea P/S Nabweru
Division was appraised
29/1/2022
- Namatovu Glorious H/T St.
Jude Kiragonja P/S Gombe
Division was appraised on
27/6/2022

8

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.

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM

No evidence provided for verification.

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

0

8

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.

c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans

There was no evidence that all staff in the LG education department had been appraised against their performance plans. Katongole K Fredrick Inspector of Schools was not appraised at the time of assessment, only Nanyanzi Prima Rita Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on the 10/7/2022.

score: 2. Else, score: 0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

0

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG MEO prepared a training plan to address identified capacity gaps at the school and LG level. The training plan for 2021/2022 was signed and stamped by MEO on 14/04/2021</p> | 2 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrollment and budget allocation in the PBS by December 15</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

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

From Nansana MC LG approved budget estimates 2021/2022, Shs 65,041,000 was budgeted and approved for monitoring and inspection.

Output 1: Education management and monitoring
4,500,000 + 4,900,000 (for 49 primary schools) = Shs 9,400,000

Output 2: School inspection
4,000,000 + 5,488,000 (for 49 schools for three terms) = Shs 9,488,000

Grand total = 18,888,000 (the allocation of Shs 65,041,000 is more than 100%)

Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters
If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0

There was no evidence that the LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as analysed below:

-Quarter-1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul 2021 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-5 for school capitation grant was prepared on 22nd Jul. 2021 (beyond 5 working days);

-Quarter-2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct. 2021 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-11 for school capitation grant was prepared on the same day 20th Oct. 2021 (within 5 working days)

-Quarter-3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-19 for school capitation grant was prepared on the same day on 25th Jan 2022 (within 5 working days)

-Quarter-4 Cash Limits were issued on 4th Apr 2022 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-25 for school capitation grant was prepared on 26th Apr. 2022 (beyond 5 working days)

Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

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

There was no evidence that the LG invoiced and communicated releases of capitation grants to schools within 3 working days from the release date on quarterly basis as analysed below:

-Q1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul 2021 and School capitation grant was not invoiced until 8th Nov. 2021 (beyond 3 working days);

-Quarter-2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct. 2021 and the school capitation grant was invoiced on 8th Nov. 2021 (beyond 3 working days)

-Q3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and School capitation grant was Invoiced on 27th Jan 2022 (beyond 3 working days);

-Q4 Cash Limits were issued on 4th Apr 2022 and the School capitation grant was Invoiced on 6th May 2022 (beyond 3 working days)

There was no evidence that the releases had been published at all.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG school inspection plan for 2021/2022 was prepared on 26/05/2021 and signed and stamped by the MEO on 26/05/2021

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 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"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 | <p>From inspection report submitted to DES on 16/06/2022 there was evidence that all the 49 schools (100%) had been inspected and inspection report submitted to DES on 16/06/2022 shows that all the 49 schools (100%) had been inspected</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>There was no evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to make corrective actions</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>From acknowledgement notes dated 14/06/2022 and 22/09/2022 by DES, there was evidence that findings from inspection were presented and reports submitted to DES</p> | 2 |

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that education sector matters at Nansana M/C were discussed by the Education and Sports Committee four times during the year on the following days:

-On 23rd Nov. 2021;

-On 10th Feb. 2022;

-On 16th May 2022; and

-On 20th May 2022

Some of the issues discussed included:

-Sectoral budget estimates 2022/2023 were eventually discussed by council on 30th May 2022 under Minute No. 41/CM/21/22

-Proposed revision of workplans for FY 2021/2022 were discussed at council plenary on 15th Dec 2021 under Minute No. 19/CM/21/22

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

From the report from MIS to the TC dated and stamped by MEO on 26/05/2022 there was evidence that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children ion school.

This report was for a workshop for parents, SMCs (photos of participants attached)

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

From the sampled schools there was evidence that schools had up to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.

Kazo CU PS had 11 classrooms, 170 desks, 13 latrine stances and 3 teacher accommodation units

Nakyesanjja CU PS had 9 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 131 desks and 6 teacher accommodation units

Kiwenda PS had 7 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 99 desks and 01 teacher accommodation unit

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

There was evidence that prioritized AWP investment for education are derived from the Local Government Development Plan desk appraised by MTPC and is eligible under sector or funding source grant guidelines .

1. Construction of 2-Stance VIP Pit Latrines and Water Tank at Kibibi Catholic P/S and Building Tomorrow-Gombe P/S at UGX 24,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

2. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kanyange P/S at 85,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

3. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kirolo Umea P/S was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

4. Construction of Teachers Staff House at Kabonge P/S P/S at 95,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

These were approved by DTPC on 2nd Feb. 2021, Agenda No.5 under Minute No. 054/TPC/02/2021

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that prioritized AWP investments for education: (i) were field appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability; and (ii) had their designs customized to suit site conditions, where applicable

Field appraisals were conducted on 20th Sep. 2021 and the report signed by all the 5 members was in the file

Projects sampled included the following:

1. Construction of 2-Stance VIP Pit Latrines and Water Tank at Kibibi Catholic P/S and Building Tomorrow-Gombe P/S at UGX 24,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

2. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kanyange P/S at 85,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

3. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kirolo Umea P/S was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

4. Construction of Teachers Staff House at Kabonge P/S P/S at 95,000,000 was appraised on 16th Dec. 2021

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>No Seed Secondary Schools planned in this current FY</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>The following projects were approved by CC ;</p> <p>Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 (SFG funded). Contracts Committee minutes signed on 2nd December 2021 under Min No: 076/CC/006/2021-2022 was chaired by Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary</p> <p>Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom blocks and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/7 school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00001. Contracts Committee minutes signed on 2nd December 2021 under Min No: 075/CC/006/2021-2022 was chaired by Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as Secretary</p> <p>Project 3: Completion of 4 staff house modified with a store and shade at Kanyange Primary School under Nabweru Division. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00040. Contract signed on 21st June 2022 .</p> | 1 |

Contracts Committee minutes signed on 17th June 2022 under Min No: 239/CC/016/2021-2022 was chaired by Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as Secretary.

All the three sampled projects approved by CC did not require clearance from SG as the contract sums were below the 200m threshold

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the LG had fully established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for education projects in the previous FY. For all sampled projects in the different sectors, there was no clerk of works included on the list of PIT appointed by the Town Clerk. This is described below.

Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S (SFG funding)

The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom block and supply of 36 (thirty six) school

0

desks at Kanyange P/ & school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding)

The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

Project 3: Completion of 4 staff house modified with a store and shade at Kanyange Primary School under Nabweru Division

The letter dated 4th April 2022 from the Town Clerk (Byabagambi Francis) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | Not applicable since there was no seed secondary school constructed. | 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>Not applicable since there was no seed secondary school constructed.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving DEO, Environmental Officer, CDO etc has been conducted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project: Construction of a skilling centre/shelter for vulnerable youths and temporary shelter for domestic violence victims at Kasozi in Busukuma Division which took place on 25th February 2022 and was attended by Principal Asst. Town Clerk, EO, PCDO, Municipal Engineer and the Contractor's representative. 2. Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S (SFG funding) which took place on 14th April 2022 and was attended by Principal Asst. Town Clerk, EO, PCDO, Municipal Engineer and the Contractor representative. 3. Construction of 2 (two) classroom block and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/& school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding) which took place on 18th May 2022 and was | 1 |

attended by Principal Asst. Town Clerk, EO, PCDO, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education officer, Headteacher of Kanyange P/S and the Contractor's representative.

13

1

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

There was evidence that projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as follows;

Project 1: Construction of 1 (one) unit of staff quarters, 2 (two) stances lined latrine and supply of 1 (one) 1,000 litres capacity of HDPE water tank at Kabonge CoU P/S. NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 (SFG funded). Contract signed on 20th January 2022.

Contractor's Requisition: SKYLIGHT GENERAL SERVICES LIMITED request was on 4th April 2022 amounting to UGX 50,000,00. This was signed and forwarded by Engineering Assistant (12th April 2022); Municipal Engineer (21st April 2022), Municipal Education Officer (26th April 2022) and Town Clerk.

Certificate No.1: provided on 11th April 2022 was signed by the Assistant Engineering Officer, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Principal CDO and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 53,639,514 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 47,457,627 (including VAT) was initiated

on 9th May 2022 and payment was made on 13th June 2022 under voucher No. 43886196

This lies within the required contract period for payment.

Project 2: Construction of 2 (two) classroom blocks and supply of 36 (thirty six) school desks at Kanyange P/7 school in Nabweru Division (SFG funding).

NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00001. Contract signed on 23rd May 2022

Contractor's Requisition: P&D TRADERS AND CONTRACTORS LTD request was on 6th June 2022 amounting to UGX 82,415,300. This was not signed by either Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer and Town Clerk.

Certificate No.1: provided on 2nd June 2022 was signed by the Assistant Engineering Officer, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Environment Officer, Principal CDO and Town Clerk. Amount: UGX 78,294,535 (VAT inclusive).

Payment of UGX 77,572,940 (including VAT) was payment was made on 24th June 2022 under voucher No. 44529976

This lies within the required contract period for payment

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | There was evidence that the Procurement Plan for the Education sector was submitted before 30th April, 2021 as follows; The Education Procurement Plan was submitted on 26th April 2021. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i> | No Seed Secondary school constructed in the previous FY | 1 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0

There was evidence of records of complaints in the Education Sector (indicating nature of cases, dates of registration, and any follow up actions taken) in line with the grievance redress framework as exemplified by the following the list of complaints recorded in the Grievance Records Book.

1. An agreed cook reported unfair termination of his job having worked for 12 years, on 18/6/2021. The case was investigated and both parties were invited for mediation that resulted in payment of 6 million UGX to the aggrieved; and

2. St. Jones CoU P/S reported that they were facing a challenge of accessing church compound due to huge gullies caused by poor drainage systems on 13/5/2022. The Municipal Engineer was assigned to visit the site and provide support and technical guidance.

Safeguards for service delivery.

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 3, or else score: 0

Circular to school administrators NMC for reopening of education institutions dated 14/01/2022 emphasizing maintaining green schools and circular to headteachers for opening of term three 2022 meeting (item 6 in the circular), there was evidence that the LG disseminated the education guidelines to schools

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, *score: 2, else score: 0*

There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had Costed ESMP incorporated in BoQs and contractual documents to comply with safeguards requirements within the Education sector as exemplified by the following education projects.

1. Construction of 5-stance lined latrine at Kirolo, UMEA P/S project. The EMSP dated 2/11/2021 was incorporated in BoQs, page 8, Item A, B and C: plant and ensure establishment of fruit trees, fence of the work station with tapes of bright colours and fully equip First Aid Tools; and

2. Construction of pit latrine at Migadde Church of Uganda Primary School. The EMSP dated 2/11/2021 was incorporated in the BoQs, Element 7: Environment and Social safeguards - replacement of vegetation lost by planting trees and ensuring establishment of 5 fruit trees.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 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 was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had proof of land ownership, access and availability to conduct planned school construction projects as no land titles, agreements, Memoranda of Understanding or consent letters from landowners were provided by the LG. School under the management of Nansana Municipal Council are constructed on land owned by the foundation bodies.</p> | 0 |
| 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 no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council conducted support supervision and monitoring over the previous FY (2021/2022) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and provided monthly monitoring reports as site visit reports and monthly compliance monitoring reports were not available.</p> | 0 |

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

Score: 1, else score:0

There was Evidence that at Nansana Municipal Council all education contractor payments certificates had been signed off by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects as exemplified by the following payment certificates.

1. Interim payment certificate for the construction of a 50 stance lined latrine with urinal at Kirolo UMWE P/S, endorsed on 2/6/2022;

2. Interim payment certificate no 1 for proposed construction of 2 classroom block at Kanyange P/S, endorsed on 2/6/2022; and

3. Interim payment certificate no 1 for the Renovation of Nabagereka Damalie P/S, endorsed on 16/6/2022.

**Health Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 | <p>The LG registered increased utilization of health care services of 23.3% (from 2,424 deliveries in FY 2020/2021 to 2,990, in FY 2021/2022): Changes at each of the 3 sampled health facilities are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliveries at Nabweru HCIII increased from 1,082 to 1,358 as shown in Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 respectively; 2. Deliveries at Nassolo Wamala HCIII increased from 43 to 148 as shown in Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 respectively; and 3. Deliveries at Kawanda HCIII increased from 1,299 to 1,484 as shown in Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 respectively. | 2 |

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.

There was evidence that the health development grant was used on eligible activities. The projects sampled include the following:

1. renovation of staff house at Nabutiti HC-III at UGX 99,921,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget)
2. construction of OPD at Buwambo H/C-IV at UGX 302,907,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget)
3. construction of Maternity Ward at Namulonmge HC-III at UGX 17,900,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget)

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that certification of works was done by DHO, CDO and Environment Officer before the LG made payments to the suppliers.

