



LGMSD 2021/22

Mukono District

(Vote Code: 542)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 86% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 80% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 10% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 30% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 68% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 58% |
| Health Performance Measures | 57% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 69% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 83% |

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|---|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that the 3 sampled DDEG projects were being utilized as per the purposes of the projects:</p> <p>1-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506(LG Annual Performance report page 78);</p> <p>2-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674(LG Annual Performance report page 78); and</p> <p>3-Constructed Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000(LG Annual Performance report page 93).</p> | 4 |
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 | <p>This was not applicable for this year 2021/22.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2 | Service Delivery Performance | 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. | There was evidence that the projects planned to be implemented in the LG Annual Work Plan for the year 2021/22 page 6, were all completed 100% as per quarter 4 Performance report page 78 and 93: | 3 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 | <p>1-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506(LG Annual Performance report page 78);</p> <p>2-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674(LG Annual Performance report page 78);</p> <p>3-Constructed Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000(LG Annual Performance report page 93); and</p> <p>4-Phased Construction of the Administration Block at Ugx 150,000000(LG Annual Performance report page 88).</p> | |
| 3 | Investment Performance | 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: | There was evidence from the LG Annual work plan Page 6 and pages 78, 88 and 93 of the Annual Performance Report that LG spent all the DDEG of the year 2021/22 Ugx 1,944,285,000 on eligible projects. The projects/activities included: | 2 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | Score 2 or else score 0. | <p>1-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506;</p> <p>2-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;</p> <p>3-Constructed Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000;</p> <p>4-Phased Construction of the Administration Block at Ugx 150,000000;</p> <p>5- LLGs Ugx 1,081,481,000;</p> <p>6- Capacity building Ugx 86,200,000;</p> <p>7- Investment monitoring Ugx37,600,000;</p> <p>8- Payment for construction of two Classroom Block at Ttaba primary school in Mpatta SC - UGX 12,557,820;</p> <p>9.Procurement of tree seedlings for distribution to Public places Ugx- 15,000,000; and</p> <p>10. Procurement of Office furniture Ugx 39,923,000.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the estimate. The sampled projects were for: Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P.S in Kiyampisi sub county, where the estimate was Ugx 168,754.950 and the award was Ugx 166,427,506 and hence the variation was - 1.34%; and the Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Bukasa , Namiyade in Kimenyedde sub county, where the estimate was Ugx 168,754,950 and the award was Ugx 165,014,674 and hence the variation was -2.21% | 2 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0 | Three sampled LLGs to ascertain the accuracy of filled positions. Kasawo SC; The DC list had 14 filled positions and the list obtained from HR also had 14 Nakisunga Sc list had 19 and the list obtained from HR had 16 Kasawo SC list had 14 and the HR list also had 14 | 0 |
| 4 | Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0 | There was evidence that the projects planned to be implemented in the LG Annual Work Plan for the year 2021/22 page 6 , were all completed 100% as per quarter 4 Performance report pages 78 and 93: 1-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506; 2-Constructed 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674; and 3-Constructed Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000. | 2 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0 | The LG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS as per the submission letter HRM/MKN/156/01 dated 28th September 2022 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0 | The District conducted the tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per the attendance register of July 2021 to June 2022, reviewed; and the acknowledgement of the analysis by the CAO dated 12th June 2022 | 2 |
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0 | The LG had ten (10) HoD, Only eight (8) were appraised on the following dated; 1. CFO - 24th August 2022, 2. District Planner - 7th September 2022, 3. District Health Officer, 4. District Commercial Officer, 5. District Natural Resources Officer, 6. District Community Development Officer - 14th July 2022 , 7. District Engineer - 5th August 2022 and 8 . District Production Coordinator - 27th September 2022 | 0 |
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0 | The implemented administrative rewards and sanctions as per the minutes of the Reward and Sanctions Committee meeting held on 28th June 2022 and the letter to the PS ministry of Public Service HRM/MKN/157/1 dated 4th July 2022 submitting the 4th quarter reward and sanctions committee reports | 1 |
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0 | The district established the Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress as per the appointment letter MKN?/ P. 3056 dated 28th January 2022 , However the committee was NOT functional | 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>The district recruited twenty one (21) new member of staff during the previous FY, Group 1 of 9 candidates on 9th March 2022 and Group two of of 11 candidates on 18th January 2022.</p> <p>Group one candidate assumed duty during the month of April 2022. Of the five new employees of the group sampled , 4 accessed the IPPS payroll during the month of May and June - within two months of their assumption of duty, they included; Inspector of Schools - Gasuza Isaac who accessed during the month of May 2022 and Veterinary Officer - Sekiwunga Rogers who accessed during the month of July - Three months after assumption of duty</p> <p>Group two candidates assumed duty during the month of February 2022. Five new employees of the group sampled; accessed the IPPS payroll during the month May and June, over two months after assuming duty. They included; Education Assistant - Migadde Olive who accessed during the month of June 2022 and Office Attendant - Olive Nankabirwa who accessed during May 2022</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p> | <p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p> | <p>Eleven (11) employee retired from service on various dates during the previous FY as per the district retirement list examined. Only nine (9) accessed the payroll in 2 months. Five were sampled on the as sampled on the IPPS payroll. They included 1. Mulabbi Kirya Assistant Education Officer, retired on 26th 11 2021 and accessed during the month of January 2022 2. Namuli Mary - Inspector of Schools, retired 10/12/2021 and accessed during the month of January 2022 3. Nsubuga Jacob retired on 22/1/2022 and accessed during the month of March 2022, 4. Mulumba Romulus - Principal Fisheries Officer - retired on 15th August 2021 and accessed payroll during the month of January 2022, four months after retirement, and 5. Adraka Gard Harold - Education Assistant - retired on 20th November 2021 and accessed payroll during the month of February 2022, three months after retirement</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG transferred DDEG funds in full to LLGs. A total of UGX 1,081,481,484 as budgeted for in the year 2021/22, was fully transferred to LLGs as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 Ugx 360,493,828 was transferred on 23/7/2021;</p> <p>Quarter 2 Ugx 360,493,828 was transferred on 8/10/2021; and</p> <p>Quarter 3 Ugx 360,493,828 was transferred on 10/1/2022.</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not submit warrants in time for DDEG transfers to LLGs:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 23/7/2021, expenditure limits date was 6/7/2021; 17 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2021, expenditure limits date was 30/9/2021; 8 days and</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 10/1/2021 , expenditure limits date was 22/12/2022;19 days</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Quarter 1 invoiced on 23/7/2021, expenditure limits date was 6/7/2021; 17 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoiced on 8/10/2021, expenditure limits date was 30/9/2021; 8 days and</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoiced on 10/1/2021 , expenditure limits date was 22/12/2022;19 days</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG supervised and mentored all LLGs at least once quarterly:</p> <p>Q1 mentoring was done on 1/10/2021 at Nakifuma and Nagalama, and focus was on Work plan and Budgets;</p> <p>Q2 mentoring was done on 3/1/2022 at Mpunge and focus was on Budget Manual;</p> <p>Q3 mentoring was done on 31/3/2022 at Ntunda and focus was on Project maintenance; and</p> <p>Q4 mentoring was done on 27/5/2022 at Namugamba and focus was on DDEG guidelines.</p> | 2 |
