



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Kasanda District

(Vote Code: 625)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	48%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	55%
Educational Performance Measures	55%
Health Performance Measures	50%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	48%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	2%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s) as per the Annual Performance Report for the FY 2019/20 and AWP FY 2019/20. The previously completed DDEG projects Included:  Construction of staff houses at Musoozi HCIII UGX 45,000,000 pg. 53 of Annual Performance Report;  Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000 pg.32 approved Budget.	<b>4</b>
2	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	Not Applicable.	<b>0</b>

2

Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 were completed as per the work plan; Ref: KASSANDA District LG approved work plan and quarter 4 performance report .

The LG had planned for the following projects as per the LG approved work plan 2019/2020 as indicated below;

1. Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000; page 32 approved Budget. Start date :1/7/2019 and Finish date: 14/4/2020
2. Construction of staff houses at Musoozi HCIII UGX 45,000,000 pg. 53 of Annual Performance Report; Start Date: 1/12/2019 and Finish Date: 30/6/2020.

Percentage of completed projects were calculated by dividing completed (2) total projects over (2) Overall Total projects multiplied by 100 projects completed as per work plan.

This was 100% completion as per the LG Q4 performance report.

3

3

Investment Performance

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0.

The LG Budgeted and spent all UGX 326,898,048 DDEG Fund for the previous FY on eligible Project / Activities as per DDEG Grant Budget and Implementation Guidelines. The activities/Projects included:

Construction of the District Administration Block UGX 170,995,297;

Construction of staff house at Musozi HCIII UGX 45,000,000;

Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000;

Procurement of 1 boat UGX 10,000,000;

Dissemination DDEG, Mentoring and Preparation of BoQs UGX 11,877,046;

Distribution of tree seedlings UGX 7,000,000;

Compilation and submission of Quarterly DDEG reports UGX 4,449,000;

Retooling-2 printers, 2 desktop computers, 2 filing cabins and internet router UGX 16,346,000;

Monitoring UGX 6,538,000 and

Capacity Building/Performance Improvement UGX 32,692,705.

2

3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price to for all the DDEG projects reviewed was within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates</p> <p>Only one DDEG project was availed for assessment</p> <p>These are the details of the projects reviewed.</p> <p>1. Project Name: Construction of a 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Buseregenyu P/S</p> <p>Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00012</p> <p>Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20</p> <p>Contract Price: 23,883,200</p> <p>Engineer's Estimate:22,800,000</p> <p>Price Variation: 1,083,200</p> <p>Percent Variation: 4.75%</p> <p>Comment: Variation is with range of +/-20%</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

#### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate.</p> <p>The information on the staff lists for the 3 sampled LLGs ie Kassanda T/C, Kiganda Sub county and Kassanda S/C was corresponding with the information on the approved costed staff establishment for Sub Counties and Kassanda Town council 2019/2020.</p>	2
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>All the reports on infrastructure constructed using the DDEG funds were reviewed. This included the following:</p> <p>Rehabilitation of boreholes at Makokoto 2, Bukuya 2, Kiganda 2, Kalwana 2 and Kassanda 2 UGX 500,000,000 LGDP pg. 86 and pg. 79 AWP. Interim payment certificate dated 13th January, 2020.</p> <p>Construction of staff houses at Musozi HCIII in Kiganda UGX 45, 000,000 AWP pg. 48. Interim payment certificate dated 25th June, 2020.</p> <p>Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000 LGDP pg. 85 and pg.32 approved Budget. Interim payment certificate dated 14th April, 2020</p>	2

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;  If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs  score 4 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the District had developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	No implementation of the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY was done.  The PIPs were not developed.	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS on 24th/11/2020 in a document with title "Submission of Recruitment Plan for FY 2021/2022" dated 24/11/2020.  <b>However, the submission date was after 30th/September 2020.</b>	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG HoDs were appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY.</p> <p>The HoDs who were not appraised included;</p> <p>District Community Development Officer Ssebulime Gonzaga,</p> <p>District Health Officer Ssentamu Lawrence,</p> <p>Ag District Natural Resource Office Kanagara Clare,</p> <p>Ag District Education Officer,</p> <p>Ag District Engineer Ssebyatika Fred and</p> <p>Senior Land Management Officer Nassanga Hamidah.</p> <p>Those who were appraised included;</p> <p>Chief Finance Officer Wekiky Nelson appraised on 30/6/2020,</p> <p>Ag District Commercial Officer was appraised on 16/6/2020 among others.</p>	0

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 Administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented as provided for in the guidelines.</p> <p>Examples of cases handled included;</p> <p>Minutes of Rewards and Sanctions Committee meeting held on 6/11/2019, Min 04/07/2019 was handling Disciplinary cases. Mukamwiza Abigail a Teacher was summoned for abscondment of duty for two years. She was sick but without asking for a sick leave. The committee recommended cautioning and to be transferred to a nearby school where she can access treatment.</p> <p>Rewards and sanctions report for quarter one FY 2020/2021 dated 10/10/2020 was submitted to MoPS on 10/10/2020. The major issues reported were abscondment and absenteeism.</p> <p>Committee minutes dated 25/8/2020 Min 4/RS/KAS/08/2020 handled disciplinary cases; Namagembe Annet Enrolled Midwife Kiganda HCIV refused to honour transfer. She wrote an apology and committee recommended re-instatement on the payroll.</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>The LG had not established a functional Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress at the time of this assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>Not all staff recruited during the previous FY accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment.</p> <p>Some Parish chiefs (Nakigudde Phionah, Nalugo Rehema, Lutaya Dirisa and Nawanku Esther) were appointed on 2/9/2019 and accessed payroll 28/11/2019.</p> <p>Bakabagabe Judith Parish Chief was appointed on 2/9/2019 and accessed payroll on 28/5/2020.</p> <p>Other staff were appointed on 2/9/2019 and 11/9/2019 but there was no information to determine when they accessed salary payroll.</p>	0

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.

The evidence provided was inadequate to determine  
whether all staff that retired during the previous FY  
accessed the pension payroll not later than two months  
after retirement.

List of staff who retired in the FY 2019/2020 from HRM,  
indicated that Kusiima Tinka Beatrice, Ssekaggya  
Kasirye Haruna, Mugerwa John Lucycyi and Nkuuma  
Jackson retired on 9/8/2019, 31/12/2019, 10/10/2019  
and 12/8/2019.

However, the date or month of accessing pension  
payroll was not indicated.

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



Effective Planning,  
Budgeting and  
Transfer of Funds for  
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

The LG warranted and transferred direct DDEG worth Ugx. 513,161,159 to LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget in FY 2019/20.

The LG had 9 sub counties and 1 Town Council and warranting of DDEG funds for all quarters was done as follows;

Q1 funds were warranted on 15th July 2019

Q2 funds were warranted on 8th October 2019

Q3 funds were warranted on 13th January 2020

The LG transferred DDEG funds for all quarters to all 9 sub counties and 1 Town Council. It was observed from release letters, for Q1 dated 15th July 2019 , Q2 dated 8th October 2019 and Q3 dated 13th January 2020 , in three equal installments( summed up) as detailed below:

1. Bukuya Ugx. 57,434,882
2. Kalwana Ugx. 60,200,248
3. Kassanda Ugx. 54,543,817
4. Kiganda Ugx. 67,365,060
5. Kitumbi Ugx. 96,652,799
6. Makokoto Ugx. 24,753,284
7. Manyogaseka Ugx. 30,032,619
8. Nyanzi Ugx. 43,733,750
9. Nalutuntu Ugx. 49,138,784
10. Kassanda TC Ugx. 29,305,916

Total 513,161,159

Thus the percentage of DDEG funds transferred to LGs was  $513,161,159 / 513,161,159 \times 100$

= 100 % of DDEG funds were transferred to LLGs thus the LG was compliant.

10

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:

Score: 2 or else score 0

GOU Approved Warrant Report KASSANDA District LG Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to 30-Jun-2020, dated 7-11-2020, the District LG had warranted DDEG funds for the FY 2019/2020 as follows;

Q1 DDEG funds were received on 15th July 2019 and transferred to Sub counties on 12th August 2019. (27 days)

Q2 DDEG funds were received on 08th October 2019 and transferred to divisions on 22nd October 2019.(14 days)

Q3 DDEG funds were received on 13th January 2020 and transferred to Sub counties on 22nd January 2020. (9days)

From the above, ALL DDEG transfers were delayed by more than 5 days, from the time of receipt of funds from MoFPED and release of funds to LLGs, thus the LG was not compliant.

0

10

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

The correspondence issued by CAO to LLGs on DDEG releases was not reconciling with the transfers for all quarters were as follows;

Q1 funds were released on 12th August 2019 and a communication sent on 15th July 2019.

Q2 funds were released on 22nd October 2019 and a communication sent on 8th October 2019.

Q3 funds were released on 22nd January 2020 and a communication sent on 13th January 2020.

There was a delay of more than 5 days between the times the DDEG funds were released and when a communication was sent to LLGs, thus KASSANDA District LG was non-compliant in this area.

0

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was insufficient evidence availed to ascertain that the District supervised or mentored all LLGs at least Quarterly. Only 3 reports for 3 Quarters were availed as follows:</p> <p>Report for the activity of carrying out Technical backstopping to Sub counties in Data collection dated 5th September, 2019 for Quarter 1.</p> <p>Support supervision and Mentoring of LLGs Report dated 20th December, 2019 showed that all the ten LLGs were supervised or mentored between 24th November and 16th December 2019 for Quarter 2.</p> <p>Report for the activity of carrying out technical Backstopping to Sub counties in Development Work plans Dated January, 2020 for Quarter 3.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was neither Monitoring reports nor TPC minutes availed by the planner to show whether the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC and evidence for corrective actions and follow up.</p>	0

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The LG did not maintain an updated Assets Register covering details on Buildings and Structures, Transport Equipment, Machinery and Equipment and other Assets as per Formats prescribed on pages 167 to 170 of Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007.</p> <p>In reference to the Draft Financial Statements FY 2019/20 and Summary Statement of Stores and other Assets (Physical Assets) as at the end of the year 30th June 2020. Page 34.</p> <p>The following Assets were acquired during the year:</p> <p>Land: 11,000,000</p> <p>Non Residential Buildings: 1,968,832,193</p> <p>Residential Buildings : 67,053,014</p> <p>Roads and Bridges : 252,734,324</p> <p>Furniture and Fittings : 2,528,022</p> <p>All these totaled to Ugx. 2,302,147,553.</p> <p>All the above Assets were not posted in the Assets Register at the time of Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was NO recommendation from the Board of Survey Report of FY 2018/19, to inform assets management decisions including procurement of new assets , maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets, as per section 102 (1) LGFAR and S34 (3) of the PFMA Act 2015.</p> <p>The report was submitted to Accountant General, MoFPED on 23rd August 2019 in a letter dated 15th August 2019.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>KASSANDA District LG was NOT compliant with the Physical Planning Act 2010, Part III Section (9), which requires the Physical Planning Committee to be in place and functional. It should be constituted by 13 members including a Physical Planner in private practice. The Committee should meet at least once per Quarter.</p> <p>The Chief Administrative Officer on 22nd August 2019, under reference No CR/214/1 appointed Eight Members to the Committee and thus the Committee was not fully constituted.</p> <p>The was NO evidence that the Committee was functional during the FY 2019/2020 , since there was no evidence presented about the 4 sets of minutes (one set per Quarter) that were submitted to MoLHUD, at the time of Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source. Below are some of the prioritized investments:</p> <p>Construction of Manyogaseka seed School UGX 650,814,000 LGDP pg.85 and pg. 32 Approved Budget 2019/2020.</p> <p>Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000 LGDP pg 85 and pg.32 approved Budget.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of boreholes at Makokoto 2, Bukuya 2, Kiganda 2, Kalwana 2 and Kassanda 2 UGX 500,000,000 LGDP pg. 86 and pg. 79 AWP 2019/2020.</p> <p>Drilling of deep boreholes in Bukuya 1, Myanzi 1, Kitumbi 2, Kassanda 1, Kiganda 1 and Makokoto 1 UGX 191,653,000 LGDP pg. 86 and pg. 79 AWP 2019/2020.</p> <p>Construction of staff houses at Musozi HCIII UGX 45,000,000 LGDP pg. 85 and Annual Performance Report pg. 53.</p> <p>Construction of the District Administration Block UGX 170,000,000. KSDEC meeting held on 22nd January, 2020 min 05/05/2019/KSDEC.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p>	<p>There was no field appraisal reports availed by the planner to confirm whether the LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility; Environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects for previous FY.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p>	<p>Evidence was provided to show that project profiles with costing had been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines. TPC meeting held on 23rd April, 2020 under Min. 08/23/04/2020. The following are the sampled investment projects in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under water/ Human capital program. The project of safe water provision, the activities included: Drilling 6 of boreholes at Kalama A, Kabagala, Masaba, Kiduuzi North, Kassazi B Kitayiza village. Rehabilitation of Boreholes at Bimbye, Mweya, Kiduuzi, south, Kalwanga, Kabulubutu, Katungulu, Nsozinga villages.</li> <li>Construction of a mini solar powered piped water system in Kyabakadde TC and Designing of a piped water system in Lugongwe TC. These are costed at UGX 714,308,000.</li> <li>2. On improvement of Health services provision under health department. The major activities were to: Renovate the vaccine store at Kassanda HCIV and upgrade of Kyasansuwa HCII to HCIII, which requires construction of a maternity ward, Placenta pit, staff quarter and other VIP latrines at UGX 946,905,000.</li> <li>3. Completion of Manyogaseka (St. Maria Gorret) and construction of Makokoto Seed School 1st phase of the construction and clearing of balance on Makokoto Seed at UGX 964,350,000.</li> </ol>	1
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>		

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were four DDEG projects implemented by the District, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Construction of staff quarters at Musozi primary school;</li> <li>2) Construction of administration Block at Kassanda District Headquarters;</li> <li>3) Procurement of a boat engine; and</li> <li>4) Procurement of Tree seedlings.</li> </ol> <p>Of the four projects, only Construction of staff quarters at Musozi primary school needed screening. Screening for the Administration Block was done in earlier years as this was being done in phases and this was phase II. The procurement projects for boat engine and seedlings did not require environmental screening.</p> <p>The screening from for Musozi staff quarters was signed by Mr. Kyakonye Medih on 24 June 2020.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All infrastructure projects for the current FY that are to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Sampled projects under DDEG in approved Procurement Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a 2 Stance Lined VIP latrine at Kabulubuutu Trading Centre</li> <li>2. Construction of a 4 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Tc play ground</li> <li>3. Second phase Staff House at Kiryanongo</li> </ol> <p>Note: DDEG projects for FY 20/21 obtained from the Submission of Kassanda DLG Procurement Plan 2020/2021 to PPDA dated 23-Sept-2020 and signed off by the Ag. CAO, Betunguura John.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	All infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction.  The following projects on the Procurement Plan appeared in the Contracts Committee Minutes.  1. Project: Construction of a 3 Stance Lined Latrine at Kikandwa P/S  Approved under: Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20  2. Project: Completion of Maternity at Myanzi  Approved under: Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20  3. Project: Construction of an office block at Ndeeba P/S  Approved under: Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG properly established the Project Implementation Team as specified in the sector guidelines.  Only one PM was appointed for all SFG projects – Kaweesa Ronald was appointed by the CAO on 28-Oct-2019	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer. This is because the DLG team didn't avail themselves for the site visit of this particular DDEG project.	0



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

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

There was no sufficient evidence that there was supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY.