The following projects were sampled:

1. VN 4446464020 of 22nd Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 99,921,136 to M/S Link Investments Ltd for construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre-III. There was no Engineers Certificate, 100% payment was made against Finance Trust Bank Guarantee of 6th Jun. 2022.

No Certificate was issued and therefore none could be signed by CDO & Environment Officer

2. VN 44579944 of 28th Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 307,984,868 to the Construction Brigade of the UPDF & NEC for the construction of Phase-I of the OPD at Buwambo Health Centre.

-No Certificate issued yet

-No certificate has been issued/ signed by CDO or Environment Officer

-Payment was requested on 8th Jun. 2022 and executed on 28th Jun 2022 (beyond 10 working days)

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 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>There was evidence that the contract price of sampled works for the previous FY contracts were within +/-20% of the MOH Engineers estimates as follows;</p> <p>Project 1: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006. Contract signed on 25th May 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineer's Estimate: UGX 99,921,000 • Contract sum: UGX 109,651,700 • Percentage variations: 9.73% | 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>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | <p>Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 | <p>There was evidence that the LG had recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure. The approved customized staffing establishment for HCIVs was 58, but staff in position was 63 showing more 5 extra staff. For HCIIIs was 114, filled position was 98 showing a gap of 16. The percentage of health facility positions of workers filled in HCIVs and HCIIIs was at 93.6%.</p> | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 | <p>Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY</p> | 2 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. There were no discrepancies between positions on staff deployment lists from the DHO and those in the staff registers at all the 3 sampled health facilities as reflected below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Ttikalu HCIII, 18 staff out of 19 in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 were reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO. 2. At Namulonge HCIII, 16 staff in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 were reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO. 3. At Nabweru HCIII, all the 17 staff in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 were reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO. | 2 |
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate. The following were the constructions in Nansana municipality in FY 2021/2022 as evidenced on page 79 of the PBS report dated 25th August 2022:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OPD at Buwambo HCIV; and 2. Staff quarters at Nabutiti HCIII; | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>The health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans & budgets to the DHO by March 31st of the previous FY 2021/2022 as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nabutiti HCIII submitted on 30th March 2022; 2. Kawanda HCIII submitted on 31st March 2022; and 3. Nassolo Wamala HCIII submitted on 18th March 2022. <p>The budgets of these sampled health facilities conformed to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines since they had highlights of performance, annual expenditure and had been endorsed by the In-charges.</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>The health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY 2021/2022 by July 15th of the current FY 2022/2023 as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. The submission dates for each of the 3 sampled health facilities are shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ttikalu HCIII submitted on 15th July 2022; 2. Nabweru HCIII submitted on 6th July 2022; and 3. Nassolo Wamala HCIII submitted on 15th July 2022. | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility</p> | <p>a) Health facilities have</p> | <p>The health facilities developed</p> | 2 |

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

developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

- Score 2 or else 0

and reported on implementation of facility Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) that incorporated performance issues identified in assessment reports. All the 3 facility PIPs for the sampled health facilities including; Namulonge HCIII, Nabweru HCIII and Nassolo Wamala HCIII had issues identified in the DHMT support supervision reports as shown below:

1. Namulonge HCIII PIP dated 15th March 2022 catered for procurement of drugs as shown on page 12. Stock out of essential drugs had been identified during the DHMT support supervision for Namulonge HCIII and a recommendation of procurement of drugs had been made as shown in quarter 2 supervision report dated 30th December 2021 on page 2.
2. Nabweru HCIII PIP dated 31st March 2022 catered for payment of water expenses as shown on page 61. Lack of running water in the new toilets had been identified during the MHMT support supervision as shown in quarter 3 supervision report dated 30th March 2022 on page 4.
3. Nassolo Wamala HCII PIP dated 18th March 2022 catered for health facility equipment and items as shown on page 44. Lack of screens and curtains in the ANC clinic had been identified during the MHMT support supervision as shown in quarter 3 supervision report dated 30th December 2021 on page 8.

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

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

The health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). For example,

1. Buwambo HCIV's latest monthly reports were submitted on the 6th day following the end of month and the latest quarterly reports were also submitted on the 6th day following the end of month.

2. Kasozi HCIII's latest monthly reports were submitted on the 7th day following the end of month and the latest quarterly report was also submitted on the 7th day following the end of month.

3. Kawanda HCIII's latest monthly reports were submitted on the 7th day following the end of month and the latest quarterly reports were submitted on the 6th day following the end of month.

6

2

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

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

The municipality is not responsible for receiving RBF invoices. All facilities submit their RBF invoices to the DHO's office.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

1

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.

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

The MHMT does not submit RBF invoices to MoH. The DHO's office is responsible for submitting RBF invoices to MoH.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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.

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

There was no record in planning unit on when they received quarterly departmental reports including from MHO; the PBS could not show any dates of submission either.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

1

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.

h) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

The LG had an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) dated 15 April 2022 that catered for all the health facilities under the RBF program.

There was no health facility that was classified among the weakest (scored <75%) according to the RBF guidelines. The individual facility scores are as follows; Buwambo HCIV- 95%, Namulonge HCIII- 94.5%, Nabweru HCIII- 91.5%, Kawanda HCIII- 100%, Nabutiti HCIII- 85%, Ttikalu HCIII- 95.7% and Kasozi HCIII- 90%.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

1

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.

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

The LG implemented activities in PIPs for the weakest performing facility as highlighted below: In as support supervision report dated 12th July 2021 indicated an issue of congested and dilapidated OPD structure at Buwambo HCIV and action point was for a Municipal Health Officer to plan to construct OPD in Buwambo HCIV. The PIP dated 15th April 2022 catered for construction of OPD at Buwambo HCIV.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Human Resource Management and Development

7

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).