| 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 evidence that the reports of support supervision and monitoring were discussed in the TPC meetings held on 28/4/2022 MIN73/MKN/DTPC/2021/22 and 27/1/2022 MIN/52/MKN/DTPC/2021/22.</p> | 2 |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0 | The LG maintained an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, Land etc. as per format in the accounting manual and was last updated on June 15,2022. 1. Land Ugx 0; 2. Building and structures: a) Non Residential buildings Ugx 6.984,098,108 ; b) Residential buildings Ugx 454,694,648 3. Roads and bridges Ugx 0; 4. Motorcycles Ugx 12,480,000 ; a) Others Ugx 19,204,000; 5. Office equipment Ugx 0; 6. Medical equipment Ugx 12,094,745; 7. ICT equipment Ugx 244,601,722 ; 9. Furniture and Fittings Ugx 107,393,157; 10. Cultivated assets Ugx 0 11. Motor vehicles Ugx 253,156,682 12. Others Ugx 4,451,458,653 Total Assets Ugx 12,717,157,857 | 2 |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets: Score 1 or else 0 | There was evidence in the Assets Register that the LG used the Board of Survey Report dated 25/8/2022 to make Assets Management decisions; assets such as Assets and ICT equipment were engraved as advised. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p> | <p>The LG Physical Planning Committee was in place and functioning, at least 4 sets of minutes were prepared and submitted to MoLHUD as required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes dated 15/9/2021 submitted on 20/9/2021; 2. Minutes dated 8/12/2021 submitted on 12/1/2022; 3. Minutes dated 29/3/2022 submitted on 14/4/2022; and 4. Minutes dated 17/6/2022 submitted on 18/6/2022. <p>The committee was constituted with 12 members and submission of new investments were considered within 30 days of submission. The LG did not have an approved Physical Development Plan.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (Page 136, 138) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 12/10/2020 for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506; 2-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;and 3-Construction of Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in Field Appraisal report dated 14/10/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included:</p> <p>1-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506;</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;and</p> <p>3-Construction of Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that the project profiles with costing were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY 2022/23. These projects were discussed in the meeting of 25/11/2021 MIN39/MKN/DTPC/21/22 . They included:</p> <p>.1Construction of 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Mpunge H/CIII in Mpunge S/c at Ugx34,000,000;</p> <p>2.Construction of 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Bugoye H/CII in Mpatta S/c at Ugx 34,000,000; and</p> <p>3.Construction of 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Kigogola H/CII in Kasawo S/c at Ugx34,000,000.</p> | 1 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before projects funded by the DDEG are approved for construction. There were two DDEG projects implemented and Environmental Screening was done as follows:</p> <p>1) Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S. Screening for this project was done and the Screening Form was signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO. The Form was not dated; and</p> <p>2) Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county. Screening for this project was done and the Screening Form was signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO. The Form was dated 01/07/21.</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>There was evidence that infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. The sampled projects were: Construction of a 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Damba Parents P/s in Koome S/c at Ugx 47,000,000; and Construction of a 5 stance VIP lined latrine at St Kizito Banda in Nakisunga S/c at Ugx 32,000,000.</p> | 1 |
| | | <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | | |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The was evidence of minute 117/2022 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on January 24, 2022 to approve the projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG under item 117.1.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG properly established PITs for the various sector projects. This was as per the following sampled letters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to the letter from the CAO referenced FIN/MKN/105/01 dated July 1, 2021 the PIT for Micro irrigation project was composed of: the District Production and marketing officer, the Senior agricultural officer, the senior environment officer, and the CDO; 2. According to the letter from the CAO referenced FIN/MKN/105/01 dated July 1, 2021, the PIT for Health sector projects was composed of: the District Health officer, the District Engineer, the senior environment officer, and the CDO; and 3. According to the letter from the CAO referenced FIN/MKN/105/01 dated July 1, 2021, the PIT for the Education sector project was composed of: the District Education officer, the District Engineer, the senior environment officer, and the CDO. | 1 |
| | | <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 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 evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer. The sampled projects were: 1. The Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi SC, where the sampled internal dimensions of the classroom were 7.5m x 8.23 m and it had 3 windows at the front and 3 windows at the rear with both a main door and an emergency rear door; and 2. The construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c Kyampisi SC, where the sampled internal dimensions of the classroom were 7.5m x 8.23 m and it had 3 windows at the front and 3 windows at the rear with both a main door and an emergency rear door. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO Supervised any projects. The sampled projects were the: Supply and installation of solar powered Microscale irrigation education demo sites, where only the District Marketing and Production officer and the Senior agricultural engineer approved payment of Ugx 40,623, 730 to RIMA (EA) Ltd; Construction of a medical store, a kitchen with 3 in one saving store, walk way to the incinerator, 10,000 litre and a fire fighting equipment, where the DHO, The Hospital Superintendent and District engineer approved a payment of Ugx 67,968,632. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes. The sampled payments were to: 1. RIMA (EA) for the supply of microscale irrigation system, where the invoice was received on June 8, 2022, was certified by the Production officer and the CDO on June 8, 2021 and payment was effected on July 21, 2022 under vr. no. 44364624; 2. KANAH TECHNICAL SERVICES for the expansion of Kome GFS, where the invoice was received on January 1, 2021, was certified by the Engineering assistant officer and the District water officer on , January 27 2021 and payment was effected on February 24, 2021 under vr. no. 34534460; 3. GABIKAN ENGINEERING LTD for the Construction of a medical store at the Mukono General hospital, where the invoice was received on March 30, 2022, was certified by the Engineering assistant officer and the DHO officer and LG Engineer on , May 5 2022 and payment was effected on May 24, 2022, under vr. no. 43555588. | 1 |