The project below were reviewed and found to have attendance of relevant technical officers.

Data for one project was availed.

1. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 10-Oct-2020

In Attendance: PAS, Ag. DE, SEO, DISO, RDC, Civil Eng, DEO, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

2. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction

Date of Site Meeting: 03-Nov-2020

In Attendance: RDC, DISO, CAO, C/Person, DE, SE, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

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

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

Sample projects:

1. Project Name: Construction of 4 Stance Lined VIP Latrine with Shower at Bukuya HC III

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00033

Contractor: Bench Mark Technical Services (U) Ltd

Date of payment request: 24-June-2020

Date when paid: 25-June-2020

Amount: 34,275,342

2. Project Name: Renovation of Bukuya HC III Maternity Ward

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00033

Contractor: Winrar Services Ltd

Date of payment request: 24-June-2020

Date when paid: 25-June-2020

Amount: 35,524,496

3. Project Name: Upgrade of Makokoto HC II to HC III

Proc No: MoH/UgIFT/Wrks/2019-20/00001

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of payment request: 21-May-2020

Date when paid: 29-May-2020

Amount: 194,330,225.4

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

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

Score 1 or else 0

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

Sampled procurement files include:

1. Proj Name: Construction of a Classroom Block at Kanoga P/S Phase I in Makokoto S/C

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00005

Contractor: Kremiya Logistics Co Ltd

Contract Price: 47,889,710

Date of Contract Award: 25-Nov-2019

Approved Under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Date of Evaluation Report: 18-Oct-2019 Signed by Ssebyatika Fred who was the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee.

2. Proj Name: Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kinoni P/S Kiganda S/C

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00006

Contractor: Rosco Contractors Ltd

Contract Price: 46,492,000

Approved Under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Evaluation Report 21-Oct-2019 Signed by Sebyatika Fred who was the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee.

3. Proj Name: Construction of 4 Stance Lined VIP Latrine with Shower at Bukuya HC II

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00033

Contractor: Bench Mark Technical Services (U) Ltd

Contract Price: 34,275,342

Date of Contract Award: 27-Mar-2020

Approved Under: Min 15/Kas/DCC/March/19-20

Date of Evaluation Report: 03-Mar-2020 Signed by Sebyatika Fred who was the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee.

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.	There was evidence that the District had designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints). A letter dated 14 April 2020 written by the Ag. CAO, Mr. Betunguura John, appointed Mr. Sewankambo JB Kikere , Principal Assistant Secretary, as Chairperson of the Grievance and Redress Committee, Kassanda District.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<b>However</b> , presence of the GRC was mentioned but no documentation produced to indicate and/or give evidence of its presence.	
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.	A Grievance Log titled "Kassanda District Local Government Grievance Register 2019/2020" was available. The Log had a column for Date, Complaint Raised, Mode of Communication and Contact, Department and feedback.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0	The first entry in the Log was made on 4/4/2020 and the last was entered on 10/07/2020.  There was a paltry four entries entered within the period the Complaints Log has been in place. Two of the entries were in Education, one in Works and the last in Production.	
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	There were two adverts on two Noticeboards indicating how Grievances were handled. One was at the main District Noticeboard and the other at the CAOs Office Noticeboard.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0	But that was all. Grievance handling mechanisms were not advertised on other Noticeboards like LLG offices, Health Centres or Market places. It was therefore only those able to come to the District Headquarters that knew how grievances were handled. Also, the District web page was only being updated and grievance handling was not yet included.	

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 that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions had been integrated into LG Development Plans 2015/2016-2019/2020 dated 26th June, 2015, Annual work plans and budgets as described below:</p> <p>Restoration of degraded wetland UGX 4,000,000 LGDP pg. 90 and pg. 85 AWP 2091/2020;</p> <p>Sensitization of community members on environmental management UGX 3,000,000 LGDP pg. 90 and pg. 86 AWP 2019/2020;</p> <p>Staff training in environment and Natural resource management UGX 6,000,000 LGDP pg.87 and pg. 81 AWP 2019/2020 and Establishment of new nursery grounds UGX 4,000,000 LGDP pg.88 and pg. 82 AWP 2019/2020.</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  score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence availed by the planner was the attendance list for 2017/2018 without specific date when the LG disseminated the enhanced DDEG guidelines to LLGs.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The two DDEG projects outside health, education, water, and irrigation were:</p> <p>1) ) Procurement of a boat engine; and 2) Procurement of Tree seedlings.</p> <p>These projects did not need costing of Environmental and Social Management Plans.</p>	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. This is Procurement of Tree seedlings of a nursery that is run by a contractor. From records of Kassanda district Local Government Budget estimates FY 2019/20, the nursery was budgeted at UGX7,000,000/=	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all 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	The only project that required proof of ownership was Construction of staff quarters at Musozi primary school. But the Title for this Land was with the Founding body and not the District.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports. Reports availed included Environmental and Social Compliance Monitoring for:  1) Construction of Kassanda District Administration Block, dated 12th June 2020; and  2) Supervision of government projects in Kitumbi, Kalwana, Manyogaseka, Makokoto and Kiganda, dated 06/01/2020.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was NO evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. The two officers made it abundantly clear that they were not involved in this business.	1

## Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had carried out monthly bank reconciliations at the closure of FY on 30th June 2020 and was up to date as of 30th November 2020. The following Bank Accounts were all reconciled:</p> <p>Health Services Account, Statutory Bodies and Natural Resources, Education and Community Development, Operations, General Fund, Production and Marketing, UWEP Recovery, UWEP Enterprise and YLP Fund.</p> <p>The LG was compliant.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared and submitted all quarterly Internal Audit Reports as indicated below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 on 28/11/2019,</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 28/02/2020,</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 18/06/2020 and</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 25/08/2020.</p> <p>The LG was compliant.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had provided IA information to the LG Council/Chairperson and the LG PAC by submission of the reports on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 on 10/12/2019,</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 05/03/2020,</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 05/03/2020 and</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 01/09/2020.</p> <p>The status of implementation of IA findings for the previous FY, on follow up on Audit Queries from ALL Quarterly reports was done in the LGPAC meetings held on 17th and 18th March 2020 during the review of Q1 &amp; Q2 and also on 15th and 16th July 2020 during the review of Q3 &amp; Q4.</p> <p>These reports were submitted to the District LG Speaker and copied to the, Office of the Internal Auditor General, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Local Government, Inspector General of Government, Auditor General, Resident District LG Commissioner, District LG Public Accounts Committee, Chief Administrative Officer.</p>	1

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

The IA reports were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer on the following dates :

Quarter 1 on 10/12/2019,

Quarter 2 on 03/03/2020,

Quarter 3 on 29/06/2020, and

Quarter 4 on 01/09/2020.

The IA reports were submitted to LG PAC on the following dates as follows:

Quarter 1 on 10/12/2019,

Quarter 2 on 05/03/2020,

Quarter 3 on 05/03/2020 and

Quarter 4 on 01/09/2020.

The LG PAC had reviewed ALL quarterly Internal Audit Reports as evidenced by the following LG PAC minutes;

The LG PAC Committee meeting held on 17th and 18th March 2020 reviewed Q1 and Q2 Internal Audit Reports and made recommendations. Ref: Min 03/LGPAC/KSD/2020

The LG PAC Committee meeting held on 15th and 16th July 2020 reviewed Q3 & Q4 Internal Audit Reports and made recommendations. Ref: Min 04/LGPAC/KSD/2020.

LG was compliant.

## Local Revenues

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.

From the Draft financial statements 2019/20, page 10, 11 of the Statement of Appropriation Account and Statement of Local revenue, page 27. The projected revenue was Ugx.532, 950,000 and the Actual local revenue collection realized was Ugx. 366,825,160. This translated into a revenue collection ratio of 69% which was 31 % short of target. The allowable short fall is 90%.

This was beyond the acceptable allowable range of +/- 10% and hence LG not compliant.



19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2018/2019 was Ugx. 323,578,932 as shown on page 27 of the Final Accounts FY 2019/20.</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2019/2020 was Ugx. 366,825,160 as shown on page 27 of Financial statement ended 30th June 2020.</p> <p>Thus Ugx. (366,825,160 - 323,578,932)</p> <p>There was increase of Ugx 43,246,228</p> <p><math>(43,246,228/323,578,932) \times 100 = 13.3\%</math></p> <p>This was an increase in revenue, of 13.3% in comparison to the previous FY. This was above the 10% incremental range.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Sec 85 of LGA (2) "In rural areas, revenue shall be collected by the sub county councils, and a sub county council shall retain 65 percent, or any other higher percentage as the district council may approve, of the revenue collected by it and pass the remaining percentage over to the district"</p> <p>(4) "A district council may, with the concurrence of a sub county, collect revenue on behalf of the sub county council but shall remit 65 percent of the revenue so collected to the relevant sub county."</p> <p>In this regard to (4) above the DLG collected Local Service tax, Land fees, Business Licenses and other Revenues amounting to UGX 366,825,160. (Draft Final Accounts, Page 27, Statement of Revenues Collected during the year ended 30th June 2020). The 65% to be remitted to Sub Counties and Town Councils was equivalent to <math>(366,825,160 \times 65\%) = \text{UGX. } 238,436,354</math>.</p> <p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment, that the LG had remitted these funds to the Town Councils and Sub Counties.</p> <p>LG was not compliant.</p>	0

**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 the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published on the notice boards. Copies of publications were availed on file.

Sampled projects:

1. Proj Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places within Kassanda District

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Date of Display: 02-Nov-2019

Date of Removal: 11-Nov-2019

Best Evaluated Bid: Jjemusa Entreprises Ltd

2. Proj Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Date of Display: 02-Nov-2019

Date of Removal: 11-Nov-2019

Best Evaluated Bid: Spread Investments Ltd

3. Proj Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Proc No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Date of Display: 02-Nov-2019

Date of Removal: 11-Nov-2019

Best Evaluated Bid: KLR Uganda Ltd

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 at the time of the assessment that LGPA results and implications reports of 2018/19 FY were publicized on the LG notice board dated 28th November, 2019.

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG during the previous FY had meeting of feedback to the public on status of project implementation. District Chairperson's Accountability day/Baraza Report dated 28th June, 2019. The following are some of the issues discussed: Construction works for Kassanda District Administration block still in progress. Brick work for the first floor is ongoing and it was communicated that in this FY completion will be done; Sector performance in terms of infrastructure development activities and service delivery in education, Health and sanitation ,HIV/AIDS information; Physical planning; Trade, commerce and local economic developments; Works progress during the year and Land management and land security.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the notice boards at the LG, there was evidence on display of information related to tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal to the public.</p> <p>The CFO had prepared a circular addressed to tax payers inviting them for a local enhancement committee meeting. on 15/7/2019.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared an IGG report 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>During the Council meeting held on 26th November 2019, the Second meeting of the 1st Council, under MIN06/02/KDSC/2019.</p> <p>PRESENTATION OF IGG REPORT. (Page 7)</p> <p>Issue 1: "Delayed recruitment and appointment of staff as a result of lack of enough wage especially the economist"</p> <p>Action: "Wage request from the ministry of Finance to enable to recruit staff.</p> <p>Issue 2: "There was alleged inflation of pupils by Head teacher Kalyabulo"</p> <p>Action: "The staff was submitted to the District Service Commission"</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From Ref. no. EDUC/213/4, there was evidence that the PLE pass rate improved by 10.7% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2018: (DIV 1: 218; DIV 2: 1923; DIV 3: 1034; TOTAL PASS: 3175; TOTAL CANDATES: 4876).</p> <p>2019: (DIV 1: 301; DIV 2: 2535; DIV 3: 874; TOTAL PASS: 65.1%; TOTAL CANDATES: 4893). Therefore, the calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>(3175/4876 \times 100) = 65.1\%</math> while the calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>(3710/4893 \times 100) = 75.8\%</math>. Hence, the percentage decline was <math>75.8\% - 65.1\% = 10.7\%</math>.</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the UCE pass rate had improved by 1% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2018: (DIV 1: 8; DIV 2: 52; DIV 3: 88; TOTAL PASS: 148; TOTAL CANDATES: 382).</p> <p>2019: (DIV 1: 19; DIV 2: 80; DIV 3: 131; TOTAL PASS: 230; TOTAL CANDATES: 578).</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>148/382 \times 100 = 38.7\%</math> While the calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>230/578 \times 100 = 39.7\%</math>.</p> <p>Therefore <math>39.7\% - 38.7\% = 1\%</math> improvement.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	Not Applicable.	0

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

There was evidence that the Education  
development grant was use on eligible activities  
as defined in the Sector Guidelines. The SFG  
mounted up to UGX 650,813,872= for FY  
2019/2020.