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

The LG had budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The performance contract for the current FY 2022/2023 on page 27 had UGX 4,019,341,185 budgeted for the 175 health workers' salaries as indicated in the approved structure.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had not deployed health workers as per guidelines. The staffing level was 72.6% (93 out of 128 staff in the approved structure).</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p> | <p>Some of the health workers were not working in the health facilities where they were deployed. The information on positions of health workers filled was inaccurate. There were discrepancies between positions on staff deployment lists from the DHO and those in the staff registers in 2 out of the 3 sampled health facilities as reflected below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Nabweru HCIII, one of the staff was not found in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 yet he was reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO; 2. At Kawanda HCIII, all the staff in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 were reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO; and 3. At Ttikalu HCIII, one of the staff was not found in the attendance register for FY 2022/2023 yet he was reflected on the deployment list for FY 2022/2023 from the DHO. | 0 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG publicized health workers' deployment by posting deployment lists for FY 2022/2023 on facility notice boards. All the 3 sampled health facilities as shown below:

1. At Ttikalu HCIII a deployment list dated 30th June 2022 for FY 2022/2023 was displayed on the waiting area notice board;
2. At Nabweru HCIII a deployment list for FY 2022/2023 dated 30th June 2022 was displayed on the waiting area notice board; and
3. At Kawanda HCIII a deployment list for FY 2022/2023 dated 30th June 2022, was displayed on the waiting area notice board.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

The MMOH had not conducted annual performance appraisal for all the health facility In-Charges against agreed performance plans during the previous FY. Out of the 7 Health Facility In-Charges in the Municipality four were not appraised. Only two Health facility In charges were appraised. The following Health Facility In-Charges were not appraised:

1. Mr. Nabawanuka Jalia, a Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge of Nabutiti HCIII;
2. Ms. Nazirambi Jalia, a Clinical Officer and In-Charge of Ttikalu HCIII;
3. Mr.Mwanja Peter, a Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge of Nabweru HCIII; and
4. Mamata Betty, a Nursing Officer In-Charge of Kasozi HCIII.

The two In charges that were appraised are

1. Sserwanga Mathias Senior Clinical Officer In charge of Namulonge HCIII appraised on the 17/7/2022
2. Dr. Kizza Dominic Kateregga Medica Officer In charge of Buwambo HCIV appraised on the 14/ 7/2022.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 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 that the MMOH ensured the Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all facility workers against agreed performance plans and submitted copies through MMOH to the HRO during the previous FY.</p> <p>For example some of the health workers who were appraised are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Namutebi Christine Enrolled Nurse Gombe HCII was appraised on the 30/6/2022 2. Nalumu Dorothy Enrolled Midwife Matugga HCII was appraised on the 30/6/2022 3. Nandawula Sylvia Nursing officer Gombe HCII was appraised on the 30/6/2022 amongst others 4. Balyejjusa Allen Enrolled Nurse Maganji HCII was appraised on the 30/6/2022 among others. | 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>No evidence of corrective action taken was availed for verification</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG:
i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0

The LG had a Continuous Professional Development (CPD) work plan for 2021/2022 on file. It is titled, "Training schedule for health department in Nansana municipality for the FY 2021/2022" dated 1st July 2021 and trainings were conducted in accordance to this training. For instance:

1. Training of municipal health workers and service providers on waste management was conducted on 20th September 2021 as shown in a report titled "Report on waste management training of municipal health management team" dated 20th September 2021;

2. Training of health inspectorate staff on health and safety guidelines for solid waste handlers was conducted on 12th September 2022 as shown in a report titled "Report on training of health and safety guidelines for solid waste handlers" dated 14th September 2021.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0

There were no documented training activities in the training/CPD database at the time of assessment.

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>The 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. The letter is titled "Submission of data for the generation of local government indicative planning figures (IPFS)" dated 23rd September 2022 and the ministry acknowledged receipt on 29th September 2022.</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 LG allocated only 7% of the PHC-NWG to health monitoring budget.</p> <p>The health budget for PHC-Non-Wage was UGX 729,721,000 (Pg 22 of the Approved Budget) and the allocation for health monitoring was UGX 49,051,000.00 under budget output code 088302, of the Budget/PBS which is on Page 25 the approved budget, representing 7% allocation (which is less than 15%)</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0

The LG did not make timely warranting of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget
-Quarter-1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul 2021 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-5 for PHC NWR grant to health facilities was prepared on 22nd Jul. 2021 (beyond 5 working days)

-Quarter-2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct. 2021 and the Warrant No. 532AW-2022-14 for PHC NWR grant to health facilities was prepared on same day 20th Oct. 2021 (within 5 working days)

-Quarter-3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-19 for PHC NWR grant to health facilities was prepared on the same day 25th Jan 2022 (within 5 working days)

-Quarter-4 Cash Limits were issued on 4th Apr 2022 and the Warrant No. 779AW-2022-25 for PHC NWR grant to health facilities was prepared on 22nd Apr 2022 (beyond 5 working days)

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not invoice or communicate releases to health facilities within 5 working days from the release date on quarterly basis as analysed below:

-Q1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul 2021 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was Invoiced to health facilities on 5th Aug. 2021 (beyond 5 working days)

-Q2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct 2021 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was invoiced to health facilities on 22nd Oct 2021 (within 5 working days)

-Q3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,879 was invoiced to health facilities on 25th Jan 2022 (within 5 working days)

-Q4 Cash Limits were issued on 4th Apr 2022 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was invoiced to health facilities on 27th Apr 2022 (beyond 5 working days)

No copies of disbursements schedules to Health Facilities had been placed on the notice board.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence 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- through posting on public notice boards or websites:

-Q1 Cash Limits were issued on 6th Jul 2021 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was Invoiced to health facilities on 5th Aug. 2021 (beyond 5 working days)

-Q2 Cash Limits were issued on 20th Oct 2021 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was invoiced to health facilities on 22nd Oct 2021 (within 5 working days)

-Q3 Cash Limits were issued on 25th Jan 2022 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,879 was invoiced to health facilities on 25th Jan 2022 (within 5 working days)

-Q4 Cash Limits were issued on 4th Apr 2022 and PHC-NWR of UGX 90,446,829 was invoiced to health facilities on 27th Apr 2022 (beyond 5 working days)

No copies of disbursements schedules to Health Facilities or lists of health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants had been placed on the notice board.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0

The health department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY. For example:

1. In a performance review meeting held by MHMT on 3rd March 2022, it was recommended in action point number 3, that health facilities' work plans for FY 2022/2023 should be submitted by 31st March 2022. Implementation of this action point is evidenced by the presence of work plans showing submission dates before 31st March 2022. For example, Kawanda HCIII submitted on 31st March 2022, Kasozi HCIII was submitted on 18th March 2022 and Namulonge HCIII submitted on 15th March 2022; and

2. In a performance review meeting held by MHMT on 8th September 2022, it was recommended in action point number 7, that all staff should be appraised. Implementation of this action point is evidenced in the staff performance appraisal report dated 11th July 2022 showing that all staff had been appraised.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

The LG quarterly performance review meetings involved all the health facility In-Charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department. For example:

1. Quarter 1 performance review meeting on 8th September 2021 was attended by all in-charges as evidenced by the attendance list attached to a report dated 8th September 2021;