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG had complete procurement file in place for each contract. The sampled files were for:

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00005, Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P.S in Kiyampisi sub county, whose:

procurement requisition was made on September 17, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 168,754,950, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on November 18, 2021; and contract was signed on January 10, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 166,427,5060;

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00002 Construction of a medical store, a kitchen with 3 in one saving store, walk way to the incinerator, 10000 litre tank and a fire fighting equipment, whose:

procurement requisition was made on September 16, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 299,078,501, the advert was made on October 4, 2021 ; evaluation was completed on November 22, 2021; and contract was signed on February 14, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 296,869,608.

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00032 Supply and installation of solar powered Microscale irrigation education demo sites, whose:

procurement requisition was made on April 12, 2022; the procurement approval was made on April 12, 2022 with an estimate of 46,765,443, the advert was made on April 12, 2022; evaluation was completed on April 28, 2022; and contract was signed on May 25, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 45,644,457.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that Mukono District LG had 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. Letters dated January 28, 2022 with different Reference Numbers, signed by Mr. Nkata B. James, Chief Administrative Officer Mukono DLG were presented where seven staff were appointed to the Grievance Committee of Mukono DLG. The Principal Assistant Secretary (PAS) Coordinated the Committee.

2

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. Complaints were handled but no Complaints Log was in place. A Hard Cover Counter Book was available in the Deputy CAOs Office where notes were kept about various cases presented to the DLG but no systematic recording of the cases was done.</p> | 0 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties knew where to report and get redress. All department notice boards had telephone contacts of staff to contact in case of a grievance. The Notices were signed by the Principal Assistant Secretary (PAS), Mukono DLG.</p> | 1 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets ,Ugx 12 million was budgeted for tree seedlings on page 51 of the 2021/22 LG approved budget for the 3 projects below:</p> <p>1-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506;</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;and</p> <p>3-Construction of Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0 | There was evidence that DDEG guidelines were given to LLGs in the LG TPC meeting of 5/6/2022 and were acknowledged for. | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | <p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p> | <p>Costing was done for all DDEG projects and costed values were appended on the Screening forms for all projects screened namely:</p> <p>1) Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S; and</p> <p>2) Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county.</p> <p>But the costed values were not those in BoQs. Instead, summarized figures were recorded as lumpsum consideration for Environmental issues at UGX2.5 million.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | <p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p> | No such project was presented. There was nothing in this regard. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that ALL DDEG projects were implemented on land where Mukono DLG had proof of ownership, access, and availability of Land. The situation that obtained was as follows: 1) Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S. A letter to the District Education Officer dated 24.5.2021 from the Chairman of Masjid Noor Islamic School gave land to the school. The Local Council Chairman confirmed this in a letter dated 09/07/2021 and mentioned that the land donated to the school truly belonged to the Muslim Foundation; and 2) But for the Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county, there was no proof of ownership of land availed. | 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 no evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports. The situation that obtained was as below: 1) Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S. There was no Monitoring report for this; and 2) Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county. The Monitoring Report was dated 06/04/2022 and was signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent the Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO. | 0 |
| 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 for the two DDEG projects implemented in the previous FY. No records were availed in this regard. | 0 |

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>All the 3 bank accounts sampled had their monthly reconciliations done up to October 31, 2022. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Youth Livelihood Project ; 2. MUWRP; and 3. General Fund. | 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 produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports in the FY 2021/22 as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was prepared on 10/1/2022;</p> <p>Quarter 2 report was prepared on 11/4/2022 ;</p> <p>Quarter 3 report was prepared 28/6/2022; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was prepared on 22/7/2022.</p> | 2 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG had provided status of implementation of internal audit findings to the LG PAC for all the 4 quarters:</p> <p>Quarter 1 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 12/1/2022;</p> <p>Quarter 2 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 13/4/2022;</p> <p>Quarter 3 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 30/6/2022; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 29/7/2022.</p> | 1 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that all the 4 quarters internal audit reports were discussed.</p> | 0 |

Local Revenues

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 18 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The actual/budget local revenue collection ratio for the FY 2021/22 was 60% (UGX1,941,687,245 / 3,250,400,000). This was a budget variance of 40% which is outside +/- 10 %.</p> <p>(Source: LG draft Final accounts for FY 2021/22 page 12 and the LG Approved Work Plan and Budget for 2021/22 page 6.)</p> | 0 |
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. | <p>The LG OSR increased by 26 % from UGX 2020/21 shs 1,541,093,851 to UGX 1,941,687,245 in the FY 2021/22. (Source: LG audited accounts for Financial Year (FY) 2020/21 page 12 and draft accounts for the year 2021/22 page 12).</p> | 2 |

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

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

The shareable revenue of Ugx1,338,558,160 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:

NTENJERU-KISOGA TOWN COUNCIL
Ugx55,760,526;

NAKIFUMA-NAGALAMA TOWN COUNCIL Ugx
94,940,342;

KATOSI TOWN COUNCIL Ugx 79,249,940;

NAMATABA TOWN COUNCIL Ugx119,910,888;

KASAWO TOWN COUNCIL Ugx48,755,163;

MPATTA SUB COUNTY Ugx15,322,644;

KIMENYEDDE SUB COUNTY Ugx17,498,833;

KOOME SUB COUNTY Ugx34,080,574;

KYAMPISI SUB COUNTY Ugx179,190,946;

NAGOJJE SUB COUNTY Ugx29,746,259;

NAKISUNGA SUB COUNTY Ugx250,677,843;

NTUNDA SUB COUNTY Ugx4,463,204;

KASAWO SUB COUNTY Ugx32,073,530;

MPUNGE SUB COUNTY Ugx17,196,187;

NAMA SUB COUNTY Ugx347,353,029; and

SEETA NAMUNGANGA SUB COUNTY
Ugx12,338,252.

Transparency and Accountability

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence on the MoFED online portal details of bid opening which took place on November 14, 2022 in for projects in the Mukono DLG. The sampled projects were:</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block with office and store including furniture at Namataba PS in Namataba TC, and the bidders were JAHE BUILDING CONTRACTORS LIMITED with a quotation of Ugx138,857,208.00, ERASCO CO LTD with a quotation of Ugx 179,556,097 and AZIZA TECHNICAL SERVICES LIMITED with a quotation of Ugx 176,680,969.</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with urinal and bathroom at Bulijjo P/s in Kyampisi S/c AKIRAPA SUPPLIERS & ENGINEERS LTD with a price of Ugx 35,251,409, MUYIZZI CONSTRUCTION CO. LTD with a price of Ugx 33,820,487, and QUALITY ENGS AND SUPPLIERS LIMITED with a price of Ugx 34,755,809; and</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block with office and store including furniture at Nsonga CU P/S in Nakisunga S/c and the bidders were EVER INVESTMENT LTD with a quotation of Ugx 164,958,849, M/s CITY SIDE INVESTMENTS LTD with a quotation of Ugx160,806,651 and ERASCO CO LTD with a quotation of Ugx 179,556,097.00</p> | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>LG performance assessment results dated 3/10/2022 for the year 2020/21 together with the implications were available on the LG notice board at the time of the assessment on November 10, 2022.</p> | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation:</p> <p>A stakeholder meeting at the LG Headquarter on 29/8/2022 discussed budget performance and roads.</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>There was evidence that the LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal dated 6/7/2021 on the notice board.</p> | 1 |
| 22 | <p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG prepared a report dated 18/2/2022 on alleged abuse and mis use of public fund by the, chairperson LC3 Kimenyedde, he appeared in IGG and the case was still ongoing..</p> | 1 |