The educational guidelines followed were  
'planning, Budgeting and Implementation  
guidelines for Local government for education  
sestor of MoES-May 2019 on pages 11,12, 20  
and 26. The grant was used to construct projects  
like:

1. Construction of a 2 classroom block at  
Nkandwa P/S phase 1 under Ref. number  
kasa625/wrks/19-20/00008 by NAKIDUDUMA  
GENERAL MERCHANDISE at a sum of  
46,492,000= on 19th /11/2020.
2. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kinoni  
P/S on 23rd/9/2020 under ref number  
kasa625/wrks/19-20/00006 at 46,492,000= by  
ROSCO CONTRACTORS LTD.
3. Construction of a classroom block at Kanoga  
P/S Phase 1 under ref number kasa625/wrks/18-  
19/00005 at 47,889,710= on 31st /8/2020 by  
KREMIYA LOGISTICS Co LTD.
4. Construction of a 6 classroom block at  
Kawungeera P/S in Kiganda S/C on 24TH  
/6/2020 under ref number kasa625/wrks/18-  
19/00007 at 48,403,600= by ROSCO  
CONTRACTORS LTD.
5. Construction of a 5-stance VIP lined latrine at  
Lwanzo P/S in Kalwana S/C under  
kasa625/wrks/19-20/00036 by KREMIYA  
LOGISTICS Co LTD at 23,250,720= on 4th  
/6/2020.
6. Renovation of a 4 classroom block at kijukira  
P/S in Bukuyu S/C by Ssebu General  
Merchandise under contact number kasa/wrks/19-  
20/00028 at 29,076,380= on 26th /5/2020.
7. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Bukuyu  
islamic P/S in Bukuya S/C on 12th /5/2020 under  
ref number kasa625/wrks/18-19/0007 at  
47,553,410= by KHAZANA SERVICES LTD.
8. Construction of a 2 classroom block at  
Kakondwe P/S in Kiganda S/C on 30th /3/2020  
under ref number kasa625/wrks/19-20/00004 at  
87,012,846= by WINRAV SERVICES LTD.

Investment  
Performance: The LG  
has managed  
education projects as  
per guidelines  
  
Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

b) If the DEO, Environment  
Officer and CDO certified works  
on Education construction  
projects implemented in the  
previous FY before the LG made  
payments to the contractors  
score 2 or else score 0

From sampled vouchers showed 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. This was further confirmed after  
interacting with the Environment Officer and CDO  
who made it clear that they were not involved in  
the process and requested the CFO in future, not  
to effect payments before they certify works.  
Below are some of the payment vouchers  
reviewed:

Kaleeta Construction Ltd was contracted to  
construct Manyogaseka Seed Secondary School.  
At a contract sum of Ugx. 2,138,728,950.  
Certificate 3, was submitted on 12/5/2020.  
Certification was done by the CAO, CFO, DEO,  
CE, DE and District LG Internal Auditor worth  
Ugx. 137,518,922 on 12th May 2020

Rose Construction Ltd was contracted to  
construct a 2 Classroom block at Kinoni P/S,  
Phase 1. The Contract was worth Ugx.  
46,492,000. Certificate 1 was presented on  
17/3/2020 and Certification was done by the  
CAO, CFO, DEO, CE, DE and District LG Internal  
Auditor on 17th March 2020. Payment worth Ugx.  
46,492,000, was made on 25th March 2020.

Kremiya was contracted to construct a 2  
Classroom Block with an office under SFG at  
Banoga P/S Makokoto, the Contract sum of Ugx.  
47,889,770 .On 25th February 2020, Certificate 1  
was submitted. The Civil Engineer, DE, IA and  
CAO all signed on 25th February 2020 and  
payment was made on 26/2/2020.

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

The variations in contract price of sampled  
works/supplier for the previous FY contracts are  
all within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates

The following are the sampled projects.

1. Project Name: Construction of a 2 Classroom  
Block at Bukuya Islamic P/S, Phase I

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00007

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 47,583,410

Engineer's Estimate:51,000,000

Price Variation: -3,416,590

Percent Variation: -6.7%

Comment: Variation was within the range of +/-  
20%

2. Project Name: Construction of Classroom  
Block at Kanoga P/S Phase I in Makokoto S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00005

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 47,889,710

Engineer's Estimate:51,000,000

Price Variation: -3,110,290

Percent Variation: 6.1%

Comment: Variation within the range of +/-20%

3. Project Name: Construction of a 2 Classroom  
Block at KInoni P/S Kiganda S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00006

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 46,492,000

Engineer's Estimate:51,000,000

Price Variation: -4,508,000

Percent Variation: -8.84%

Comment: Variation within the range of +/-20%

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY

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

Education projects, for the previous FY, were all completed as per work plan/Consolidated procurement plan.

82%% of the projects were completed (9/11\*100%).

The following projects were completed;

1. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block with an office at Kakondwe P/S in Kitumbi S/C
  2. Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Bukuya Islamic P/S in Bukuya S/C
  3. Construction of a two Classroom block at Kanoga P/S in Makokoto S/C
  4. Construction of a 2 Classroom block at Kinoni P/S in Kiganda S/C
  5. Construction of a 2 Classsroom block at Nkandwa P/S in Klganda S/C.
  6. Construction of 3 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Nazareth P/S in Kitumbi S/C
  7. Construction of a 2 unit Staff House at Kiryanonogo P/S in Kiganda S/C
  8. Construction of a 3 Stance Pit Latrine at Mayirikiti P/S in Kalwana S/C
  9. Construction of a 2 Duoble Roomed Staffhouse at Musozi P/S
- The following projects were not completed
1. Construction of a 4 Stance VIP Lined Pit Latrine at Mirembe P/S in Nalutu S/C
  2. Construction of a 3 Stance VIP Lined Pit Latrine at Kigalama P/S in Myanzi S/C

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines

- If 100%: score 3
- If 80 - 99%: score 2
- If 70 – 79% score: 1
- Below 70% score 0

There was evidence that the LG had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.

The submission of established Primary School Teachers dated 17/1/2020 indicated;

Required staff= 1119

Filled posts = 821

$821/1119 \times 100 = 73\%$

73% filled staff posts.



4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>All schools met the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines. From the submission of information on the school's assets register for Kasanda LG.</p> <p>From the submission of information on the school's assets register, all the 100 schools in Kasanda District submitted their Assets registers.</p> <p>Also from the performance contract;</p> <p>100 (100/100 X 100 = 100%) UPE schools had met the standards.</p>	3
---	---	---	--	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed. Below is the verification of deployment by the Municipal and the sampled school to verify deployment as per the minimum standards (Key: - SL- Deployed Staff List; and PV- Physical verification of deployment on ground):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mirembe Maria P/S in Kasanda T/C with an enrolment of 705 had SL-13, PV-13</li> <li>2. Namabale UMEA P/S in Kasanda S/C with an enrolment of 761 has SL-11, PV-11</li> <li>3. Kiganda RC P/S in Kiganda S/C with an enrolment of 676 has SL-14, PV-14.</li> </ol>	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a school Asset register reporting the school name, EMIS number, Number of classrooms, latrines, desks, laboratories, teacher's accommodation as of 2019/2020. However, all the sampled schools had no asset registers at the time of assessment. The schools also had no inspection reports apart from Kiganda RC P/S which was inspected by Lukwago Frank on 19th /9/2019 who recommended the school to lobby for the construction of a latrine and fining a strategy for renovation the teachers house, the school to establish policies that make parents to send their children to school on the first day.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

6	School compliance and performance improvement:	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:	There was no evidence the Kasanda LG had ensured that all registered primary schools had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they had submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30th. 100 primary schools were registered in the performance contract as per the PBS document at the LG.	0
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>100(100/100 X 100 = 100%) H/Ts submitted their assets registers.</p> <p>43 (43/100 X 100 = 43%) primary schools submitted annual reports with budget expenditures for 2019. Averagely, 71.5% ((100+43)/2 = 71.5%) registered primary schools had complied with the MoES annual Budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p>	
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:	There was no evidence that UPE schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations. All the three sampled schools prepared and implement SIPs in line with Inspection recommendations.	0
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>		
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:	There was evidence that LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year and information from EMIS data from MoES and it was consistent with that provided by the LG. Both sets of data had 100 UPE schools. 100(100/100 x 100) =100% UPE schools submitted their EMIS data to PBS on 19/9/2019 approved by the CAO on 11th /9/2019.	4
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>		

## Human Resource Management and Development

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

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:

Score 4 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that Kasanda LG Education department budgeted for at least a H/T and a minimum of 7 teachers as per Performance Contract FY 2019/2020. Kasanda had 100 primary schools and 818 teachers including Head teachers. The deployment list by school shows that at least seven (7) teachers are deployed in each primary school as per performance contract. The approved LG budget FY 2019/2020 for Kiboga LG, indicated a wage of UGX 4,770,369,918= from the annual work plan and budgeted for the H/T and a minimum of 7 teachers per school from the BFP raw data document.

For example;

1. Mirembe Maria P/S in Kasanda T/C with an enrolment of 705 had 13 teachers including the head teacher;
2. Namabale UMEA P/S in Kasanda S/C with an enrolment of 761 has 11 teachers including the Head teacher; and
3. Kiganda RC P/S in Kiganda S/C with an enrolment of 676 has 14 teachers including a Head teacher.
4. Kibanyi P/S with P1 –P2 with 186 pupils had 5 teachers.

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

There was evidence that the LG accurately reported on Teachers and where they were deployed. From the Staff lists and List of schools LG had deployed a Head Teacher in all the 100 government primary schools and a minimum of 7 teachers per school (or a minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) and a maximum of 13 teachers per school for this current FY 2019/2020. The total number of teachers was 818. The deployment list at the LG was the same as that in the sampled schools.

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,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the teacher deployment data was disseminated or publicized on LG notice board. However, from the sampled schools, the deployment list was displayed on the noticeboard in the Head Teachers office.</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>Some Primary School Head teachers were appraised while others were not.</p> <p>Those appraised included Nanyonjo Brenda appraised on 29/11/2019,</p> <p>Muhindo Samuel appraised on 30/12/2019,</p> <p>Lutalo Nelson appraised on 13/2/2020,</p> <p>Nakacwa Gertrude appraised on 31/12/2019,</p> <p>Mawejje Robert appraised on 29/11/2019 and</p> <p>Walugembe Moses appraised on 29/12/2019.</p> <p>Those who were not appraised included;</p> <p>Ssebukera Aloysius, Ndawula Charles, Mwebe Ssendawula Albert and Baingana Johnson.</p>	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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all secondary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p> <p>The list of secondary schools and their Head teachers provided included;</p> <p>Kimuli Ben, Ssenyonjo Richard, Kiiza Abdullah, Ssemata Deo, Nambi Sophia, Ssebulime Syrus, Kiiza Paskazia, Ssensalile John Mary, Gyagenda Moses and Acen Agnes N.</p>	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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department staff were appraised against their performance plans in the previous FY as follows;</p> <p>The Inspectors of Schools Naalima Benedicto and Lukwago Frank were appraised on 17/7/2020 and</p> <p>Inspector of schools Namuli Florence was appraised on 3/3/2020.</p> <p>Education Officer Namuyingo Mary Gorreti was appraised on 9/7/2020,</p> <p>Pool Stenographer Nantumbwe Marie was appraised on 19/3/2020 and Office Attendant Katongole Akim was appraised on 4/5/2020.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the Municipal level.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

**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>The LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the PBS by December 15th Annually. The list of submission to PBS has a list of 100 primary schools, their enrolment and Budget allocation and submitted on 19th /9/2019 to the planner.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

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

There was evidence that the LG had Annual Sector work plan and Budget for FY 2019/2020. The inspection was budgeted for UGX 43,322,000= and the department made allocations to monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education.

The inspection and monitoring functions in line with sector guidelines ie the Handbook for school inspection by DES printed on 2016 and MoES DES guidelines for inspection of Education institutions on SOPs by DES –Oct 2020. The activities conducted included;

Allowances/SDA, printing /Photocopying, travel inland for submission of reports & accountabilities, Dissemination

inspection findings & H/T & departmental meetings 30,912,000=;

Fuel - 4,000,000=

Office computer & accessories (Printers, UPS, Antivirus) - 9,000,000=

Vehicle/motorcycle maintance & insurance 2,500,000=

As submitted to DEO on 31st /7/2019 by DIS and forwarded to CAO on 7/8/2019 & received by DES on 20th /8/2019.

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 evidence that the LG submitted the PBS time stamp capitation grants for three quarters. This was cited on the PBS, GOU Approved Warrant Report KASSANDA District LG Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to 30-Jun-2020, dated 7-11-2020 and GoU Cash Limits Report as indicated below:

Term 1 capitation grant were received on 15th July 2019 and warranted on 12th August 2019.

Term 2 capitation grant were received on 08th October 2019 and warranted on 22nd October 2019

Term 3 capitation grant were received on 14th April 2020 and warranted on 19th April 2020

All warrants were submitted after 5 days; from the date of receipt of cash limits thus the LG was non-compliant.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG invoiced and that the MEO had communicated /publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MOFPED. The capitation list was pinned up on the LG notice board. H/Ts also receive messages through their watsap platform.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education department prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p>	0
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> <p>• If 100% score: 2</p> <p>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>• Below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence from the DIS of LG inspection and monitoring reports for the 100 UPE schools.</p>	0

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 evidence that School inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend for corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed –up.</p> <p>From the departmental meeting of Term 3, held on 6/1/2020 in the department office under minute EDUC/KSD/04/6/1/2020 under resolutions, inspection of schools was to complete reports concerning schools to be rehabilitated both tradition and government aided. Encouraging board members to produce minutes of meetings held discussing about errant teachers with clear actions to be taken.</p> <p>In the H/T meeting with school management committee chairpersons held at Kassa Boarding P/S on Wednesday 4th /Dec/2019 under EDU/KSD/6/4/12/2019 –inspection of school communication, Dissemination of inspectorate findings which is from a-h.</p> <p>For term 1, in the H/T’s meeting with school management committee chairpersons held on 13/2/2020 at the District HQ under minute EDUC/KSD/05/13/2/2020, the dissemination of inspection findings.</p>	2
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):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DIS and MEO 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).</p>	0



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had a Social Services Committee which had discussed education service delivery issues as follows;</p> <p>The Committee meeting held on 31/7/2019, under Education department, (Page 4):</p> <p>Among other items, they discussed Inspection and Monitoring findings in both Government and Private Schools in the District.</p> <p>During Council meeting held on 29th August 2019, MIN05/02/KSDC/2019. (Page 3)</p> <p>“Motion adopting LGPAC Report Recommending the Change of All UPE Bank Accounts from Stanbic to Centenary Bank”</p> <p>The LG was compliant.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.</p>	0

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a school Asset but not accurately reporting the school name, EMIS number, Number of classrooms, latrines, desks and laboratories as of 2019/2020. For example, at the Local Government;</p> <p>Mirembe Maria P/S in had 9 classrooms in good condition, 0 classrooms needing rehabilitation and needs 0 new facilities, 3 Latrines with 5 needing rehabilitation and need 14 new latrine, 110 desks with 0 needing rehabilitation and 146 more desks needed;</p> <p>Namabale UMEA P/S had 0 classrooms in good condition, 8 classrooms needing rehabilitation and needs 0 new facilities, 0 Latrines with needing rehabilitation and need 9 new latrines, 120 desks with 0 needing rehabilitation and 131 more desks needed; and</p> <p>Kiganda RC P/S in had 10 classrooms in good condition, 0 classrooms needing rehabilitation and needs 0 new facilities, 4 Latrines with 14 needing rehabilitation and need 0 new latrines, 120 desks with 0 needing rehabilitation and 105 more desks needed. At the school level, there was no school that had an assets register.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source in the previous FY. DEC Min 05/05/2019/KSDEC held on 22nd January, 2020. Review of Work plan for health, Education Department and DDEG Funds for the FY 2019/2020. The prioritized investments included:</p> <p>Construction of Manyogaseka seed School UGX 650,814,000 LGDP pg.85 and pg. 32 Approved Budget 2019/2020.</p> <p>Construction of a pit latrine at Buseregenyu primary school UGX 22,000,000 LGDP pg. 85 and pg.32 approved Budget.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no field appraisal reports availed by the planner to confirm whether the LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility; Environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects for previous FY.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, *score: 1, else score: 0*

The education infrastructure projects were incorporated into the LG procurement plan.