2. Quarter 2 performance review meeting on 8th October 2022 was attended by all in-charges as evidenced by the attendance list attached to a report dated 8th October 2022;

3. Quarter 3 performance review meeting on 3rd March 2022 was attended by all in-charges as evidenced by the attendance list attached to minutes dated 20th April 2022; and

4. Quarter 4 performance review meeting on 12th April 2022 was attended by all in-charges as evidenced by the attendance list attached to minutes dated 12th July 2022.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

If not applicable, provide the score

The LG supervised all HCIVs which received PHC grant in the FY 2021/2022. Buwambo HCIV was the only one in the municipal council and was supervised at least once every quarter as shown below;

1. Quarter 1 - 22nd September 2021 (report date 5th October 2021);

2. Quarter 2 - 30th December 2022 (report date: 30th December 2022);

3. Quarter 3 - 30th March 2022 (report date: 30th March 2022); and

4. Quarter 4 - 18th May 2022 (report date: 18th July 2022).

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

- If not applicable, provide the score

The DHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY. All the 3 sampled health facilities were supervised as follows:

1. Namulonge HCIII was supervised by Kyadondo North HSD in all quarters as per reports titled "Support supervision report" dated 5th October 2021 for quarter 1, 30th December 2021 for quarter 2, 30th March 2022 for quarter 3 and 18th May 2022 for quarter 4;

2. Kasozi HCIII was supervised by Kyadondo North HSD in all quarters as per reports titled "Support supervision report" dated 5th October 2021 for quarter 1, 30th December 2021 for quarter 2, 30th March 2022 for quarter 3 and 18th May 2022 for quarter 4; and

3. Nabweru HCIII was supervised by Kyadondo North HSD in all quarters as per reports titled "Support supervision report" dated 5th October 2021 for quarter 1, 30th December 2021 for quarter 2, 30th March 2022 for quarter 3 and 18th May 2022 for quarter 4.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

The LG used results / reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits to make recommendations for specific corrective actions. For instance,

1. In Buwambo HCIV supervision report for quarter 4 dated 18th May 2022, it was recommended that the In-charge should work with the Assistant Health Educator to ensure that health education services are planned for. In a subsequent supervision evidenced in a quarter 1 report dated 30th September 2022 page 2, it was indicated that the health education work plan had been put in place, comprising of community health activities;

2. In Namulonge HCIII supervision report dated 30th March 2022 page 2, it was recommended that the In-charges should ensure that SOPs on medical waste are followed. In a subsequent report dated 14th June 2022 on page 2, it was indicated that SOPs on medical waste had been followed;

3. In Kasozi HCIII supervision report dated 30th March 2022 page 2, it was recommended that inventory register should be updated. In a subsequent report dated 14th June 2022 page 3, it was indicated that inventory register was up to date.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 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>The LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in the FY 2021/2022. This is evidenced in the essential medicines support supervision report dated 10th September 2021 which shows that all the 9 facilities supposed to be supervised were supervised from 6th to 10th September 2021. The facilities include: Kasozi HCIII, Kassolo Wamala HCIII, Ttikalu HCIII, Nabutiti HCIII, Kawanda HCIII, Buwambo HCIV, Nabweru HCIII, Nansana HCII and Matugga HCII.</p> | 1 |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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>The district allocated only 16% of the PHC-NWG to health promotion which is less than 30%</p> <p>The health budget for PHC-Non Wage was UGX 729,721,000 (Pg 22 of the Approved Budget) out of which only UGX UGX 115,640,000 (representing 16%) allocated to health promotion under budget output code 088101 on Page 22 of the approved budget</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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>The MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the FY 2021/2022. For example:</p> <p>The MHT conducted a radio talk show on COVID-19 mass vaccination campaign. This is evidenced in a report titled “Radio talk show report round 3 of COVID-19 mass vaccination campaign dated 17th June 2022; and</p> <p>The MHT trained community health workers on malaria and family planning. This evidenced in a report titled “Training of community health workers on malaria and family planning” dated 25th June 2022.</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The MHT followed up actions on health promotion and disease prevention issues. For instance,</p> <p>In the MHT workshop held in May 2022 it was noted that there was low uptake of immunization as evidenced in a report “Workshop on immunization communication plan” dated 4th July 2022. Follow up action on this issue is evidenced in quarter 1 report titled “community dialogue meetings on low turn-up of for COVID-19 vaccination” dated 19th July 2022, showing that community dialogue meetings had been held to improve uptake of immunization.</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset</p> | <p>There was evidence that The District maintains an up-dated</p> | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|---|

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0

assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual.

Below is an extract derived from the summary of the register:

Land UGX 11,892,463,900.00

Non-Residential buildings UGX 6,049,982,162.00

Roads and bridges UGX 57,333,731,740.00

Transport equipment – motor UGX 2,434,488,960.00

vehicles

Machinery and equipment UGX 14,450,000.00

Furniture and fittings UGX 227,047,590.00

ICT Equipment UGX 356,329,546.00

Medical Equipment UGX 120,572,500

Office Equipment UGX 20,100,000

Other Assets UGX 0.00

Total value of physical assets UGX 78,449,166,398.00

The LG had an updated Asset register which set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. The register was titled “Asset register for health facilities of Nansana municipality for FY 2021/2022” and was updated on 1st July 2021. It contained the description of the asset, asset category, cost, health facility, sections, serial number, condition, among others.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were:

(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);

(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and

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

score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that prioritized AWP investments in the health sector: were derived from the Local Government Development Plan, desk appraised by DTPC and are eligible under sector or funding source grant guidelines.

The following investments were sampled:

1. renovation of staff house at Nabutiti HC-III at UGX 99,921,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget);
2. construction of OPD at Buwambo H/C-IV at UGX 302,907,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget); and
3. construction of Maternity Ward at Namulonmge HC-III at UGX 17,900,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget)

These projects were appraised on 16th Dec. 2020 and were approved by DTPC on 2nd Feb. 2021, Agenda No.5 under Minute No. 054/TPC/02/2021

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that field appraisals were conducted for all prioritized AWP investments for health: the projects, (i) were field appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability; and (ii) had their designs customized to suit site conditions, where applicable

Field appraisals were conducted on 20th Sep. 2021 and a report signed by all the 5 members was available.