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>The LG experienced a 2% decline in PLE results between 2019 and 2020 as shown below;</p> <p>2019: Div. one was 1702, Div two was 6182, and Div. three was 2228. The total pass, therefore, was 10112 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 12520. The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, $10112/12520 \times 100 = 81\%$</p> <p>2020: Div. one was 2117; Div. two was 6,452, and Div. three was 2,398. The total pass, therefore, was 10,967 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 13,861 The calculated percentage for 2020 was, therefore, $10,967/13,861 \times 100 = 79\%$.</p> <p>Therefore $81\% - 79\% = 2\%$ percentage decline.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>The LG experienced an 11 % decline in UCE results between 2019 and 2020 as shown below;</p> <p>2019: Div. one was 285, Div two was 155, and Div. three was 280. The total pass, therefore, was 720 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 997. The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, $720/997 \times 100 = 72. \%$</p> <p>2020: Div. one was 223; Div. two was 555, and Div. three was 622. The total pass, therefore, was 1400 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 2,280. The calculated percentage for 2020 was, therefore, $1,400/2280 \times 100 = 61\%$.</p> <p>Therefore $72\% - 61\% = 11\%$ percentage decline.</p> | 0 |
| 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"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 | <p>This assessment was not yet applicable.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p> | <p>The LG received a sum of 706,944,000UGX development grant under Vote number 899 which was used on eligible activities as stipulated planning, budgeting, and implementation guidelines for local government dated May 2019 page 12, code 321470 as shown below;</p> | 2 |
| | | | <p>a) Construction of a two-classroom block at;</p> | |
| | | | <p>i. St. Balikuddembe Tabba P/S in Mpatta Sub-county.</p> | |
| | | | <p>ii. Namulugwe P/S in Nama sub-county.</p> | |
| | | | <p>iii. Namina P/S in Nakisunga Sub-county.</p> | |
| | | | <p>b) Construction of 5 stances pit latrine at;</p> | |
| | | | <p>i. Kyajja P/S in Nagojje sub-county</p> | |
| | | | <p>ii. Kazinga UMEA P/S in Nakifuma town council.</p> | |
| | | | <p>iii. Kamwokya P/S in Namagunga sub-county.</p> | |
| | | | <p>iv. Mwanyangiri P/S in Nakisunga sub- county.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the year 2021/22 before the LG made payments to the contractors:-</p> | 2 |
| | | | <p>1. A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block by Danrite investments Ltd at Kiyunga P/S in Kyampisi SC at Ugx 79,815,759 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 9/6/2022 before payment on 14/6/2022;</p> | |
| | | | <p>2. A Contract for the construction of a pit latrine by Sabel Holdings at Kayanja PS, Nagole SC at Ugx 32,243,736 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 9/5/2022 before payment on 24/5/2022; and</p> | |
| | | | <p>3. A Contract for the construction of a pit latrine by Eden Contractors Ltd at Kazinga PS, Nakifuma TC at Ugx 31,789,779 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 17/5/2022 before payment on 30/5/2022.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0 | <p>There was evidence that the the variations in the contract prices for education sector projects were within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates, The sampled projects were for:</p> <p>the Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P.S in Kiyampisi sub county, where the estimate was Ugx 168,754.950 and the award was Ugx 166,427,506 and hence the variation was - 1.34%; and</p> <p>the Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Bukasa , Namiyade in Kimenyedde sub county, where the estimate was Ugx 168,754,950 and the award was Ugx 165,014,674and hence the variation was -2.21%</p> | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | <p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | The LG did not have a project for seed Secondary schools | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | There was evidence from the Human resource office, staffing structure, and teacher staff list that the LG had recruited 1,659 (94%) primary school teachers out of 1,758 teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. | 2 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | <p>From the consolidated Schools asset register for both 187 UPE and 18 USE schools from the previous two FYs, 131 (64%) of both UPE and USE met the prescribed DES minimum standards while only 74 schools (36%) did not meet them. Among the schools that do not meet the basic minimum requirements of at least 3 permanent classrooms complete with a classroom ratio of 1:53 pupils; desk pupil ratio of 1:3 pupils; a latrine stance pupil stance ratio of 1:40 pupils and teachers' accommodation in Mukono LG included the following: Wantuluntu P/S in Ntunda sub-county, Namukupa P/S in Ntunda sub-county, Namayuba UMEA in Ntunda Sub-county, Bubiuro community P/S in Nagojje Sub-county, St. John Bosco Wasswa P/S in Nagojje, Ntente P/S in Kimenyedde Sub-county, Galigatya UMEA in Kimenyedde, Buyiita UMEA in ssetta namuganga, Namanoga Public in sseta namuganga, Koome C/U in Koome Islands, Koome Buyaya in Koome Islands among others.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>There was consistency in information from the LG teacher deployment list and from the three sampled schools regarding teacher deployment as shown below: Namakwa Primary school had 11 teachers; St Balikuddembe Kisoga primary school had 09 teachers and Nsanja primary school had 10 teachers.</p> | 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"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>The LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the schools' infrastructures like classrooms; latrines, desks, laboratories, and teachers' accommodation in all registered primary schools which was last updated in February 2022. The information provided on the consolidated asset register was consistent with that obtained from the sampled schools as shown below: 1) Namakwa P/S had 87 desks; 7 classrooms; 1 teacher's house and 10 toilet stances. 2) St Balikuddembe P/S had 150 desks; 7 classrooms; 2 teacher houses and 10 toilet stances. 3) Nsanja P/S had 120 desks; 10 classrooms; 10 latrine stances and 3 teachers' houses.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>There was no evidence from the sampled schools (0%) which were; St Balikuddembe Kisoga Primary school, Nsanja Primary school, and Namakwa Primary school, to show that they had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and had submitted reports to the DEO by January 30.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 | <p>There was no evidence from inspection reports of the previous year and from the sampled schools (St Balikuddembe Kisoga, Namakwa P/S, and Nsanja P/S), to show that they were supported to develop school improvement plans.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | <p>There was evidence from MoES OTIMS data that the LG had collected and compiled OTIMS for all 187 (100%) registered schools from the previous FY year with a total enrollment of 101,188 pupils.</p> | 4 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY: | From the LG performance contract, list of schools, and staff list, it was evident that the LG had 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 as per the sector guidelines for the current FY 2022/2023 with a wage provision of 12,186,577,000 UGX to cater for a total of 1,659 teachers in the 187 UPE schools. | 4 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Score 4 or else, score: 0 | | |
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, | From the teachers' deployment list and school list, it was evident that the LG had deployed 1659 teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY in the 187 UPE schools for example; St Balikuddembe Kisoga P/S had 09 teachers, Namakwa Primary school had 11 teachers and Nsanja primary school had 10 teachers. | 3 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Score 3 else score: 0 | | |
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, | From the sampled schools: St Balikuddembe Kisoga P/S; Nsanja P/S and Namakwa P/S, it was evident that teacher deployment data had been disseminated or publicized on mainly school notice boards. The information found on the notice boards of respectful information was consistent with what was provided by the LG education department | 1 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | score: 1 else, score: 0 | | |