The following are the sampled projects.

1. Project Name: Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Bukuya Islamic P/S Phase I

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00007

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 47,583,410

2. Project Name: Construction of Classroom Block at Kanoga P/S Phase I in Makokoto S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00005

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/Dcc/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 47,889,710

3. Project Name: Construction of a 2Classroom Block at Kinoni P/S Kiganda S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00006

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 46,492,000

Note: The projects above were extracted from the procurement plan that was submitted by the Kassanda DLG to PPDA and received on 13-Dec-2019 and signed off by the CAO.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, *score: 1, else score: 0*

The education infrastructure investments were approved by Contracts Committee.

Sampled projects included:

1. Proj Name: Construction of an Office Block at Ndeeba P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 21,828,052

2. Proj Name: Construction of a two Stance Lined Latrine at Yala P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 9,027,911

3. Proj Name: Construction of a 3 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kamusenene P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 15,000,000

Note: The above education projects in procurement plan FY 20/21 were approved during a Contracts Committee meeting under Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20

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 projects constructed within the last FY were overseen by an implementation team as prescribed within the sector guidelines

Only one project within the current FY was availed for assessment.

1. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 10-Oct-2020

In Attendance: PAS, Ag. DE, SEO,DISO, RDC, Civil Eng, DEO, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

2. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction

Date of Site Meeting: 03-Nov-2020

In Attendance: RDC, DISO, CAO, C/Person, DE, SE, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The standard technical designs provided by the MoES were not fully followed.</p> <p>Spot measurements at the building site were taken and they were not fully compliant with the MoES standard designs.</p> <p>Standard drawings: Manyogaseka Seed Sec School – Science Block</p> <p>Door: Width – 1.2m, Height – 2.4m</p> <p>Windows: Width – 1.2m Height – 1.49m</p> <p>Veranda: 1.5m</p> <p>Splash Apron – 0.6m</p> <p>Building Width – 9.23m</p> <p>Roof – Gauge 26</p> <p>Site Measured Dimensions: Manyogaseka Seed Sec School – Science Block</p> <p>Door: Width – 1.22m, Height – 2.46m</p> <p>Windows: Width – 1.17m, 1.17m; Height – 1.45m, 1.45 m</p> <p>Veranda: 1.45m, 1.45m</p> <p>Splash Apron – 0.58m, 0.56m</p> <p>Building Width – 9.3m</p> <p>Roof – Gauge 26</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the monthly site meetings were conducted for all Education sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY.</p> <p>Sample reports availed were all for the current FY.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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 *score: 1, else score: 0*

During supervision, there was full participation of engineers, environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction.

The projects below were reviewed:

1. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 10-Oct-2020

In Attendance: PAS, Ag. DE, SEO, DISO, RDC, Civil Eng, DEO, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

2. Project Name: Construction of Manyogaseka Seed Sec School

Contractor: Kaleeta Construction

Date of Site Meeting: 03-Nov-2020

In Attendance: RDC, DISO, CAO, C/Person, DE, SE, Contractor

Signed off by: Kaweesa Ronald

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG provided evidence which indicated that all payment requests for sector infrastructure in FY 2019/2020 were initiated and executed as per contract and implementation results.

From the Projects undertaken by the KASSANDA District LG payments were made for stages that were satisfactorily completed and approved as per signed contracts; For instance:

Kremiya was contracted to construct a 2 Classroom Block with an office under SFG at Banoga P/S Makokoto, the Contract sum of Ugx. 47,889,770 .On 25th February 2020, Certificate 1 was submitted. The Civil Engineer, DE, IA and CAO all signed on 25th February 2020 and payment was made on 26/2/2020. This is a maximum of 2 days.

Rose Construction Ltd was contracted to construct a 2 Classroom block at Kinoni P/S, Phase 1. The Contract was worth Ugx. 46,492,000. Certificate 1 was presented on 17/3/2020 and Certification was done by the CAO, CFO, DEO, CE, DE and District LG Internal Auditor on 17th March 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 46,492,000, was made on 25th March 2020. This was 8 days.

Kaleeta Construction Ltd was contracted to construct Manyogaseka Seed Secondary School. At a contract sum of Ugx. 2,138,728,950. Certificate 3, was submitted on 12/5/2020. Certification was done by the CAO, CFO, DEO, CE, DE and District LG Internal Auditor worth Ugx. 137,518,922 on 12th May 2020. The payment was made on 21st May 2020. (9 days)

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, *score: 1, else, score: 0*

There was no evidence to show that the LG Education department submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30

The Education User Department submission was not availed for assessment.



Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law *score 1 or else score 0*

The procurement files for education infrastructure projects for the current FY were not yet complete.

Sampled projects included:

1. Proj Name: Construction of an Office Block at Ndeeba P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 21,828,052

2. Proj Name: Construction of a two Stance Lined Latrine at Yala P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 9,027,911

3. Proj Name: Construction of a 3 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kamusenene P/S

Date of approval of evaluation report: 27-Sept-2020

Date of Award Notification: 14-Oct-2020

Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 22-Oct-2020

Contract Price: 15,000,000

Note: The above education projects in procurement plan FY 20/21 were approved during a Contracts Committee meeting under Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20

Some constituents of the procurement files were not yet in place.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>Two grievances were recorded, namely:</p> <p>1) Madam Wanyama Justine failed to serve the transfer from Nakateete COU P/S to Seeta P/s; and</p> <p>2) Mr. Sekanabo Wilson of Kalagala P/S failed to fulfil his duty as a teacher and kept missing classes and sometimes attended classes while drunk.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the sampled schools, there was no evidence that LG had disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. Those sampled included:</p> <p>1) Construction of a 2-classroom block under SFG at Bukuya Islamic P/S in Bukuya S/C Phase II which had under Element 13 - Crosscutting issues mainstreaming including Environmental mitigation, costed at UGX1,000,000/= on page 73 of the BoQ;</p> <p>2) Construction of a 2-classroom block under SFG at Kinoni P/S in Kiganda S/C Phase I which had under Element 13 - Crosscutting issues mainstreaming including Environmental mitigation, costed at UGX1,000,000/= on page 741 of the BoQ;</p> <p>3) Construction of a 2-classroom block under SFG at Nkandwa P/S in Nalutuntu S/C Phase I which had under Element 13 - Crosscutting issues mainstreaming including Environmental mitigation, costed at UGX1,000,000/= on page 11 of the BoQ Annexes; and</p> <p>4) Construction of a 2-classroom block with an office under SFG at Kakondwe P/S in Kitumbi S/C which had under Element 13 - Crosscutting issues and mainstreaming including Environmental mitigation, costed at UGX1,000,000/= on the last unnumbered page 73 of the BoQ.</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>Of the nine school projects that had been implemented, NO one these had a title at the district. The Land Titles were held by the parent organisations namely, Church of Uganda, UMEA or RCM.</p> <p>Of those that did not belong to Faith-based Foundations like Manyogaseka and Bukuya Seed Schools, the Titles had been taken by External Auditors whose work coincided with this assessment.</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 evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports. Reports availed included Environmental and Social Compliance Monitoring for:</p> <p>1) Supervision of government projects in Kitumbi, Kalwana, Manyogaseka, Makokoto and Kiganda, dated 06/01/2020; and</p> <p>2) Ongoing renovation of classrooms under the education department.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was NO evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. The two officers made it abundantly clear that they were not involved in this business.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Local Government (LG) registered 180% increased utilisation of health care services based on total deliveries, changing from 133 in financial year (FY) 2018/2019 to 372 in FY 2019/2020 based on the 3 sampled health facilities including Kikabwa HCIII (increasing from 84 to 244), Nalutuntu HCIII (23 to 58) and Buseregenyu HCII (increasing from 26 to 70).</p> <p>There was a 43% increase in health care use based on total number of delivery (changing from 133 in FY 2018/2019 to 372 in FY 2019/2020).</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable. To be assessed next year.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 75%; score 2</li> <li>• 65 – 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65% ; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the four health facilities under the RBF scheme were in the second year.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG Budgeted UGX 711,681,000 and spent UGX 777,081,000 ( 109%) of the Health Development Grant for the previous FY on Eligible activities as per the Health grant and budget guideline as described below:

Fencing of Kassanda HCIV land UGX 32,429,000 pg. 52 of Annual Performance Report;

Construction of Makokoto HCIII UGX 500,000,000 pg.53 of Annual Performance Report;

Staff house construction at Buseregenyo HCIII UGX 150,000,000 pg. 53 of Annual Performance Report.

Construction of staff houses at Musoozi HCIII UGX 45,000,000 pg. 53 of Annual Performance Report;

Payment of retention fee for the upgrade of Buseregenyo HCII and Kikandwa HCIII UGX20,000,000 pg. 54 of Annual Performance Report and

Site appraisal and monitoring UGX 9,252,000 pg. 55 of Annual Performance Report

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

From sampled vouchers, certification of works for all Health Projects Contracts were done before payment to suppliers in FY 2019/2020, however there was no evidence that the CDO and Environment officer participated in the certification. For instance;

1. Winwar Services Ltd was contracted for Renovation of General and Maternity Ward at Bukunya HC III. Payment requisition worth Ugx. 71,099,423, was submitted by the Contractor on 16th June 2020 Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer on 16 June. Payment was made on 25th June.

2. Haso Engineers was contracted to Upgrade Makakokto HC II TO HCIII. Payment requisition was submitted by the Contractor on 19th June 2020 and Certificate 1. Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer and CE on 24th June 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 151,761,852. Payment was made on 24th June 2020.

3. Kaweesa Memorial Finance Ltd was contracted to Construct a 3 roomed Staff House at Masozi HCIII in Kiganda Sub County. Certificate 1 was submitted by the Contractor worth Ugx. 39,845,945 on 25th June 2020. Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer on 25th June 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 39,845,945 was effected on 29th June 2020.

These payments were ALL made WITHOUT certification of works done, by the Environment Officer and the CDO, as per Guidelines, hence the LG was non-compliant in this area.

Investment performance: c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0

The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.  
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

The variations in contract price of sampled works/supplier for the previous FY contracts were within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates

Projects Sampled

1. Project Name: Construction of a 4 Stance VIP Latrine with Shower at Bukuya HC III

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00033

Approved under: Min 15/Kas/DCC/March/19-20

Contract Price: 34,275,342

Engineer's Estimate:35,336,534

Price Variation: -1,061,192

Percent Variation: -3%

Comment: Variation is within range of +/-20%

2. Project Name: Renovation of Bukuya H/C III Maternity Ward

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00033

Approved under: Min 15/Kas/DCC/March/19-20

Contract Price: 98,311,700

Engineer's Estimate: 99,179,000

Price Variation: -867,300

Percent Variation: -0.87%

Comment: Variation is within range of +/-20%

3. Project Name: Upgrade of Makokoto HC II to HC III

Contract No: MoH/UgIFT/Wrks/2019-20/00001

Approved under: Min at MoH

Contract Price: 647,767,418

Engineer's Estimate:650,000,000

Price Variation: -2,232,582

Percent Variation: -0.34%

Comment: Variation is within range of +/-20%

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Health projects, for the previous FY, where contracts were not completed</p> <p>33% of the health projects were completed (1/3*100%).</p> <p>The projects completed include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrading of the General Maternity Ward at Bukuya H/C III</li> </ol> <p>Projects not yet complete</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Construction of a 4 Stance VIP Lined Pit Latrine with Showers at Bukuya HC III</li> <li>3. Upgrading of Makokoto HC II to HC III</li> </ol>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The list from HRM shows approved positions, filled and vacant or excess positions.</p> <p>The Ministry of Health Sector Grant and Budgeting guidelines to LGs for FY 2019/2020 explains the staffing schedule for HCIV=48 Staff and HCIII =19 staff.</p> <p>Kassanda DLG has 2 HCIV s=48x2=96</p> <p>6 HCIIIs =6X19=114</p> <p>96+114=210</p> <p>Filled posts for Kassanda HCIV =30</p> <p>Filled posts for Kiganda HCIV= 35</p> <p>6 HCIIIs filled posts= 15+13+7+7+6+9=57</p> <p>57/210x100= 27%</p> <p>27% positions filled.</p>	0



Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.

- If 100 % score 2 or else score 0

In the sampled facilities, the construction was not carried out according to design.