The projects include the following:

1. renovation of staff house at Nabutiti HC-III at UGX 99,921,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget) ;

2. construction of OPD at Buwambo H/C-IV at UGX 302,907,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget);

3. construction of Maternity Ward at Namulonmge HC-III at UGX 17,900,000 (Pg.24 of the approved budget)

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>.There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all health projects as exemplified by Environmental Impact Screening Reports for the following projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Construction of out-patient ward (OPD) in Buwambo village, Buwambo parish, Gombe division dated 20/9/2021, endorsed by the SEO and PCDO; and 2. The construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III, Nabutiti village, Busukuma Division dated 9/9/2021 and signed by the SEO and the PCDO. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Procurement Plan for the Health sector was submitted before 30th April 2021. The Health Procurement Plan was submitted and received by PDU on 28th April 2022.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY</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>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>The only Health department project approved by CC is provided below;</p> <p>Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding). NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006. Contract signed on 25th May 2022 . Contracts Committee minutes signed on 23rd May 2022 under Min No: 193/CC/012/2021-2022 was chaired by Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary</p> <p>The project did not require clearance from SG as the contract sum was below the 200m threshold</p> | 1 |

13

0

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

There was no evidence that the LG properly established the Project implementation team as the sector guidelines. The letter from the Town Clerk appointing PIT for execution the health sector projects didn't include the clerk of works as described below;

Project: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding)

The letter dated 9th November 2021 from the Principal Assistant Town Clerk (Mrs. Hajat Hadijah Sengendo) appointed the following PIT members;

- Municipal Engineer: Eng. Lugeye Henry
- Principal CDO: Ndagire Lilian
- Environment officer: Nalumansi Stella

13

1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 13 | 1 | <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>Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY</p> |
| 13 | 1 | <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>Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | 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 If there is no project, provide the score | Not applicable as there was no upgrade project from HC II to HC III in previous FY |
|--|--|--|

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0

There was no evidence that payment requests were certified and recommended on time within 2 weeks or 10 working days) Only the following two projects were implemented:
1. VN 4446464020 of 22nd Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 99,921,136 to M/S Link Investments Ltd for construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre-III. There was no Engineers Certificate, 100% payment was made against Finance Trust Bank Guarantee of 6th Jun. 2022.

Not signed by CDO & Env. Officer

Requested 7th Jun. 2022 and paid 22nd Jun. 2022 (beyond 10 working days)

2. VN 44579944 of 28th Jun 2022 being payment of UGX 307,984,868 to the Construction Brigade of the UPDF & NEC for the construction of Phase-I of the OPD at Buwambo Health Centre.

-No Certificate issued yet

-No certificate has been issued/ signed by CDO or Environment Officer

-Payment was requested on 8th Jun. 2022 and executed on 28th Jun 2022 (beyond 10 working days)

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the Municipality has complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law for the only project executed in the previous FY as below;

Project 1: Construction of Staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III (DDEG funding).
NANS779/WRKS/2021-2022/00006.

Engineer's Estimate: UGX 99,921,000 provided on LG PP Form 1

Works Contract signed on 25th May 2022 with a contract sum of UGX 109,651,700 (VAT Inclusive)

Evaluation Report signed on 20th May 2022 chaired by Eng. Mukasa Wilber Herman and Lukwago Charles as secretary

Contracts Committee minutes signed on 23rd May 2022 under Min No: 193/CC/012/2021-2022 chaired by Dr. Semambo Edwin and Lukwago Charles as secretary

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of records of complaints in the Health Sector (indicating nature of cases, dates of registration, and any follow up actions taken) in line with the grievance redress framework as exemplified by the following the list of complaints recorded in the Grievance Records Book.</p> <p>1.St.Matia Murumba parish reported running water with bad smell on 23/5/2022. The Municipal Engineer was assigned to investigate and advise accordingly; and</p> <p>2. On 16/9/2022 the community complained about the breakage of drainage channel. The Municipal Engineer led a team for assessment.</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>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 no evidence that the Municipal LG has issued and disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to Kasozi H/C III and Nabutiti H/C III as the guidelines on medical waste management were not available.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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 no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council had a functional system/central infrastructures with equipment for medical waste management and had a dedicated/operational budget for health care waste management as exemplified by Kasozi H/C III and Nabutiti H/C III where neither a copy of contract with a registered waste management service provider nor a dedicated/operational budget for health care waste management were available.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG had conducted training and created awareness on health care waste management as reflected below:</p> <p>Training of municipal health workers and service providers on waste management was conducted on 20th September 2021 as shown in a report titled “Report on waste management training of municipal health management team” dated 20th September 2021.</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 no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council Costed ESMPs had been incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY (2021/2022 FY) as Costed ESMPs were absent in health sector projects designs, BoQs, and bidding and contractual documents that were presented by the LG and reviewed by the Assessor.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 16 | 2 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence to ascertain that health construction projects in Nansana Municipal Council were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership as exemplified by the following land title and letter of consent.</p> <p>1.Nabutiti Health Centre located at Nabutiti, Mengo district, Kyadondo county, Busukuma sub county, Block 132, Plot 209, Private Mailo land, measuring 1.617 hectares, endorsed by the Registrar of Titles on 15/7/2014; and</p> <p>2. The process of squiring land for Buwambo Health Centre IV is ongoing as exemplified by the letter of acknowledgement addressed to the land lord Mr. Edward Sempebwa, dated 7/12/2018 and prepared by the In-charge, Buwambo Health Centre IV.</p> |
| 16 | 0 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out consistent monitoring and engagement through the contract period of as health projects of the previous FY (2021/2022) were not implemented.</p> |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council contractor payment certificates were signed by the LG Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payment of contractor invoices/certificates as health projects of the previous FY (2021/2022) were not implemented.

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|---|
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <p>a. Above 80% score 2</p> <p>b. 60 -80%: 1</p> <p>c. Below 60: 0</p> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p> | N/A | 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>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. | N/A | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. | N/A | 0 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</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> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | | |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</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> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | | |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</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> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|---|
| 5 | Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i> | c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0 <i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i> | N/A | 0 |
|---|---|---|-----|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2 | N/A | 0 |
|---|--|---|-----|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2 | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 0 |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|---|
| 8 | <p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 | N/A | 0 |
|---|---|---|-----|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|---|
| 8 | <p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p> | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| 9 | Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support. | 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 | N/A | 0 |
|---|---|---|-----|----------|

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|-----|----------|
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted | 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 | N/A | 0 |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|-----|----------|

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|-----|----------|
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted | b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3. | N/A | 0 |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|-----|----------|

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|-----|----------|
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively | a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: | N/A | 0 |
|----|---|--|-----|----------|