| 8 | Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps. | a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO | The LG had one hundred sixty seven (167) primary schools. Only five (5) Head Teachers' appraisal reports were availed for review, they were appraised " <i>late for the previous school year</i> " on the following dates; 1. Kadusu UMEA PS - 10th August 2022, 2. St. Mary Bwejjire PS - 25th May 2022, 3. Nakibanga PS - 23rd June 2022, 4. St Paul Kataba PS - 14th February 2022 and 6. Kalangalo PS - 25th February 2022 | 0 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Score: 2 or else, score: 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 by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The LG had eighteen (18) secondary schools. Only one (1) Head Teachers' appraisal report was availed for review, St. Mary's Namagunga SS - 17th February 2022</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>Only four appraisal reports were availed for review. Those education management staff were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>1. Education Officer - 1st September 2022, 2. Inspector of Schools - 9th August 2022, 3. Inspector of Schools - 9th September 2022 and 4. Education Officer - 1st September 2022. All were appraised outside the prescribed time period.</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>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>LG did NOT prepare a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG 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>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>It was evident that on 5/5/2021 the LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by communicating corrections and revision of the school list and enrolment of 101,188 pupils in 187 schools before the 15th December annual deadline.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>From the LG education annual sector work plan for the financial year 2020/2021, it was evident that the department received a total of 111,541,593 UGX for inspection and monitoring which was used in accordance with the sector guidelines (grant item code 321467) to carry out; Monitoring the teaching-learning process, sensitization of schools about standard operating procedures (SOPs) of COVID 19, checking on the functionality of school management committees and checking on the status of infrastructures.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p> | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> | <p>The LG did not submit all warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as below:</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p> | <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2021, release date was 30/9/2021; 8 days Quarter 3 warrant was on 10/1/2022, release date was 22/12/2022; 18 days and Quarter 4 warrant was on 12/4/2022, release date was 4/4/2022;8 days.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG invoiced all capitation releases to schools within 3 working days:</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 8/10/2021 and release date was 30/9/2021, 8 days; Quarter 3 invoicing was on 10/1/2022 and release date was 22/12/2022, 18 days; and Quarter 4 invoicing was on 12/4/2022 and release date was 4/4/2022, 8 days.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections. • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 | There was no evidence from DEO or DIS to show that the LG Education department had prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections. | 0 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report: • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 | On average 54% of all the 187 registered UPE schools had been inspected at least once per term and reports produced as follows: Term11(2021): 72 out of 187 (39%). Term 111(2021):45 out of 187(24%) were inspected. Term 1(2022): 187 out of 187 (100%). | 0 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up, Score: 2 or else, score: 0 | From the sampled schools which were; St Balikuddembe P/S, Namakwa P/S, and Nsanja P/S there was no evidence to show that School inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY. | 0 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0 | From the letter of acknowledgment from DES dated 1/09/2022 it was evident that the district inspector of the school had submitted reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 12/8/2021 ; 2. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 26/10/2021; 3. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 31/1/2022 ; and 4. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 1/4/2022. | 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 to show that the LG Education department had 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, score: 2, else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that an up-to-date LG asset registers dated 1/03/2022 that sets out the school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards was in place. The information on the consolidated LG assets register was consistent with that from sampled schools as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) St. Balikuddembe Kisoga P/S had 150 desks;7 classrooms; 2 teacher houses and 10 toilet stances. 2) Nsanja P/S had 120 desks;10 classrooms; 3 teacher houses and 10 toilet stances. 3) Namakwa P/S had 87 desks; 7 classrooms;10 latrine stances and one teachers' house. | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p> | <p>The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (Page 136, 138) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 12/10/2020 for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included:</p> <p>1-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506;</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;and</p> <p>3-Construction of Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000.</p> | 1 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p> | <p>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports dated 14/10/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included:</p> <p>1-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/s in Kyampisi S/c at Ugx 166, 427,506;</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Bukasa-Namuyadde P/s in Kimenyedde S/c at Ugx 165, 014,674;and</p> <p>3-Construction of Mayangayanga Water System at Ugx 190,000,000.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that LG Education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects were approved and incorporated into the LG consolidated procurement plan. The sampled projects were: Construction of 2 classroom block and furniture at Nsonga C/U P/s in Nakisunga S/c at Ugx 160,000,000; Construction of 2 classroom block and furniture at Namataba C/U P/s in Namataba TC at Ugx 160,000,000; Construction of 2 classroom block and furniture at Kasana Muslim p/s in Nagojje P/s Ugx 160,000,000; and Construction of a 5 stance VIP lined latrine at Damba Parents P/s in Koome S/c at Ugx 160,000,000.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | The LG did not have a project in the education sector above the Ugx 200,000,000 threshold which required the Solicitor General's clearance. However, there was evidence of minutes of the contracts committee meeting which sat on 22nd July 2021 which cleared procurement of all the other educational sector projects. The projects included: Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P.S in Kiyampisi sub county at Ugx166,427,506; Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Bukasa , Namiyade in Kimenyedde sub county at Ugx 165,014,674; and Construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Mwanyangiri P.S in Nakisunga SC at Ugx 31,204,215. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | There was evidence of a memo dated July 1, 2021 and referenced FIN/MKN/1-5/01 appointing the District education officer, the District environment officer, the CDO and the environment officer on the PIT for all Education sector projects of the Previous FY. The memo was also copied to the Resident district commissioner Mukono, the District chairman, the CFO, the District planner and the head of PDU. By default the Assistant engineering officer was assigned the projects' supervisor. This was considered adequate for the projects executed. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | The LG did not have a project for seed schools | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | The LG did not have a project for seed schools | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>The LG did not have a project for seed schools</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that Education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block by Danrite investments Ltd at Kiyunga P/S in Kyampisi SC at Ugx 79,815,759 submitted on 5/5/2022 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 9/6/2022 and paid on 14/6/2022; 2. A Contract for the construction of a pit latrine by Sabel Holdings at Kayanja PS, Nagole SC at Ugx 32,243,736 submitted on 11/4/2022 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 9/5/2022 and paid on 24/5/2022; and 3. A Contract for the construction of a pit latrine by Eden Contractors Ltd at Kazinga PS, Nakifuma TC at Ugx 31,789,779 submitted on 19/4/2022 was certified by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 17/5/2022 and paid on 30/5/2022. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that LG Education department submitted its procurement plan on February 20, 2021.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence the the LG had complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract. The sample files were for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00005, Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Bukasa , Namiyade in Kimenyedde sub county, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 17, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 168,754,950, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on November 18, 2021; and contract was signe d on January 10, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 166,427,5060; and MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00006, Construction a 2-classroom block, with office store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P.S in Kiyampisi sub county, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 17, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 168,754,950, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on November 15, 2021; and contract was signe d on January 10, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 165,014,674. | 1 |
|----|--|--|--|---|