Sampled projects include:

Sampled project

Standard drawings: Makokoto HC III

Windows (Pompe) Height – 1.5m

Width – 2.0m

Doors (Internal): Height – 2.4m

Width – 1.5m

Doors (Internal): Height – 2.4m

Width – 0.9m

Splash Apron: 0.6m

Measured dimensions – Makokoto HC III

Windows (Pompe) Height – 1.49m, 1.50m

Width – 1.93m, 1.96

Doors (Internal): Height – 2.30m, 2.33m

Width – 1.41m, 1.42m

Doors (Internal): Height – 2.34m, 2.33m

Width – 0.83m, 0.81m

Veranda: 2.64m

Splash Apron: 0.58m, 0.56m

## 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 lists from the DHO and those on the November 2020 staff lists at the 3 sampled health facilities including; Namabaale HCII, Kasanda HCIV and Kiganda HCIV.</p>	2
			<p>The details are presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Namabaale HCII, all the 3 staff that were working as reflected on the staff list pinned on the notice board in the triage area were also on the staffing levels list from the DHO;</li> <li>2. At Kasanda HCIV, all the 37 staff that were the November 2020 staff list pinned on the wall at the OPD waiting area were also on the staffing levels list from the DHO; and</li> <li>3. At Kiganda HCIV, all the 35 staff on the staff list in the In-Charge's office were on the staffing levels list from the DHO.</li> </ol>	
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 was accurate. The list from the District Health Officer's (DHO) office, titled "Our Resource Envelop for 2020/2022" reflected Makokoto HCII to have been upgraded to in HCIII in FY 2019/2020. The same health facilities were reflected in the PBS quarter 4 report for Financial Year (FY) 2019/2020 on page 52.</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 Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO after the deadline of 31st March 2020 as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nalutuntu HCIII submitted on 15th July 2020;</li> <li>2. Bukuya HCIII submitted on 22nd July 2020; and</li> <li>3. Buserenyu HCIII submitted on 19th July 2020.</li> </ol>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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>	<p>Few of the health facilities prepared Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2019/2020 and submitted them to the DHO. Among the 3 sampled health facilities, only Busegegeyu HCII had submitted the Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2019/2020 on 14th August 2020. Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2019/2020 for Myanzi HCIII and Makonzi HCII were not available at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>		
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p>	<p>The health facilities had developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in assessment reports. There was no documentary evidence at the time of assessment that any of the 3 sampled health facilities including Kasanda HCIV, Kiganda HCIV and St. Mulunga HCIII had incorporated issues identified from the DHT's assessments and monitoring reports.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>		
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p>	<p>The health facilities did not submit 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). Among the sampled health facilities, only Kitokolo HCII submitted all monthly and quarterly reports on time. Kasanda HCIV submitted the November report late on 13th December 2020 and Makokoto HCII submitted the January 2020 late on 12th February 2020.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>The health facilities submitted 100% of the Results Based Financing (RBF) invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). All the 3 sampled health facilities submitted on time as follows; Kassanda HCIV submitted on 5th October 2020, Kiganda HCIV submitted on 9th October 2020, and St. Gabriel Mirembe Maria HCIII submitted on 6th October 2020.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not timely verify, compile and submit to MoH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities. Quarter 1 invoices were submitted on 8th January 2020, which was beyond the deadline of 15th October 2019.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District Planner availed only Quarter 4 quarterly budget performance Report for previous FY. This was submitted to him for consolidation on 5/08/2020.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for all the four health facilities dated 30th June 2019.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DHMT implemented the Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities. For instance, quarterly support supervisions were planned as reflected on page 1 of the Performance Improvement Plan. The quarterly support supervisions were conducted as reflected from quarter 2 report dated 16th January 2020.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG budgeted for health workers without following guidelines / staffing norms. For instance, the budget for Kassanda HCIV had 6 Enrolled Midwives instead of 3, 2 Assistant Nursing Officers (Midwifery) instead of 1 and 2 Assistant Nursing Officers (Nursing) instead of 1.</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</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 deployed 45.2% (138 out of 305) as per guidelines in accordance with staffing norms.</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</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>The health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities; Namabaale HCII, Kasanda HCIV and Kiganda HCIV. The details are presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Namabaale HCII, all the 3 staff that were working as reflected on the staff list pinned on the notice board in the triage area and duty roster for November 2020 were also on the deployment list from the DHO. An Askar was recruited locally by the health facility;</li> <li>2. At Kasanda HCIV, all the 37 staff that were the November 2020 staff list pinned on the wall at the OPD waiting area and duty roster for November 2020 were also on the staff deployment list from the DHO; and</li> <li>3. At Kiganda HCIV, all the 35 staff on the staff list in the In-Charges's office and duty roster for November 2020 were on the staff deployment list from the DHO.</li> </ol>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had not publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards. Among the 3 sampled health facilities, Kassanda HCIV had pinned the staff list with 37 workers on the wall in the OPD waiting area, while Namabaale HCII had posted the list with 3 workers on the notice board. However, Kiganda HCIV did not have any staff list displayed at the time of the assessment.</p>	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	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 information from the Personal files of health facility in-charges showed that all were appraised during FY 2019/2020.  Enrolled Nurses Nabugwawo RacheL, Nankinga Alice, Namugga Jane, Nakityo Grace, Nsamba Swamad, Masereka Yereimiya, Kiyoola Damascus and Kasiano Eria were appraised on 2/7/2020, 8/7/2020, 30/6/2020, 23/7/2020, 7/7/2020, 24/7/2020, 3/7/2020 and 30/7/2020 respectively.  Clinical Officers Ssekadde Robert and Sseguya William were appointed on 18/7/2020 and 1/7/2020 respectively.  Enrolled midwives Najjemba Lilian and Nankya Annet Brenda were appraised on 4/8/2020 and 6/7/2020 respectively.  Senior Clinical Officers Oketayot Kennedy, Kabanda Joseph and Kizito Charles were appraised on 22/7/2020, 30/6/2020 and 29/7/2020 respectively.  Psychiatric Clinical Officer Kaganda Wilson was appraised on 19/7/2020.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers during the previous FY.  Only two out of the 10 sampled files had appraisals.  Kiwanuka Achileo Assistant Entomological Officer was appraised on 2/7/2020 and Magezi Kisembo was appraised on 1/8/2020.  Kutesa Prossy, Kalema Godfrey, Kagga Twahah, Kutesa Ronald, Mukasa Phoebe, Mulumba Matia, Mashani Wasige and Miria Allen were not appraised.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	The DHO/MMOH didn't take any corrective actions based on the appraisal reports.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not conduct train of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) following a consolidated plan. There was no consolidated plan for Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at the district at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had documented training activities in the training /CPD database reflected in a training log book. The data base contained key information, for instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the quality improvement training conducted on September was attended by 7 staff;</li> <li>2. the Results Based Financing conducted in on 4th January was attended by 9 staff; and</li> <li>3. the Gender Based Violence training conducted on 15th December 2019 was attended by 12 staff.</li> </ol>	1

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>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 letter from the CAO notifying the MOH in writing of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants (GoU and PNFP that received PHC NWR grants) for the current FY was not required since none of the 26 (20 public and 6 PNFPs) health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous on the list.</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>There was evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health Services in Line with Health Sector Guidelines. The PHC NWR grant was UGX 225,000,869, allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health Services was UGX 46,251,000. This translates to 20%. Annual Budget Performance Report pg.54</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>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG delayed to warrant the PHC NWR releases for three quarters. This was cited on the PBS, GOU Approved Warrant Report and GoU Cash Limits Report as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 PHC Grant were received on 15th July 2019 and invoiced on 12th August 2019,</p> <p>Q2 PHC grant were received on 08th October 2019 and invoiced on 22nd October 2019,</p> <p>Q3 PHC grant were received on 13th January 2020 and invoiced on 22nd January 2020 and</p> <p>Q4 PHC grant were received on 14th April 2020 and invoiced on 19th April 2020 .</p> <p>All warrants were submitted after 5 days; from the date of receipt of cash limits thus the LG was non-compliant.</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

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 funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0

The CAO invoiced and communicated a breakdown of Primary Health Care Conditional Grant to all health facility in charges in lower Health facilities as below;

From MoFPED quarterly circulars on expenditure limits to all accounting officers Local Governments were as follows.

Quarter 1: was dated 7th July 2019;  
Ref:MET.50/268/01.

Quarter 2: was dated 2nd October 2019;  
Ref:MET.50/268/01

Quarter 3: was dated 8th January 2020;  
Ref:MET.50/268/01

Quarter 4: was dated 8th April 2020;  
Ref:MET.50/268/01

From KASSANDA LG quarterly CAO communications on PHC releases to HCs on the following dates:

Quarter 1: 15th July 2019,

Quarter 2: 08th October 2019,

Quarter 3: 13th January 2020 and

Quarter 4: 14th April 2020.

The PHC funds were transferred as follows;

Q1 on 12th August 2019,

Q2 on 22nd October 2019

Q3 on 22nd January 2020 and

Q4 on 19th April 2020

From the above, there was a delay in releases of PHC funds to Health Facilities, thus the LG was not compliant.

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>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicised all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities after the deadline of 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED. This was reflected in the quarterly release lists by DHO as presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 list dated 19th September 2019 was pinned more than 30 working days after the release date of 9th July 2019;</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 list dated 12th December 2019 was pinned more than 30 working days after the release on 2nd October 2020;</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 list dated 30th March 2020 was pinned more than 30 working days after release on 8th January 2020; and</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 list dated 24th June 2020 was pinned more 30 working days after release on 28th April 2020.</li> </ol>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY. For instance, in the DHMT meeting held on 23rd April 2020 under minute 05/04/2020 and recommended that the Senior Community Development Officer should continue mobilizing people about COVID 19. The mobilization was conducted as highlighted in the weekly progress report on community engagement dated 24th June 2020 on page 2.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG quarterly performance review meetings involved all the 32 health facility In - Charges in quarterly DHMT performance review meetings as reflected in minutes dated 17th September 2019, 16th January 2020 and 24th July 2020.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG District Health Team (DHT) did not supervise 100% of HC IVs (Kiganda and Kassanda) at least once every quarter in the previous FY 2019/2020. Kasanda HCIV was not supervised in quarter 2 while Kigganda HCIV was not supervised in quarters 1 and 2. There was no evidence of supervision in the above quarters in the supervision books.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The DHT did not ensure that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY 2019/2020. Namabaale HCII, the only lower health facility among the 3 sampled, was not supervised in quarters 1 and 2. It was only supervised in third and fourth quarters on 21st February 2020, 9th March 2020 and 2nd June 2020.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The limited functionality of Quality Improvement (QI) Committees at health centre IVs and IIIs including Kassanda HCIV and Kiganda HCIV was discussed in the DHT quarterly meeting held on 15th April 2020 under minute 8. It was agreed that the QI committees should be sitting monthly to review medicines supplies and quality of care and make monthly reports.</p> <p>The DHT followed up on the implementation of the aforementioned recommendation and informed that QI committees for all HCIVs and HCIIIs were formed, focal persons were trained and reported monthly as indicated under minute 3 of the QI meeting held on 28th April 2020.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 the 22 health facilities that received government medicines and commodities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2019/2020. This was reflected in reports dated; 26th July 2019, 30th July 2019, 30th January 2020, 20th February 2020, 21st February 2020 and 30th June 2020.</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>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>There was insufficient evidence availed to ascertain whether the LG allocated at least 30% of Health office Budget to Health Promotion and Budget Prevention Activities. According to planner, all activities were budgeted under health care monitoring and inspection. This made it impossible to establish whether at least 30% of the budget was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities. Annual Budget Performance report pg. 54</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 DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY. For instance he weekly progress report on community engagement dated 24th June 2020 showed that community sentisation on COVID 19 as seen on page 2.</p> <p>Radio talk shows were conducted on Heart FM and Tropical FM focusing on COVID 19 among other aspects as reflected in a report titled "Radio Talk Shows" dated 14th April 2020.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>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 DHT follow up actions taken by the DHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues. For instance, the DHT recommended that the Senior Community Development Officer would continue mobilizing people about COVID 19 as reflected under minute 05/04/2020 of the meeting held on 23rd April 2020.</p> <p>Follow up on the above action was mad under minute 04/04/2020 of the meeting held on 27th April 2020 where the Senior Community Development Officer was tasked and explained on the progress made.</p>	1

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have an updated asset register which set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. There was no documentary evidence of an assets register at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source in the previous FY. Min 05/05/2019/KSDEC held on 22nd January, 2020. Review of Work plan for health, Education Department and DDEG Funds for the FY 2019/2020. The prioritized investments included:</p> <p>Renovation of Kikandwa OPD HCII UGX 40,000,000 AWP pg. 84.</p> <p>Construction of staff houses at Musozi HCIII in Kiganda UGX 45, 000,000 AWP pg. 48</p> <p>Chain link construction at Kassanda HCIV UGX 32,000,000.</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Buseregenyo HCIII and Kikandwa HCIII UGX 650,000,000 pg. 48</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no field appraisal reports availed by the planner to confirm whether the LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility; Environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects for previous FY.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>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 were three (3) Health projects implemented in the previous year. Screening was done for these as follows:</p> <p>1) Upgrading of Makokoto HC II to HC III. Screening was done and the Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 12 April 2019;</p> <p>2) Rehabilitation of Bukuya Maternity Ward. Screening was done and Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 10 Sept. 2019;</p> <p>3) Renovation of District vaccine store. Screening was done and the Screening Form was signed by Kyakonye Medih on 24 June 2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 availed by the LG health department to show that the infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans were submitted by 30th April.</p> <p>The health department procurement plan was submitted on 15-April-2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence availed by the LG health department to show that the infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans were submitted by 30th April.</p> <p>The Health User Department procurement plan was submitted on 15-Apr-2020</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments were approved by Contracts committee.</p> <p>1. Proj Name: Upgrading of Kyansansuwa HC II to III at Manyogaseka SC</p> <p>Approved Under: Min18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20</p> <p>Date of approval of evaluation report: 07-July-2020</p> <p>Date of Award Notification: 16-July-2020</p> <p>Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 25-July-2020</p> <p>Contract Price: 500,000,000</p> <p>Note: The above health project in procurement plan FY 20/21 were approved during a Contracts Committee meeting under Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The Project Implementation Team was not fully established.</p> <p>Only one member of the team (CM) was appointed by the CAO.</p> <p>Evidence of the CAO designating the CM is listed below:</p> <p>1. Ssebyatika Fred as PM for Makokoto HC II on 12-May-2020</p>	0



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG Health infrastructure did not fully conform to the approved designs</p> <p>Sampled project</p> <p>Standard drawings: Makokoto HC III</p> <p>Windows (Pompe) Height – 1.5m</p> <p>Width – 2.0m</p> <p>Doors (Internal): Height – 2.4m</p> <p>Width – 1.5m</p> <p>Doors (Internal): Height – 2.4m</p> <p>Width – 0.9m</p> <p>Splash Apron: 0.6m</p> <p>Measured dimensions – Makokoto HC III</p> <p>Windows (Pompe) Height – 1.49m, 1.50m</p> <p>Width – 1.93m, 1.96</p> <p>Doors (Internal): Height – 2.30m, 2.33m</p> <p>Width – 1.41m, 1.42m</p> <p>Doors (Internal): Height – 2.34m, 2.33m</p> <p>Width – 0.83m, 0.81m</p> <p>Veranda: 2.64m</p> <p>Splash Apron: 0.58m, 0.56m</p>
----	--	---	--

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence of existence of Clerk of Works (Mulindwa Andrew) on site.</p> <p>Reports availed were prepared by the CoW on the following dates.</p> <p>15-Nov-2020</p> <p>04-Aug-2020</p>
----	--	---	---

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

Project Site meetings were held on a monthly basis as per guidelines; There is evidence of attendance of other key stakeholders.

1. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 04-Nov-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, RDC, DISO, PASS, CAO, LC III, DE, SE

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

2. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 20-Aug-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, DHO, DE, CE, LC III, SAS, CAO, PAS, DISO

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

3. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 08-July-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, RDC, MP, DISO, PASS, LC III, ADHO, LC V

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

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

There was evidence that the Local Government teams supervised the projects at least monthly

During site visits only the Site visitor's book was availed.

Sampled project

1. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 04-Nov-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, RDC, DISO, PASS, CAO, LC III, DE, SE

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

2. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 20-Aug-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, DHO, DE, CE, LC III, SAS, CAO, PAS, DISO

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

3. Project Name: Construction of Makokoto HC III

Contractor: Haso Engineers Ltd

Date of Site Meeting: 08-July-2020

In Attendance: Contractor, RDC, MP, DISO, PASS, LC III, ADHO, LC V

Signed off by: Ssebyatika Fred

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

From sampled payment vouchers, payment requests were certified and recommended on time within 2 weeks in FY 2019/2020. For instance;

1. Winwar Services Ltd was contracted for Renovation of General and Maternity Ward at Bukunya HC III. Payment requisition worth Ugx. 71,099,423, was submitted by the Contractor on 16th June 2020 Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer on 16 June. Payment was made on 25th June. (Nine days)

2. Haso Engineers was contracted to Upgrade Makokoto HC II TO HCIII. Payment requisition was submitted by the Contractor on 19th June 2020 and Certificate 1. Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer and CE on 24th June 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 151,761,852. Payment was made on 24th June 2020. (1 day)

3. Kaweesa Memorial Finance Ltd was contracted to Construct a 3 roomed Staff House at Masozi HCIII in Kiganda Sub County. Certificate 1 was submitted by the Contractor worth Ugx. 39,845,945 on 25th June 2020. Certification of payment was done by the Chief Administrative Officer, District LG Health Officer, District LG Internal Auditor, Chief Finance Officer, District LG Engineer on 25th June 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 39,845,945 was effected on 29th June 2020. (4 days.)

All these payments were made within two weeks, hence the LG was compliant in this area.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement files for health infrastructure projects for the current FY are not complete.</p> <p>The project sampled did not have the complete set of documents required for a procurement plan as per PPDA.</p> <p>Sampled project:</p> <p>1. Proj Name: Upgrading of Kyansansuwa HC II to III at Manyogaseka SC</p> <p>Approved Under: Min18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20</p> <p>Date of approval of evaluation report: 07-July-2020</p> <p>Date of Award Notification: 16-July-2020</p> <p>Proposed Date of Contract Signature: 25-July-2020</p> <p>Contract Price: 500,000,000</p> <p>Note: The above health project in procurement plan FY 20/21 were approved during a Contracts Committee meeting under Min 18/Kas/DCC/May/19-20</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

**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 were No grievances recorded in Health.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	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>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities.</p> <p>A Circular dated 16th October 2019 written by Dr. Ssentamu Lawrence to all District Health Facility in-charges was available. Among the recipients that signed acknowledging receipt of the Guidelines included 14 Health Facilities that received the guidelines from 23 October 2020 to 17th November 2020.</p> <p>There was also a reminder to all District in-charges to pick sanitation and medical waste management guidelines dated 23rd March 2020. A long list of those who received the guidelines was appended having 18 recipients.</p>	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	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>There was evidence that the LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical wast. Evidence was that:</p> <p>1) Green Label collects medical waste all the Health Centres; and</p> <p>2) Of the twenty H/Centres, two are HC IV and have incinerators. These are Kassanda HC IV and Kiganda HC IV.</p>	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was training on IPC (infection, Prevention and Control) of medical waste management from 20 - 24th May 2020 at Kyato Hotel, Kassanda. Twenty participants attended the training.</p>	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. Of the three projects implemented, one sampled for costing was Renovation of Maternity and General Ward at Bukuya HC III was costed under Environmental Issues at UGX2,240,000, 1,500,000, and 1,000,000/- totaling to UGX4,740,000. There was also a section costed for Lightening protection costed at UGX5,000,000/- under element 10.</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access and availability.</p> <p>Of the three Health projects that were implemented, there was a Land Title for Kikandwa HC III. It is located on Plot 16, Block 405, Singo County, Mubende District.</p> <p>The second project, Bukuya HC III is located on same land with Bukuya Sub county Headquarters. The land is Plot 53 and 54 Singo, Block 473.</p> <p>The third project of vaccine store is located at Kassanda HC IV but this is on Kabaka's land and has no any form of agreement.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports. Reports availed included Environmental and Social Compliance Monitoring for:</p> <p>1) Upgrade of Makokoto H/C II to III, dated 5th September 2020; and</p> <p>2) Supervision of government projects in Kitumbi, Kalwana, Manyogaseka, Makokoto and Kiganda, dated 06/01/2020. This included Health and Education projects.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. The two officers made it abundantly clear that they were not involved in this business.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the Management Information System (MIS) of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of the rural water sources in Kasanda 84%	1
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the Management Information System (MIS) of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the facilities in Kasanda District with functional water and sanitation committees was 85%	1
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.  If LG average scores is  a. Above 80% score 2  b. 60 -80%: 1  c. Below 60: 0  (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	The Lower Local Government Assessment had not started for Kasanda District Local Government. Therefore the parameter was not assessed.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment	b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.	Kasanda District has 09 Lower Local Government namely: Bukuya Sub County (with a coverage of 41%), Kalwana Sub County (with a coverage of 24%), Kasanda Sub County (with a coverage of 61%), Kiganda Sub County (with a coverage of 12%), KKitubi Sub County (with a coverage of	0



Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

- o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2
- o If 80-99%: Score 1
- o If below 80 %: Score 0

26%), Makekoto Sub County (with a coverage of 18%), Bagezza Sub County (with a coverage of 95%), Kitenga Sub County (with a coverage of 58%), Manyogaseka Sub County (with a coverage of 4%), Myanzi Sub County (with a coverage of 82%), and Nalutuntu Sub County (with a coverage of 58%).

The average rural water coverage for Kasanda district is 37%. This made Kalwana Sub County (with a coverage of 24%), Kiganda Sub County (with a coverage of 12%), Kitumbi Sub County (with a coverage of 26%), and Manyogaseka Sub County (with a coverage of 4%), the sub counties with coverage below the district average coverage (37%).

According to the Annual Work plan 2019/2020 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 08th, 2019 - under cover letter (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) - and received on July 15th, 2019 (and approved on July 28th, 2019), nineteen (#19) infrastructure projects were planned namely:

- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 140,000,000/=;
- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 214,118,283/=;
- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and
- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,000,000/=;

The District Annual (Quarter 4) Performance Report (2019-2020) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) on June 29th, 2020 and was received (acknowledged) on June 30th, 2020, The activities implemented included:

- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 149,506,000/=;
- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 246,811,750/=;
- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and
- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,953,968/=;

A copy of this report was reviewed during the assessment. Of the 19 projects which were planned and implemented in the year 2019/2020, only 6 (32%) projects were planned and implemented in the sub counties with water coverage below district average coverage. These were:

- Drilling of hand pumped boreholes (#03);
- Rehabilitation of hand pumped boreholes (#2)
- Construction of 5 stance lined latrine

Thus only 06 (32%) of the 19 planned projects were implemented in the sub counties with water coverage below district average coverage.

2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates

- o If within +/-20% score 2
- o If not score 0

According to the Annual Work plan 2019/2020 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 08th, 2019 - under cover letter (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) - and received on July 15th, 2019 (and approved on July 28th, 2019), nineteen (#19) infrastructure projects were planned through four infrastructure contracts namely:

- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 140,000,000/=;
- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 214,118,283/=;
- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and
- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,000,000/=;

According to the District Annual (Quarter 4) Performance Report (2019-2020) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) on June 29th, 2020 and was received (acknowledged) on June 30th, 2020, The activities implemented included:

- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) through Contract with KLR Uganda Ltd signed November 25th, 2019 (Procurement Reference No: KAS625/WRKS/19-20/00002) at a cost of UGX 149,506,000/=;
- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County through Contract with Spread Investment Ltd signed January 07th, 2020 (Procurement Reference No: KAS625/WRKS/19-

2

20/00001) at a cost of UGX 246,811,750/=;

- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes through Contract with Jjemuva Enterprises Ltd signed November 25th, 2019 (Procurement Reference No: KAS625/WRKS/19-20/00003) at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and

- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,953,968/=.

Copies of these contract documents were reviewed during the assessment. On the basis of this information, it was thus observed that the variations in the contract sum from planned sum were as follows:

- the contract for Drilling of 07 boreholes (inclusive of siting and drilling supervision) was done at a deviation of 7% above the engineer estimate;

- Design and construction of 1 Piped Water Scheme was done at a deviation of 15% above the engineers estimate; and

- Construction of lined pit latrine was done at a deviation of 5% above the Engineers estimation.

All the contracts in the district were implemented well below the 20% deviation benchmark.

<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>According to the Annual Work plan 2019/2020 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 08th, 2019 - under cover letter (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) - and received on July 15th, 2019 (and approved on July 28th, 2019), nineteen (#19) infrastructure projects were planned namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 140,000,000/=;</li> <li>- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 214,118,283/=;</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and</li> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,000,000/=;</li> </ul> <p>The District Annual (Quarter 4) Performance Report (2019-2020) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) on June 29th, 2020 and was received (acknowledged) on June 30th, 2020, The activities implemented included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 149,506,000/=;</li> <li>- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 246,811,750/=;</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and</li> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,953,968/=;</li> </ul> <p>All the planned infrastructure activities were implemented during the year.</p>
---	--	--

3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>According to the Management Information System (MIS) of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of the water supply facilities in Kasanda District for the year 2018-2019 was 83%. The functionality of water supply facilities the year 2019-2020 was 84% which represents an increase of 1% in the functionality of facilities in the district.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>According to the Management Information System (MIS) of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the facilities with functional Water Supply Committees in Kasanda District in the year 2018-2019 was 84% while that for the year 2019-2020 was 85% which represented an increase of 1% in facilities with functional water sources committees.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The District Annual (Quarter 4) Performance Report (2019-2020) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) on June 29th, 2020 and was received (acknowledged) on June 30th, 2020, The activities implemented included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drilling (inclusive of siting, drilling supervision and installation) boreholes (# 07) at a cost of UGX 149,506,000/=;</li> <li>- Designing and building of 01 Mini Solar Powered Water Supply Scheme in Mirembe RGC in Nalutuntu Sub County at a cost of UGX 246,811,750/=;</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of 10 old boreholes at a cost of UGX 60,000,000/=; and</li> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Lined Pit Latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Banyogazeka Sub County at a cost of UGX 20,953,968/=;</li> </ul> <p>Three of these projects were visited namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Borehole DWD 78231 located in Maggwa B Village, Maggwa Parish, Kasanda Sub County at GPS coordinates 36N0357943, UTM0063184, Altitude 1283. At the time of verification, the borehole was functional as reflected in Quarter 4 (Annual) report mentioned above. I physically met</li> </ul>	3
---	---	--	--	---

and talked to Ms. Mulema Pualine- Tel: 0775298295 (Chairperson –Water User Committee) and Mr. Sempela Bonny (Secretary Water User Committee) both of who expressed satisfaction with the state of the borehole and the quality of water therefrom;

- Borehole DWD 78238 located in Kalagi Village, Kigalama B Parish, Kiganda Sub County at GPS coordinates 36N0348654, UTM0056858, Altitude 1209m. At the time of verification, the borehole was functional as reflected in Quarter 4 (Annual) report mentioned above. I physically met and talked to Mr. Kakooza Sylvester – Chairperson Water User Committee (Tel - 0703254814) who expressed satisfaction with the state of the borehole; and

- Borehole DWD 57881 located in Gwaffu Village, Kampiri Parish, Myanzi Sub County at GPS coordinates 36N0375939, UTM0054410, Altitude 1217m. At the time of verification, the borehole was functional as reflected in Quarter 4 (Annual) report mentioned above. I physically met and talked to Ms. Sifa Annet wife to Safari Bunifaba – Member of benefiting community (Tel - 0779578068) who expressed satisfaction with the state of the borehole.

At the time of the verification three boreholes drilled in the different locations of the district were visited – they were found to be functional and serving the communities as contained in the annual report.

5

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

Evidence that the District Water Office monitored each Water Supply and Sanitation facilities to monitor their functionality was sought during the assessment exercise. The information on the new boreholes had been collected on Form 1(#013 – 6 by the district local government while 7 were by NGO called wells of life) was collected and compiled into a report prepared and endorsed by Mr. Ssebyatika Fred (Tel: 0772985773) the District Engineer. The date when they were delivered to the Ministry of Water and Environment was not seen. Information on Form 4 pertaining existing water sources was were seen.

2

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Water Officer did not provide evidence that that they had an MIS (WSS Data) which was updated quarterly at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Kasanda District Local Government has not started conducting assessment at Lower Local Government. The LLG Assessment Reports could not be availed. Equally, there was no copies of Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) that were received and/or reviewed during the assessment.</p>	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO budgeted for Water &amp; Sanitation staff:</p> <p>The position for 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene) were vacant.</p> <p>1 Borehole Maintenance Technician and Civil Engineer (Water) were budgeted for.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer.</p> <p>They were appointed as follows;</p> <p>Environment officer Kyankonye Medih appointed on 30/1/2019,</p> <p>Forestry Officer Wamundu Micheal was appointed on 2/6/2019 and the Natural resource Officer is on the recruitment plan for 2021/2022.</p>	2

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The District Water Office had District Water Officer, Assistant Water Officer, and Borehole Technician as the substantive Staff. There was no capacity needs of the staff that was identified. Equally, there were no training activities neither was there any training plans at the district level documented in the training database.</p>	0

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



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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

Kasanda District has 09 Lower Local Government namely: Bukuya Sub County (with a coverage of 41%), Kalwana Sub County (with a coverage of 24%), Kasanda Sub County (with a coverage of 61%), Kiganda Sub County (with a coverage of 12%), KKitubi Sub County (with a coverage of 26%), Makekoto Sub County (with a coverage of 18%), Bagezza Sub County (with a coverage of 95%), Kitenga Sub County (with a coverage of 58%), Manyogaseka Sub County (with a coverage of 4%), Myanzi Sub County (with a coverage of 82%), and Nalutuntu Sub County (with a coverage of 58%).