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure Score 4 or else 0

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 0 |
| 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> | Assessment was not done | 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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 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>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> | N/A | 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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|---|
| 12 | Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements | 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 | N/A | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | | | |

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 | Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i> | | | |
| 14 | Safeguards for service delivery | 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 | Assessment was not done | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | | | |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments | 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 | Assessment was not done | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|-------------------------|----------|
| 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 | Assessment was not done | 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 | Assessment was not done | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0 | Assessment was not done | 0 |

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 | N/A | 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> | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> | <p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> | <p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | | | | |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|----------|
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|----------|
| 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|---|
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>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</p> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | N/A | 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 | d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 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 | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

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 | 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 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|---|
| 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>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 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>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |
| 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>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> | N/A | 0 |
| Maximum score 6 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</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>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>N/A - there was no micro-scale irrigation project in Nansana M/C</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> | N/A | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|----------|
| 11 | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. | b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----|----------|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 8 | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----|----------|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines | b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 8 | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----|----------|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines | c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 8 | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> | <p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 8</p> | | | |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 18</p> | | | |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 18</p> | | | |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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> | N/A | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 18</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> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>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> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>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> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 0 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--------------------------------|----------|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Assessment was not done</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|--------------------------------|----------|

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all micro-scale irrigation projects for the previous FY (2021/2022) as completed Environmental and Social Screening Forms (ESSFs) and Costed ESMPs for micro-irrigation projects for the previous financial year were not available.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>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</p> | <p>Assessment was not done</p> | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>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</p> | <p>Assessment was not done</p> | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>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</p> | <p>Assessment was not done</p> | 0 |

**Micro-scale
Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|---|----------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation | If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i> | Not applicable | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | | | |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. | If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0. | There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all micro-scale irrigation projects for the previous FY (2021/2022) as completed Environmental and Social Screening Forms (ESSFs) and Costed ESMPs for micro-irrigation projects for the previous financial year were not available. | 0 |
| | <i>Maximum score is 30</i> | | | |

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|

Human Resource Management and Development

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p> | <p>Dr.Bugembe Isaac was substantively appointed on promotion from Senior Medical Officer to Principal Medical Officer Nansana MC as per letter Ref. CRM/10283 dated 3rd/5/2021 as directed by DSC Min. No.67 of 6/2021.</p> | 30 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mr. Zimula Hassan was substantively appointed on promotion from Senior Health Inspector to Principal Health Inspector on transfer of service from Wakiso DLG to Nansana MC as per letter Ref. CRM/10422 dated 9th/3/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.27 of 3/2022</p> | 20 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Nabakema Hafswa was substantively appointed on probation as Health Educator as per Ref, CRM/10426 dated 9th/3/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No. 29 of 3/2022.</p> | 20 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|----|
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all health projects as exemplified by Environmental Impact Screening Reports for the following projects.</p> <p>1. Construction of out-patient ward (OPD) in Buwambo village, Buwambo parish, Gombe division dated 20/9/2021, endorsed by the SEO and PCDO; and</p> <p>2. The construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III, Nabutiti village, Busukuma Division dated 9/9/2021 and signed by the SEO and the PCDO.</p> | 15 |
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all health sector projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY (2020/2021) as the potential environmental and social implications identified during screening stage did not require ESIA.</p> | 15 |

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | Mr.Lwanga Henry Sempijja was substantively appointed on promotion from Senior Education Officer to Principal Education Officer Nansana MC as per letter Ref. CRM/10268 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.185/2018 | 30 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | The Education department had two(2) inspector of schools:- 1. Ms Nanyanzi Prima Ritah was substantively appointed Senior Inspector of Schools as per letter Ref. CRM/10018 dated 3rd/3/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.26 of 3/2022 2. Mr. Katongole Katono Fredrick was substantively appointed inspector of schools as per letter Ref. CRM/10116 dated 23rd/3/2022 as directed by DSC Min No.190/2018 | 40 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|-----------|
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all education projects as exemplified by Environmental Impact Screening Reports for the following projects.</p> <p>1. Proposed construction of a 2-classroom block at Kanyange mixed primary school, Nabweru Division, dated 5/10/2021 and signed by the SEO and PCDO; and</p> <p>2. Proposed construction of pit latrine at Migadde Church of Uganda Primary School, dated 2/11/2021 and signed by the SEO and the PCDO.</p> | 15 |
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all education sector projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY (2020/2021) as the potential environmental and social implications identified during screening stage did not require ESIA.</p> | 15 |

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0 | Ms Nakabugo Agnes, was substantively appointed Principal Treasurer as per letter Ref. CRM/10003 dated 21st/10/ 2019 as directed by DSC Min. No.219 of 08/2019. | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0 | Mr.Miir Samuel was substantively appointed on promotion from Statistician to Senior Municipal Planner as per letter Ref. CRM/10006 dated 15th/10/ 2020 as directed by DSC Min. No.162 of 8/2020 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0 | Mr. Lugeye Henry was substantively appointed Municipal Principal Engineer on transfer of service from Mpigi DLG to Nansan MC as per letter Ref. CRM/10355 dated 3rd/5/2021 as directed by DSC Min. No.68 of 6/ 2021. | 3 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <p>1</p> <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. Nalumansi Stella was substantively appointed Municipal Senior Environment Officer as per letter Ref. CRM/10320 dated 25th/11/2021 as directed by DSC Min.234 of 17/2021</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>1</p> <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. Semambo Edwin was substantively appointed Municipal Senior Veterinary Officer as per letter Ref. CRM/10012 dated 18th/7/2018, as directed by DSC Min. No.224/2018</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>1</p> <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Ndagire Lillian was substantively appointed Municipal Principal Community Development Officer as per letter Ref. CRM/10023 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min.213/2018.</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>1</p> <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Nabasumba Loy was substantively appointed on promotion from Senior Commercial Officer to Principal Commercial Officer as per Ref. CRM/10440 letter dated 9th /3/ 2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.49 of 4/2022</p> | <p>3</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mr. Lukwago Charles was substantively appointed Senior Procurement Officer as per letter Ref. CRM/10053 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.203/2018</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Position is Vacant. Submission made to DSC for recruitment.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms Nansukusa Getrude Mpande was substantively appointed on promotion from Senior HRO to Principal Human Resource Officer as per letter Ref. CRM/10002 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.172/2018.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Position is not in the approved staff structure of the Municipal Council</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> | <p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. Kiguli Simon was substantively appointed on promotion from Physical Planner to Senior Physical Planner as per letter Ref CRM/10022 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min No.212/2018.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> | <p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. SekalongoJoseph was substantively appointed Senior Accountant as per letter Ref. CRM/10004 letter dated 19/8/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No. 152/10/2022..</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> | <p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. Sengendo Julius was appointed Senior Internal Auditor as per letter Ref. CRM/10025 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min No.196/2028.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> | <p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Kasozi Annet was substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer District Service as per letter Ref. CR/D/12371 dated 21st/9/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 330/2018.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | | | |