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p> | <p>The GRC was advertised on the Education Noticeboard.</p> <p>A Counter book with complaints registered was availed. The first complaint was recorded on 10.03.22 and it was about abscondment from duty by Mr. Kalemba Steven. The complainant was Ms. Dairo Teddy, Headteacher Nakaswa RC</p> <p>The last entry was on 10.11.22. It was that of two children from Kayanja P/S who were refused to sit PLE by the Headmaster. The matter was referred to the DLG DIS and DEO.</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>It was evident that on 9/01/2021 and 10/06/2022 the District education officer wrote circulars (ref. no. EDUC/302/02 and EDUC/06/2022) giving guidelines to head teachers preservation of school land , proper siting of schools, tree planting or green' schools, and energy and water conservation. This information was available in the sampled schools.</p> | 3 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i> | There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had in place costed ESMPs and that these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. Costing was done for schools where projects were implemented namely: 1) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Mwanyanjiri P/S; 2) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Kazinga UMEA P/S; 3) Rehabilitation of Education Department Office Block; 4) Construction of a 2-classroom block at Namina P/S, and 5) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Kyajja UMEA P/S. But what appeared in the BoQ was a lumpsum value of UGX2.5 million taken as standard value for Environmental amelioration. That was not proper. | 0 |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i> | There was no proof of land ownership or access of school construction projects. No land title, agreement, Formal Consent or MoU was available for school projects. | 0 |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i> | There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports. Support supervision and Monitoring Reports were presented for: 1) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Mwanyanjiri P/S, dated 09/05/22; 2) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Kazinga UMEA P/S, dated 16/03/22; 3) Rehabilitation of Education Department Office Block, dated 26/03/22; 4) Construction of a 2-classroom block at Namina P/S, that was undated; and 5) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Kyajja UMEA P/S, dated 06/04/22. | 2 |