The average rural water coverage for Kasanda district is 37%. This made Kalwana Sub County (with a coverage of 24%), Kiganda Sub County (with a coverage of 12%), Kitumbi Sub County (with a coverage of 26%), and Manyogaseka Sub County (with a coverage of 4%), the sub counties with coverage below the district average coverage (37%).

According to the District Annual Work plan (2020-2021) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) on June 29th, 2020 and was received (and approved) on June 30th, 2020. The planned activities included:

- Drilling (and Siting) of 06 hand pump boreholes
- Drilling (and Siting) of 03 production boreholes (2 in Lugongwe RGC in Kitumbi S/C, and 1 in Kyabakadde RGC in Makokoto Sub County)
- Design of 2 piped water supply scheme at Lugongwe RGC in Kitumbi S/C, and at Kyabakadde RGC in Makokoto Sub County)
- Construction of one (#01) 5- stances Lined Pit Latrine at Kigalama RGC (Myanzi Sub County);
- Rehabilitation of ten (#10) old boreholes

22 projects were been planned. Of the 22 projects planned for the entire district, only 12 projects were planned in the sub counties with water coverage below the district average. These 12 projects included Drilling of 3 Hand Pumps, Drilling of 2 production wells, rehabilitation of borehole #6, and design of a pumped scheme. Thus 55% of the planned 22 projects were allocated to the sub counties with water coverage below district average coverage.

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3

The District Water Office(r) did not publicize the projects to be implemented in the different Lower Local Governments, in the year 2020/2021 including of the respective allocations per project planned in respective Sub County notice boards. Besides, the allocations to the Lower Local Government had not been uploaded to the district website.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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.)

- If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

In the pursuit for evidence that the District Water Office monitored each Water Supply and Sanitation facilities to ascertain their functionality among other aspects, four Quarterly Reports were provided by Local government District Water Office(r) for review during the assessment. The respective quarterly reports which were sent to the Ministry Head Quarters included:

- Quarter 1 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on October 14th, 2019 and was received on November 01st, 2019;
- Quarter 2 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on January 16th, 2020 and was received on February 04th, 2020;
- Quarter 3 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on April 20th, 2020 and was received on April 20th, 2020; and
- Quarter 4 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on June 29th, 2020 and was received on June 30th, 2020.

No information had been appended to the respective quarterly reports outlined above. Evidence that the District Water Office monitored each Water Supply and Sanitation facilities to monitor their functionality was sought from other documents that were shared by the district during the assessment exercise. The information on the new boreholes drilled in the district had been collected on Form 1 (#013 –# 6 by the district local government while #7 were by NGO called wells of life). This had been collected and compiled into a report prepared by Ms. Flavia Namyalo (Tel- 0784344468) the district Borehole Pump Technician and endorsed by Mr. Ssebyatika Fred (Tel: 0772985773) the District Engineer. The date when they were delivered to the Ministry of Water and Environment was not seen. Information on Form 4 pertaining over 80% of the existing water sources were also seen.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

In the pursuit for evidence that the District Water Office(r) conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings, four Quarterly Reports were provided by Local government District Water Office(r) for review during the assessment. The respective quarterly reports which were sent to the Ministry Head Quarters included:

- Quarter 1 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on October 14th, 2019 and was received on November 01st, 2019;
- Quarter 2 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on January 16th, 2020 and was received on February 04th, 2020;
- Quarter 3 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on April 20th, 2020 and was received on April 20th, 2020; and
- Quarter 4 Report (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on June 29th, 2020 and was received on June 30th, 2020.

These reports were forwarded under cover letters that were signed by Mr. John Betunguura and were each copied to the Director of Budget at the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Chairperson – Kasanda District Local Government, The Resident District Commissioner – Kasanda District, Secretary for Works and Technical Services – Kasanda District, and the District Water Officer-Kasanda District.

All the quarterly reports, with the exception of the Quarter 3 report, had respective software activities report appended to them.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2

There was no evidence that the District Water Office(r) publicized the projects to be implemented in the different Lower Local Governments, in the year 2020/2021 including of the respective allocations per project planned in respective Sub County.

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The budget was contained in the Annual Work plan 2019/2020 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 08th, 2019 - under cover letter (Ref: CR/KSND/210/3) - and received on July 15th, 2019 (the same was approved on July 28th, 2019), In this budget, UGX 33,991451/= was budgeted for NWR, of this UGX 19,961,451/= (59%) was allocated to activities related to mobilization. The activities related to mobilization in the same budget included lines 1.1-1.3, and budget lines 6.1 – 6.19.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer had reportedly trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities. 17 WUCs were trained (including 10 old boreholes and 7 new boreholes) Report on the Formation of Water Sources Committees was presented for review during the assessment. In total 90 WUC members were trained of whom 44 participants (49%) were female. The report was seen and reviewed during the assessment. It was prepared by the CDO Mr. Monday Owen and the Health Assistant. It was dated December 18th, 2019. Three water sources committees were checked on the recall of the training content – most of the committee members remembered being trained and the content of the training</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

**Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>District Water Office had a list of Water Supply and Sanitation facilities in the district. This was evidenced by the information on the new boreholes that had been collected on Form 1(#013 – 6 by the district local government while 7 were by NGO called wells of life) which was collected and compiled by Mr. Ssebyatika Fred (Tel: 0772985773) the District Engineer. There was also Information on existing water sources which was contained on Form 4 seen during the assessment.</p> <p>Beyond these, the District Water Officer in the district did not have any other assets to be registered according to the District Water Officer, Mr. Lutimba Arnold (Tel-0775040275) The equipment such as Office Table, Office Chair, Book Shelves, Cap Board, and Computers belonged to Works Department.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

b. 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 and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

There was evidence that the LG DWO had conducted a desk appraisal for all prioritized WSS Investment Projects in the Budget were derived from the approved District Development Plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. These included:

Rehabilitation of boreholes at Makokoto 2, Bukuya 2, Kiganda 2, Kalwana 2 and Kassanda 2 UGX 500,000,000 LGDP pg. 86 and pg. 79 AWP.

Drilling of deep boreholes in Bukuya 1, Myanzi 1, Kitumbi 2, Kassanda 1, Kiganda 1 and Makokoto 1 UGX 191,653,000 LGDP pg. 86 and pg. 79 AWP 2019/2020.

Design and Construction of Ggambwa solar powered piped water system UGX 216,800,000 LGDP pg.86 and pg. 79-80 AWP.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>According to Annual Work Plan (2020/2021) which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on June 29th, 2020 - under cover letter Ref CR/KSND/210/3 – and received (and approved) June 30th, 2020, the planned activities for the year (2020/2021) included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling (inclusive of siting and drilling supervision) of 06 hand pumped boreholes;</li> <li>- drilling (inclusive of siting and drilling supervision) of 03 production boreholes (2 in Lugongwe RGC Kitumbi SC and 1 in Kyabakadde RGC in Makokoto Sub County);</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes,</li> <li>- design and construction of Mini Solar piped water supply schemes at Lugongwe RGC Kitumbi SC;</li> <li>- design and construction of Mini Solar piped water supply schemes at Kyabakadde RGC in Makokoto Sub County; and</li> <li>- Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Kigalama RGC in Myanzi Sub County</li> </ul> <p>Applications were available for only 2 planned new boreholes.</p> <p>The applications that were available (seen during the assessment) included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drilling of 1 new borehole for Kayindi LC I Village Kyamulinga Parish, Kijuna Sub County which was signed by Ms. Mutumirehe Esteri on October 19th, 2020;</li> <li>- Drilling of 1 new Borehole for Kidunzi North LC I, Kijuna Parish, Kitumbi Sub County which was signed by Mr. Musisi Samuel- Tel 0750908833 (LCI Chairperson) on June 10th, 2020</li> </ul>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no field appraisal reports availed by the planner to confirm whether the LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility; Environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects for previous FY.</p>	0

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

There was NO evidence produced in this regard.



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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0

The water and sanitation infrastructure projects were incorporated in the procurement plan.

There was evidence of existence of projects in the submission of Kassanda DLG Procurement Plan for the FY 2019/20 to PPDA that was received on 13-Dec-2020 and signed off by the CAO

The following are the sampled projects.

Sampled project

1. Project Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places Within Kassanda District

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 66,534,200

Contractor: Jjemusa Enterprises Ltd

Evaluation Report: 29-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

2. Project Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Approved under: Min 4/Kas/DCC/Sept/19-20/

Contract Price: 246,811,750103,252,320

Contractor: Spread Investments Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

3. Project Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/19-20

Contract Price: 149,506,000

Contractor: KLR Uganda Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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:

There was evidence that water supply and public sanitation infrastructure projects for the current FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction

Sampled project

1. Project Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places Within Kassanda District

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 66,534,200

Contractor: Jjemusa Enterprises Ltd

2. Project Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Approved under: Min 4/Kas/DCC/Sept/19-20/

Contract Price: 246,811,750/103,252,320

Contractor: Spread Investments Ltd

3. Project Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/19-20

Contract Price: 149,506,000

Contractor: KLR Uganda Ltd

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

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

There was no evidence that the LG established the project implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines.

Contracts Implementation and management plans were availed but the only technical person on board was the Contract Manager

The following are the sampled projects.

1. Project Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places Within Kassanda District

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 66,534,200

Contractor: Jjemusa Enterprises Ltd

Evaluation Report: 29-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

2. Project Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Approved under: Min 4/Kas/DCC/Sept/19-20/

Contract Price: 246,811,750103,252,320

Contractor: Spread Investments Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

3. Project Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/19-20

Contract Price: 149,506,000

Contractor: KLR Uganda Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Kasanda district Local Government did construct one latrine at Kyabayiro RGC in Manyogaseka Sub County during year. However, due to the poor state of the road, the site could not be accessed during the verification. Seven boreholes were constructed during the year, three of which were visited as part of the field verification. I attest that the visited boreholes had their platforms constructed according to the national standard design for the hand pumps. The boreholes had also been installed with hand pumps of Uganda Mark II (U2) which is the equivalent of India Mark 2 which is the national technology of choice for hand pumped boreholes.

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

There was no sufficient evidence that the District Engineer, DWO, Environment officer and CDO participated in supervising the WSS projects.

Contracts Implementation and management plans were availed but the only technical person on board was the Contract Manager.

The following are the sampled projects.

Sampled project

1. Project Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places Within Kassanda District

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 66,534,200

Contractor: Jjemusa Enterprises Ltd

Evaluation Report: 29-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

2. Project Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Approved under: Min 4/Kas/DCC/Sept/19-20/

Contract Price: 246,811,750103,252,320

Contractor: Spread Investments Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

3. Project Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/19-20

Contract Price: 149,506,000

Contractor: KLR Uganda Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

<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>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the Sampled Vouchers that payment requests for Water Projects were certified and recommended for payment as per contract as highlighted below;</p> <p>KLR Uganda Ltd was contracted for siting, drilling, Construction and supervision of 6 hand Pump Boreholes. The Contract sum of Ugx. 149,506,000. Requisition for payment worth Ugx. 80,431,750 vide Certificate No.1 was submitted on 24th June 2020. Certification for payment was done by the CAO, CFO, IA, CE, DE and DWO on 24th June 2020. Payment worth Ugx. 80,431,750 was effected on 30th June 2020. (6 days).</p> <p>Spread Investments Ltd was contracted for Construction of Mirembe Solar Powered piped water system in Nalutuntu Sub County. Requisition for payment of Certificate No.1 worth Ugx.84, 534,610 was submitted on 28th January 2020. Certification for payment was done by the CAO, CFO, IA, CE, DE and DWO on 28th January 2020. Payment was effected on 30th January 2020. (2days)</p> <p>Spread Investments Ltd: Certificate N0.3 worth Ugx. 86,388,095 was submitted for payment on 4th June 2020. Certification for payment was done by the CAO, CFO, IA, CE, DE and DWO on 4th June 2020. Payment was effected on 11th June 2020. (6 days)</p> <p>Jjemura Enterprises Ltd was contracted for Rehabilitation of 10 Hand Pump boreholes in Kiganda, Nalututu, Makokoto, Bukuya, and Kassanda. Certificate No.1 worth Ugx. 38,487,854. Requisition for payment was submitted on 11th December 2019. Certification for payment was done by the CAO, CFO, IA, CE, DE and DWO on 11th December 2020. Payment was effected on 11th December 2019. (1 day)</p> <p>Certificate No.2 worth Ugx. 24,508,423. Requisition for payment was submitted on 10th January 2020. Certification for payment was done by the CAO, CFO, IA, CE, DE and DWO on 13th January 2020. Payment was effected on 15th January 2020. (5 days).</p>
---	---	--

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Score 2, If not score 0

Each contract for water infrastructure investments had all relevant records as per the PPDA law

The following are the sampled projects.

Sampled project

1. Project Name: Rehabilitation of 10 Boreholes in Various Places Within Kassanda District

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00003

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/Nov/19-20

Contract Price: 66,534,200

Contractor: Jjemusa Enterprises Ltd

Evaluation Report: 29-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

2. Project Name: Design and Construction of a Solar Powered Piped Water System at Mirembe TC in Nalutuntu S/C

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00001

Approved under: Min 4/Kas/DCC/Sept/19-20/

Contract Price: 246,811,750103,252,320

Contractor: Spread Investments Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

3. Project Name: Siting and Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Various Places

Contract No: Kas625/Wrks/19-20/00002

Approved under: Min 10/Kas/DCC/19-20

Contract Price: 149,506,000

Contractor: KLR Uganda Ltd

Evaluation Report: 24-Oct-2019. Signed by Sebyatika Fred as Chairperson of the Committee.

### Environment and Social Requirements

Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

*Maximum 3 points this performance measure*

Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:

Score 3, If not score 0

There were No grievances recorded in Water and Environment.