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

The Municipal Council has four(4) Divisions and hence 4 Senior Assistant Town Clerks/Principal Township Officers

The status of their appointment was as follows:-

Town clerks of the Division councils:-

1. Gombe Division: Mr. Senoga Ahmed appointment Senior Assistant Town Clerk as per letter Ref. CRM/10159 dated 17th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 176/2018;

2. Nansana Division: Ms. Namiiro Rosette appointment Senior Assistant Town Clerk as per letter Ref.CRM/10054 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 176/2018;

3. Nabweru Division: Ms.Namala Saudah Kajubi appointment Senior Assistant Town Clerk as per letter Ref.CRM/10067 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 176/2018;

4. Busukuma Division: Musoke Suleiman Kassim appointment Senior Assistant Town Clerk as per letter Ref. CRM/10054 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min No.176/2018

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The status of appointment for community development officers for the four divisions was as follows:-

Municipal Divisions

1. Nansana Division:
Nakyandiba Jenifer
appointment CDO as per letter Ref CRM/10084 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.215/2018;

2. Busukuma Division:
Walusimbi Ismael
appointment CDO as per letter Ref CRM/10035 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.216/2018;

3. Nabweru Division:
Namuswe Racheal
appointment CDO as per letter Ref CRM/10046 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.215/2018;

4. Gombe Division:
Zalwango Dorah
appointment CDO as per letter Ref CRM/10043 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.217/2017

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The Senior Accounts Assistants/Assistant Treasurers for the Divisions

1. Gombe Division.:Mr.Mr. Kirega David appointment Assistant Treasurer as per letter Ref. CRM/10075 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min, No. 194/2018;

2. Nansana Division: Namirembe Eva appointment Assistant Treasurer as per letter Ref. CRM/10052 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 194/2018;

3. Nabweru Division: Nayiga Florence appointment Assistant Treasurer as per letter Ref. CRM/10007 dated 18th/ 7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.192/2018;

4. Busukuma Division: Kakeeto Salim appointment Assistant Treasurer as per letter Ref. CRM/10008 dated 18th/7/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No. 192/2018

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>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> | <p>There was evidence that LG has released 188% of funds allocated in the previous FY to Natural Resources department (beyond 100%).</p> | 2 |
| <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>This is derived from Pg.11 of the annual financial statement: Statement of Appropriations</p> | <p>Whereas the budget for Natural Resources was UGX 251,464,000.00 a total of UGX 474,190,115.00 was released to the department during the year representing 188% disbursement to the department</p> | |
| 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>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> | <p>The LG had released only 75% of funds allocated in the previous FY to Community Based Services department and not 100%</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>This is derived from Pg.11 of the annual financial statement: Statement of Appropriations</p> | <p>The budget for Community Based Services was UGX 542,013,173.00 out of which UGX 235,847,698.00 was released representing 44% disbursement to the department</p> | |

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

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,

score 4 or else 0

There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects as exemplified by Environmental Impact Screening Reports for the following projects.

Maximum score is 12

1. Construction of the Rehabilitation and Skilling centre at Kasozi village, Busukuma Division, Nansana Municipality dated 13/10/2020, Signed by the Environmental Officer and the Principal Community Development Officer; and

2. The construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti HC III, Nabutiti village, Busukuma Division dated 9/9/2021, signed by the Environmental Officer and the Principal Community Development Officer.

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

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

There was no evidence that Nansana Municipal Council carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY (2020/2021) as the potential environmental and social implications identified during screening stage did not require ESIA.

Maximum score is 12

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 Nansana Municipal Council had Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) prior to commencement of all civil works as exemplified by letters of submissions of ESMP for construction projects prepared by the SEO and addressed to the Town Clerk.

1.A letter of submission of ESMP for Kasozi rehabilitation and skilling centre in Busukuma division, signed by the SEO and PCDO on 13/10/2020; and

2. A letter of submission of ESMP for a proposed construction of staff quarters at Nabutiti Health Centre III in Busukuma Division dated 22/9/2021.

Financial management and reporting

5

10

Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

There was evidence that Nansana Municipal Council, Vote No. 779 obtained un-qualified audit opinion for the FY 2021/2022.

This is derived from Page 3, Item No.115 of Auditors General's Report-Extract of Audit-Opinions issued on 1st Feb. 2023.

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).

maximum score is 10

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),

score 10 or else 0.

There was 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 FY 2020/2021. The submission was made on 25th Jan. 2022 vide Town Clerk's (unreferenced letter) dated 12th Jan. 2022 (signed by T/Clerk: Byabagambi Francis).

The report was submitted before February 2022.

Some of the issue in the report include the following:

-Failure to absorb funds (unspent balances) of UGX 623,220,943

-Failure to recover Youth Livelihood Program funds of UGX 448,052,765

- Failure to recover UWEP Program funds of UGX 413,856,015

Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY

Maximum Score 4

If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,

score 4 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG has submitted an annual Performance Contract and Procurement Plan for 2022/2023 within the time limit on 1st Aug. 2022 submitted through the PBS before the deadline of 31st Aug. 2022.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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>There was evidence that The LG submitted their Annual Performance Report for the year 2021/2022 to PSST before August 31, 2020 as follows:</p> <p>The quarterly reports were submitted as follows:</p> <p>Quarter-1 submitted through the PBS on 30th Oct. 2021</p> <p>Quarter-2 submitted through the PBS on 31st Jan. 2022</p> <p>Quarter-3 submitted through the PBS on 24th May 2022</p> <p>Quarter-4 was submitted on 28th Aug 2022, before the deadline of 31st Aug. 2022</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 LG did submitted all the Annual Performance Reports for the year 2021/2022 to PSST before August 31, 2021. Further verification of the records revealed the following:</p> <p>Quarter-1 was submitted through the PBS on 30th Oct. 2021;</p> <p>Quarter-2 was submitted through the PBS on 31st Jan. 2022;</p> <p>Quarter-3 was submitted through the PBS on 24th May 2022; and</p> <p>Quarter-4 was submitted on 28th Aug 2022, before the deadline of 31st Aug. 2022</p> <p>All reports were submitted through the PBS</p> | 4 |