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. Certifications were presented for:

- 1) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Lined Latrines with Urinals and bathrooms at Kalangalo P/S. Contractor was M/S NK General Dealers. Procurement Ref: Muko542/Wrks/21 - 22/LOT 02;
- 2) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Lined Latrines with Urinals and bathrooms at Kisowera C/U P/S. Contractor was M/S Telsa N.K Consultants Ltd Procurement Ref: Muko542/Wrks/21 - 22/00036;
- 3) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Lined Latrines with Urinals and bathrooms at Kalangalo, Buyita P/S and Bwejire P/S. Contractor was M/S NK General Dealers. Procurement Ref: Muko542/Wrks/21 - 22/LOT 02; and
- 4) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store including furniture at Kayini-Kamwokya P/S. Contractor was M/S PERA INVESTMENTS (U) LTD. Procurement Ref: Muko542/Wrks/17 - 18/00004.

**Health
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG attained a 20% or more increase in the coverage of institutional deliveries. The total number of institutional deliveries in the three sampled health facilities in FY 2020/21 was 3103, increasing to 3168 in FY 2021/22, an increase of 2.1%.</p> <p>1. Kojja HCIV 1205 (2020/21) - 1248 (2021/22)</p> <p>2. Seeta-Nazigo HCIII 340 (2020/21) - 333 (2021/22)</p> <p>3. Nakifuma HCIII: 1558 (2020/21) - 1587 (2021/22)</p> <p>Total 2021/22 (3168) - Total 2020/21 (3103)/ = 65/3103*100= 2.1%</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant Ugx 424,283,000 for the year 2021/22 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The projects were:</p> <p>1. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HCIII in Seeta Namuganga S/c at Ugx25,917,006;</p> <p>2. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HCII in Kyampisi S/C at Ugx 31,833,214;</p> <p>3. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Mpoma HCII in Nama S/c at ugx 29, 925,000; and</p> <p>4. Construction of Inpatient ward with Pediatric wing and bathrooms at Katoogo HCIII in Nama SC at Ugx336,835,304.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Namasumbi by Muyizzi Ltd of Ugx 10,524,128 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 16/6/2022 before payment on 22/6/2022; 1. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Mpoma HC II by Quality Ltd of Ugx 29,925,000 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 31/5/2022 before payment on 14/6/2022; and 3. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Mukono General Hospital by Gabikan Ltd of Ugx 101,374,396 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 28/4/2022 before payment on 24/5/2022. | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the variations in the contract price of the health infrastructure investments are within +/-20%. The sampled contracts were for:</p> <p>the Construction of a medical store, a kitchen with 3 in one saving store, walk way to the incinerator, 10000 litre and a fire fighting equipment for Mukono General hospital, where the estimate was Ugx 299,078,501 and the award price Ugx 296,869,608, hence the variation was -0.7%;</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi SC, where the estimate was Ugx 32,414,100 and the award price Ugx 31,833,214, hence the variation was -1.7%; and</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namaganga HC II in Seeta Namuganga SC, where the estimate was Ugx 34,960,100 and the award price Ugx 33,917,006, hence the variation was -2.9%</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | <p>The LG health sector did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards | a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure | There was no evidence that Mukono LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure. In the PBS the percentage of positions funded at Kojja the only HCIV was 35.4% and the average at the 10 HCIIIs was 72%. The overall average of staffing at HCIIIs and IVs was 53.7% | 0 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards | b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs. | The LG did not have a project for HC II being upgraded to HC III. | 2 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 | | |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 5 | Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information | a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | There was no evidence that the health workers in Mukono DLG were in place as indicated in the staff list from the District Health Office. | 0 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | <p>Staff on the DHO List did not match those at the sampled health facilities as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HCIV – A total of 8 staff on the DHO list were not on the facility list: Makonzi Aggrey (Senior Health Inspector); Mayega John Bosco (Public Health Dental Assistant); Ndagire Peruth (Asst. Health Educator); Apinyi Merab Nalumu (Anaesthetic Officer); Rosette Namuli (Enrolled Midwife); Nambooze Sarah (Laboratory Assistant); Musoke Celestine (Public Health Dental Surgeon); 2. Seeta-Nazigo HCIII: Two staff on the DHO List were not on the health facility list – Max Okello (Askari); Richard Kisaku (Porter); and 3. Nakifuma HCIII – One staff on the DHO list was not on the health facility list: Nabukenya Martha Namata (Enrolled Nurse). | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the information submitted in the PBS on construction status and functionality was accurate. In FY 2020/21 there were no health facilities that were upgraded.</p> <p>The procurement plan for FY 2020/21 dated 7/04/21 had a range of projects none of which included an upgrade of HCII to HCIII which is consistent with the information in the 4th quarter report of the PBS on page 70.</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that the Health Facility annual work plans and budgets of sampled facilities were submitted by 31st March of the previous FY as follows: 1. Kojja HCIV 31/03/2021, 2. Seeta Nazigo HCIII - 31/03/2021, and 3. Nakifuma HCIII: 20/03/2021. However, the provided work plans did not conform to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines at the three sampled health facilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HCIV - has highlights of the performance, minimum expenditure, and budget report. The report mentions the status of some of the items in the asset register. However, it lacked a reconciled cash flow statement. The report was endorsed by the HUMC. 2. Seeta Nazigo HCIII - has highlights of the performance, minimum expenditure, and budget report. and was endorsed by the HUMC. However, it lacked a reconciled cash flow statement and an asset register. The plan was endorsed by the HUMC. 3. Nakifuma HCIII has highlights of the performance. However, it lacked a minimum expenditure and budget report; an asset register and a cash flow statement. The report was endorsed by the HUMC. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that the sampled health facilities - 1. Kojja HCIV 2. Seeta Nazigo HCIII, and 3. Nakifuma HCIII had budget performance reports that conformed to the Budget Grant Guidelines.</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that the sampled health facilities - Kojja HCIV, 2) Seeta Nazigo HCIII, and 3) Nakifuma HCIII had health facility improvement plans with issues that had been identified in the DHMT monitoring and assessment reports as evidenced by the following illustrations:</p> <p>1) Nakifuma HCIII: The Integrated Support Supervision for Q3 on 22/03/22 recommended that essential medicines be procured. Subsequently, the PIP has budgeted an additional 8 million to procure essential medicines and supplies.</p> <p>2) In Q4 - the Integrated Support Supervision identified the lack of essential medicines at Kojja HCIV. Subsequently, the facility PIP has incorporated 12 million to procure essential medicines.</p> <p>3) Seeta Nazigo HCIII: The Mukono DLG Q3 integrated support supervision after the visit made on 14/03/22 noted that the health facility faced encroachment on their land. The Seeta Nazigo HCIII PIP for the current FY has budgeted 4.5 million to fence off the facility property.</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 | <p>There was no evidence that the three sampled health facilities had submitted timely monthly and quarterly reports 7 days following the end of the month and quarter. All quarterly and monthly reports for the three sampled health facilities - Kojja HCIV, 2) Seeta Nazigo HCIII, and 3) Nakifuma HCIII were on time except the July 2021 report from Seeta Nazigo HC3 which was submitted a day later on the 08/08/21.</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>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>There was no evidence that the previous quarter's invoices were submitted to the DHO by the 15th of the month following the end of the quarter. Some of the submission dates were late as shown:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HCIV: Q1 – no receipt date; Q2 – 14/03/22 (late); Q3 – 17/05/22 (late); Q4 – 31/08/22 (late); 2. Seeta Nazigo HCIII: Q1 – no receipt date; Q2 – 03/03/22 (late); Q3 – 10/05/22; Q4 – 30/08/22 (late); and 3. Nakifuma HCIV: Q1 no receipt date; Q2 – 03/03/22 (late); Q3 – 10/05/22; Q4 – 31/08/22 (late). | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the submission for all participating health facilities were made before the 28th of the month following the quarter, as below:</p> <p>Q1: 23/11/21 (late);</p> <p>Q2: 25/03/22 (late);</p> <p>Q3: 30/05/22 (late); and</p> <p>Q4: 12/09/22 (late)</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>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 Health Department Submitted all the 4 Quarterly Budget Performance reports to the planner for consolidation within a month after the end of the quarter as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 was submitted on 23/10/2021;</p> <p>Quarter 2 was submitted on 24/1/2021;</p> <p>Quarter 3 was submitted on 29/4/2022; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 was submitted on .24/7/2022</p> | 1 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>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 lowest-performing health facility at the end of 2021/22 was Kyampisi HCIII. There was evidence that Mukono DLG had developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan for Kyampisi HCIII. The activities for improvement included – patient management, and financing with a budget of about 30 million UGX.</p> | 1 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG had implemented an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities. The plan was dated 05/08/21. Several reports demonstrated that parts of the plan had been implemented. The activities for improvement included – patient management, and financing with a budget of about 30 million UGX.</p> | 1 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines. The PBS indicates that the staff who are on the staff register for 2022 constitute 72% of expected positions.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had deployed health workers as per the guidelines. The staff registers for the current FY indicates that 72% of positions are filled.