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence presented of such dissemination.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were NO such Plans in place.</p>	0



15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The District Water Officer provided evidence (Land titles, agreement Formal Consent, MOU) that Water Source and Sanitation Projects are implemented on land where the Local Government had Proof of Consent without any encumbrances for the new water and sanitation infrastructure projects implemented in the year 2019/2020.</p> <p>Five land agreements were provided for the boreholes that had been drilled in the district during the year. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Borehole at Kireeba LC I, Kiziika Parish, Kitumba Sub County. The land agreement was signed between Mr. Kiryahamuheru John (Land Owner) and witnessed by Mr. Timbitiina Alex – Chairman on August 01st, 2019;</li> <li>- Borehole at Kyakayongo LC1, Nalutuntu Parish, Nalutuntu Sub County. The land agreement was signed between Mr. E Ddamulira (Omutaka) (Land Owner) and Mr. Kadiyala Juma (LC 1 Chairperson);</li> <li>- Borehole at Gwaffu LC 1, Kampiri Parish, Myanzi Sub County. The land agreement was signed by Ms. Nabatanzi Tewo – Land Owner on March 08th, 2020;</li> <li>- Borehole at Luginji LCI, Luginji Parish, Kitumbi Sub County. The land agreement was signed between Mr. Nkundabandi Sayimoni – Tel 0702041371 (Land Owner) and witnessed by Mr. Ntamuhanga David Chairman LCI Tumwebaze; and</li> <li>- Borehole at Maggwa B LCI, Maggwa Parish, Kasanda Sub County. The land agreement was signed between Ms. Mpambu Florence (Land Owner) and witnessed by Mr. Mugisha James (Tel 0777413044) – LC Chairman on January 20st, 2020.</li> </ul>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>From the sampled payment Certificates, there was NO evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO signed the E&amp;S Certification forms before final payments to contractors were made.</p>	0

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was NO evidence in this regard for the  
Water and Environment Sector.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 4</li> <li>• 60 – 69%; score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%; score 0</li> </ul> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80% score 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
Maximum score 6				
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1  • If below 75% score 0	There was no evidence that the LG had recruited Extension Workers as per staffing structure. Comparing the approved costed staff establishment for 9 Sub Counties with the costed staff list for Agriculture Extension workers;  Approved Structure for LLGs Extension workers has 39 positions.  The costed staff list has 23 Positions.  23/39x100=59%  59% Filled positions.	0
Maximum score 6				

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	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	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	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	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	There was evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate.	0
	Maximum score 4		Information from the Kassanda Town Council staff list and Kiganda S/C staff list about extension workers was similar to that from  Kassanda LG costed staff list for Agriculture extension workers for FY 2019/2020.	

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	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	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>Maximum score 6</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>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
---	--	--	--	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	From the sampled LLGs there was evidence that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed.  The sampled LLGs included Kassanda T/C, Kassanda S/C and Kiganda S/C. All the staff lists had the names of the extension workers as per the deployment list from Production Department.  Also the arrival books/ Attendance registers showed regular attendance of the extension workers.	2
	Maximum score 6			
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	c) Evidence that extension workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that extension workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board.	0
	Maximum score 6			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	There was no evidence that the District Production Coordinator Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY;	0
	Maximum score 4			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of corrective actions taken.	0
	Maximum score 4			



8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0

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

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	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	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
----	--	--	--	---

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not assessed. LG not among the pilot beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation grant for FY 2020/2021.	0



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

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG recruited and appointed a Civil Engineer (Water) Lutimba Arnold on 14/9/2020, Min No. 34/2020 34.8 (1).	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence that the LG recruited an Assistant Water Officer for Mobilisation.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG recruited and appointed a Borehole Maintenance Technician Namyalo Flavia on 30/1/2019, Min No. 04/2019 4.15.	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	There was no evidence that the Natural Resources Officer was substantively recruited and appointed.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG recruited and appointed an Environment Officer Kyankonye Medih on 30/1/2019 Min No. 04/2019 4.9 (1).	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG recruited and appointed a Forestry Officer Wamundu Michael on 2/6/2017, Min No. 51/2017 51.4 (1).	10

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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.

Screening Reports were available for:

1) Surveying, drilling and installation of borehole at Kalagi village, Kigarama parish, Kiganda Sub County. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 04 Feb. 2020;

2) Surveying, drilling and installation of borehole at Kyakayongo village, Nalutuntu parish, Nalutuntu sub county. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 06 Feb. 2020;

3) Surveying, drilling and installation of borehole at Kalongo village, Kizibawo parish, Bukuya sub county. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 04 Feb. 2020;

4) Surveying, drilling and installation of borehole at Kireba 'A' village, Kiziika parish, Kitumbi sub county. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 03 Feb. 2020; and

5) Surveying, drilling and installation of borehole at Maggwa 'B' village, Maggwa parish, Kassanda sub county. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 07 Feb. 2020

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.	Screening reports indicated that ESIAs were not necessary for any of the projects screened.	<b>10</b>
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	There was NO evidence that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM. The only available abstraction permits were for mini solar-piped water system in Mirembe T/C in Nalutuntu Sub county.	<b>0</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the District Health Officer Ssentamu Lawrence was substantively appointed on 2/9/2019, Min No. KAS/DSC/25/2019 25.2.1.	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG recruited Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing.  Nursing Officer Nanyonjo Barbrah was assigned the duties of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing.	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG recruited Assistant District Health Officer (Environmental Health) Mashate Isaac on 12/9/2019, Min No. 40.1 /2019 (1).	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	The structure doesn't provide for the post of a principal Health Inspector.	10

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG recruited the Senior Health Educator Nekesa Esther Ruth on 23/10/2019, Min No. 48/2019 (5).</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG recruited a Biostatistician. According to the recruitment plan FY 2021/2022 dated 24/11/2020, the post of a Biostatistician was vacant.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG recruited and appointed a District Cold Chain Technician Muhindo Faustine on 11/9/2019, Min No. 39.9 (1)/2019.</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

1 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.

j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## **Environment and Social Requirements**

2 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)

If the LG carried out:  
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There were three (3) Health projects implemented in the previous year. Screening was done for these as follows:

1) Upgrading of Makokoto HC II to HC III. Screening was done and the Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 12 April 2019;

2) Rehabilitation of Bukuya Maternity Ward. Screening was done and Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 10 Sept. 2019;

3) Renovation of District vaccine store. Screening was done and the Screening Form was signed by Kyakonye Medih on 24 June 2020.

Maximum score is 30

**15**

2 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)

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

Screening reports indicated that ESIA's were not necessary for any of the projects screened.

Maximum score is 30

**15**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:  <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The LG didn't have a substantively recruited and appointed District Education Officer.  The Senior Inspector of Schools Hajji Sekabira Abdul was assigned duties of District Education Officer on 13/7/2020.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:  <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	There was evidence that the District had recruited and appointed all the Inspector of Schools as follows;  The Inspectors of schools Naalima Benedicto and Lukwago Frank were appointed on 26/11/2018.  The Senior Inspector of Schools was assigned duties of DEO.	40

**Environment and Social Requirements**



2

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:  
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There were nine Education projects. Those sampled that had been screened were as follows:

1) Construction of a two classroom block at Kampiri primary school, Kampiri village, Kampiri parish, Myanzi sub county. Screening form was signed by Wamuntu Michael on 27/Sept/ 2018;

2) Construction of Manyogaseka Seed School. Screening form was signed by Kyakonye Medih on 03/03/2019;

3) Construction of a permanent classroom block at Kanoni P/S. Screening form was signed by Kyakonye Medih on 02/03/2020;

4) Completion of a 3 classroom block at Nsozinya P/S. Screening form was signed by Kyakonye Medih but not dated; and

5) Construction of staff house at Kiganda secondary school. Screening Form was signed by Ms. Kamagara Claire on 01 April 2019.

15

2

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

The Maximum score is 30

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

Screening reports indicated that ESIAs were not necessary for any of the projects screened.

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG recruited a Chief Finance Officer Wekiye Nelson substantively appointed on 14/9/2020, KAS/DSC/MIN.34/2020, (34.1) (1).	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Planner was vacant as evidenced in the recruitment plan for FY 2021/2022 dated 24/11/2020.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG recruited a District Engineer. Senior Engineer Ssebyatika Fred Francis was assigned the duties of District Engineer on 13/7/2020.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence that the District Natural Resources Officer was substantively recruited and appointed.  The Senior Environment Officer Kanagara Clare was assigned the duties of District Natural Resource Officer on 13/7/2020.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence that District Production Officer was substantive. The Senior Production Officer Katongole Samuel Katushabe was assigned the duties of District Production Officer on 13/7/2020.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	There was evidence that the District Community Development Officer Ssebulime Gonzaga was substantively recruited on 30/1/2019, KAS/DSC /2019 4.17 (1).	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer,  score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence that the District Commercial Officer was substantively appointed.  The Senior Commercial Officer Kasendwa Robert was assigned the duties of District Commercial Officer.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	There was evidence that the Senior Procurement Officer Nansinjo Jesca was recruited on 10/9/2019, KAS/DSC/MIN NO/ 40.3 (1).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Procurement Officer Mugisa Godfrey was appointed on 21/1/2019, Min No. 04 /2019, 4.4 (1).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer,  score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Principal Human Resource Officer Naisaza Rebecca was appointed on 28/7/2020, Min No. 27 /2020 (1).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Senior Environment Officer Kanagara Clare was substantively appointed. The evidence was from the staff list of Natural Resource Department.	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Senior Land Management Officer Nassanga Hamidah was appointed on 11/9/2019, Min No. 39.7 (1).	2
	Maximum score is 37.			
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Senior Accountant Tumwebaze John was substantively appointed on 14/9/2020 KAS/DSC/34/2020, 34.2, (1).	2
	Maximum score is 37.			
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs,	There was no evidence that the Principal Internal Auditor was substantively appointed. The Senior Internal Auditor Baguma James was assigned the duties of Principal Internal Auditor on 19/10/2020.	0
	Maximum score is 37.	score 2 or else 0		
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The post of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was not filled at the time of this assessment.	0
	Maximum score is 37.			

2

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

There was no evidence that the LG had recruited Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGs.

Waguma Andrew Ag SAS Manyogaseka and Nakabiri Robinah Ag Town Clerk Kassanda were assigned duties of SAS on 13/7/2020.

Ddembe Latimer SAS Kassanda

S/C was appointed on 30/5/2007,

Nyinabalenzi Judith Birabwa SAS Kiganda S/C was appointed on 10/1/2014,

Lubega Micheal SAS Myanzi S/C was appointed on 4/1/2007,

Busuulwa David SAS Kalwana S/C was appointed on 20/2/2015 and

Matovu Julius SAS Nalutuntu S/C was appointed on 28/6/2017 among others.

0

2

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

score 5 or else 0.

There was no evidence that the LG recruited Community Development Officers or Senior CDOs in all LLGs.

Community Development Officers Ssenkayi Samuel (Manyogaseka S/C) and Namukose Edith (Makokoto S/C) were in acting positions.

CDOs Buzabalyawo Naggayi Rita (Kassanda S/C) and Nakandi Barbra (Kitumbi S/C) were appointed on 30/1/2029 among others.

0

2

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0.

There was no evidence that the LG recruited Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGs.

The list of Senior Accountants Provided included the following;

Ategeka Patrick, Tumwesigye Justus, Nankumba Norah, Kasozi Joel, Walakira Joseph, Kansime Meble and Kibuuka Spencer.

However, their personal files were not available at the time of this assessment to ascertain whether they are substantive or not.

0

### Environment and Social Requirements

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

From the Final Accounts for FY 2019/20 financial statement as at 30th June 2020 page 10, Statement of Appropriation Account (Based on Service Voted), the budgeted funds (Revised) for Natural Resources were Ugx.218, 593,267.

The actual Natural Resources funds released as of June 30th were Ugx. 218,593,267. This was 100% release of Budgeted Funds.

The LG was compliant with the performance measure because it released all funds that were allocated to Natural Resources.

2

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

From the Final Accounts for FY 2019/20. Financial statements as at 30th June 2020, page 10, Statement of Appropriation Account (Based on Services Voted), the budgeted funds (Revised) for Community Based Services were Ugx. 333,125,455.

The actual Community Based Services funds released as of 30th June 2020 were: Ugx. 333,125,455. This was 100% release of Budgeted Funds

Thus the LG was compliant to the performance measure since 100% of funds allocated to Community Based Services were ALL released.

2

4

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or else 0

There were four DDEG projects implemented by the District in the previous year, namely:

1) Construction of staff quarters at Musozi primary school;

2) Construction of administration Block at Kassanda District Headquarters;

3) Procurement of a boat engine; and

4) Procurement of Tree seedlings.

Of the four projects, only Construction of staff quarters at Musozi primary school needed screening. Screening for the Administration Block was done in earlier years as this was being done in phases and this was phase II. The procurement projects for boat engine and seedlings did not require environmental screening.

The screening from for Musozi staff quarters was signed by Mr. Kyakonye Medih on 24 June 2020.

4

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	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	Screening reports indicated that ESIAs were not necessary for any of the projects screened.	4
---	--	---	---	---

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;  score 4 or 0	It was mentioned that costing had been done for all DDEG projects but apart from the purchase of Tree Seedlings, paper evidence for the other three projects did not come-by.	0
---	--	--	---	---

**Financial management and reporting**

5	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	This will be assessed in January 2021 after the release of the Auditor Generals report.	0
---	---	---	---	---



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.

KASSANDA DLG submitted the responses on the Internal Auditor General's report for FY 2018/19 on 29th November 2019, Ref: CR/KSD/101/1. The responses were received by MOFPED, Accountant General, IGG, MOLG and Auditor General on 6th December 2019.

Seven queries were raised and all were responded to and their status clarified as detailed below:

1. Doubtful Expenditure. Cleared.
2. Un remitted shareable revenues to LLG. Done
3. Diversion of Funds. Done.
4. Non Remittance of 6% WHT. Done
5. Irregularities over payment of staff Salaries. Done.

The LG submitted responses on the Auditor General report for 2018/19 on 29th November 2019, which was received by MOFPED on 6th December 2019, Auditor General and Parliamentary LGAC.

The number of queries raised were three and they were cleared, as detailed below:

1. Budget Performance.
2. Under absorption of Funds
3. Implementation of Key Output.

This was within the submission deadline of February, hence the LG was compliant.

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 had submitted an Annual Performance Contract by 12th June, 2020. This was before August 31st of the current FY.

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on 4th October, 2019. This was beyond the deadline of August 31st.</p>	0
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 had submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year as follows:</p> <p>Q1 on 18th December, 2019.</p> <p>Q2 on 31st January, 2020.</p> <p>Q3 on 29th April, 2020.</p> <p>Q4 on 18th August, 2020.</p>	4