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence from the arrival and departure registers of the current FY that health staff in the following sampled health facilities: 1) Kojja HCIV, 2) Nakifuma HCIII, and 3) Seeta Nazigo HCIII were on duty where deployed.</p> | 3 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono Local Government had publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY at all the sampled health facilities 1) Nakifuma HCIV, 2) Seeta-Nazigo HCIII, and 3) Nakifuma HCIII.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had thirty three (33) health facilities. Ten (10) appraisal reports of Officers-in-Charge of Health Centers were sampled. The Officers were appraised on the following dated;</p> <p>1. Nakifuma HC III - 3rd August 2022, 2. Nabalanda HC III - 6th August 2022- 3. Kyampisi HC III - 4th August 2022, 4. Nagojje HC III - 7th July 2022, 5. Kasawo HC III - 31st July 2022, 6. Kyabazaala HC II - 6th August 2022, 7. Kimenyedde HC II - 22nd July 2022, 8. Katente HC III - 12th August 2022, 9. Bugoye HC II - 8th August 2022 and 10. Kasenge HC II - 18th July 2022</p> | 1 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>No appraisal reports were availed for review</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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Information on corrective actions taken basing on appraisals was NOT availed for review</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>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had training activities for the previous FY based on a pre-specified training plan. A training list that matched the periods in the training database. This list does not constitute a training plan.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Kayunga DLG had documented training activities for the previous FY in a hard copy black book. There are 6 training activities on 20/09/21, 17/11/21, 13/01/22, 20/01/22, 24/01/22 & 28/02/22. Five of these activities were supported by implementing partners.</p> | 1 |
|---|--|---|--|----------|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the CAO had notified the MoH of status of health facilities whether correct or wrong.</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 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The LG made allocations of Ugx86,200,000(7%) out of the Ugx 1,254,844,000 PHC NWR Grant for LLHF (Page 25 of the LG approved budget) towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services which was lower than the required 15%.</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 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>The LG did not warrant to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2021/22 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 23/7/2021, release date was 6/7/2021; 17 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2021, release date was 30/9/2021; 8 days</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 10/1/ 2022, release date was 22/12/2021; 18 days and</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrant was on 12/4/2021, release date was 4/4/2022;8 days.</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>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not warrant to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2021/22 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:</p> <p>Quarter 1 invoicing was on 23/7/2021, release date was 6/7/2021; 17 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 8/10/2021, release date was 30/9/2021; 8 days</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoicing was on 10/1/ 2022, release date was 22/12/2021; 18 days and</p> <p>Quarter 4 invoicing was on 12/4/2021, release date was 4/4/2022;8 days.</p> | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Mukono DLG had 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 as below:</p> <p>Q1: 26/07/21 (release date 06/07/21); (14 working days)</p> <p>Q2: 11/10/21 (release date 30/09/21); (7 working days)</p> <p>Q3: 13/01/22 (release date 22/12//01/22); (16 working days) and</p> <p>Q4: 14/04/22 (release date 04/04/22) (8 working days)</p> | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Mukono DLG health department had implemented actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings of the previous FY. For example, in Q2, the Performance Review report under Minute 2/30/12/2021 reported that the Q1 recommendation to get volunteers to address the COVID-19 data backlog had been addressed. The Q3 performance review report under minute 5/25/01/22 reported that a recommendation to involve political leaders for mobilization and advocacy for the services at facility had been adopted.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the attendance list of Mukono DHMT performance review meetings included all the expected categories. As shown below – the main categories included DHMT members, health facility in charges, other departments and partners. However not all in charges were included all the time.</p> <p>Q1: DHT members; i/c HSDs (2/2); health facility in charges (5/35); Partners (Petros-Zoe Initiative Mukono, Nama Wellness, Health Access Connect); Deputy CAO; Secretary for Health</p> <p>Q2: DHT members; health facility in charges (33/35); Partners (Lugazi Catholic Diocese); Registrar NIRA;</p> <p>Q3: DHT members; health facility in charges (27/35); LC5, Internal Audit; Partners (MUWRP), Nama Wellness)</p> <p>Q4: DHT members; health facility in charges (5/35); Partners (Baylor Uganda, MoH CPHL, Mariestoppes); District Community Development Officer, Deputy CAO</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>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>Mukono DLG has one public hospital, one private not for profit hospital, and one HCIV. These health facilities were supervised during all the four quarters in 2021/22 during the dates shown:</p> <p>1. Naggalama PNFP Hospital: Q4: 17/05/22; Q3 -21/03/22; Q2 - xxx; Q1 -none</p> <p>2. Kojja HC4: Q4: May 2022; Q3 -30/03/22; Q2 - none; Q1 -none</p> <p>3. Mukono General Hospital: Q4: 17/05/22; Q3 -none; Q2 - none; Q1 -none</p> <p>**Mukono General Hospital transferred to District during Q3 of last FY.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score | <p>There was evidence that the two health sub-districts in Mukono had carried out support supervision of the lower-level health facilities within the previous FY during the following periods:</p> <p>1. Nakifuma HSD: Q1- 6 health facilities (report dated 29/10/21); Q2 – 8 facilities (report dated 17/01/22); Q3 – 9 facilities (report dated 22/04/22); Q4 – 8 facilities (report dated 24/07/22);</p> <p>2. Mukono South HSD: Q3 – supervised Koome HC3 on an island; Q4 – supervised 6 private facilities & 6 public facilities.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG had provided recommendations from the previous FY. During the Q4 integrated support supervision visit, Seeta Nazigo HC3 was recommended to maintain the TB dispensing log which was done according to the entries for the subsequent months – July to October 2022); Kojja HC4 was recommended to repair the leaking roof on the female ward which was done according to the expenditure voucher dated 18/05/22.</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies. A report received by the DHO on 30/06/22 from the District Medicines Management Supervisor stated that all health facilities were supported. Additionally, the 4th quarter report received by the DHO on 18/08/22 highlighted the performance of health facilities on 5 indicators.</p> | 1 |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG allocated Ugx 41.1 million (48%) out of the Ugx 86.2 million LG Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, which was more than the required minimum of 30%.</p> | 2 |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY.</p> <p>1. A report dated 30/03/22 cited the implementation of a campaign on social mobilization and advocacy for accelerated Covid-19 vaccines.</p> <p>2. The status report about community engagement strategy tracked performance on a range of social behavioural interventions.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | 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 | There was no evidence that the Mukono DLG had implemented follow-up actions on the health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization aspects. | 0 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | | |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 12 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines. | 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 | There was evidence that the Assets register (updated on 24/08/22) details all (35/35) health facilities and equipment, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. | 1 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 12 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines. | b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); | The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (Page 136, 138) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 12/10/2020 for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included: | 1 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and | 1. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HCIII in Seeta Namuganga S/c at Ugx25,917,006; | |
| | | (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)); | 2. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HCII in Kyampisi S/C at Ugx 31,833,214; | |
| | | score 1 or else score 0 | 3. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Mpoma HCII in Nama S/c at ugx 29, 925,000; and | |
| | | | 4. Construction of Inpatient ward with Pediatric wing and bathrooms at Katoogo HCIII in Nama SC at Ugx336,835,304. | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 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>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>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports dated 14/10/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2021/22. The projects appraised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HCIII in Seeta Namuganga S/c at Ugx25,917,006; 2. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HCII in Kyampisi S/C at Ugx 31,833,214; 3. Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Mpoma HCII in Nama S/c at ugx 29, 925,000; and 4. Construction of Inpatient ward with Pediatric wing and bathrooms at Katoogo HCIII in Nama SC at Ugx336,835,304. | 1 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures were put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist. There were three Health projects implemented by Mukono DLG in the previous FY. These were screened by Mujuni the DNRO and Ntege the DCDO as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HC III in Seeta, Namuganga S/C, sated 27/10/21; 2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi S/C, dated 27/10/21; and 3) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Buliika HC II in Nama S/C that was undated. | 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 of of minute 117/2022 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on January 24, 2022, acknowledging receipt of all Health departmental work plans. The planned projects were: Completion of a theater at Katoogo HCIII at Ugx 207,512,000; Construction of pit latrines at Mpunge H/C at Ugx 32,000,000; Construction of pit latrines at Buyoge H/C at Ugx 32,000,000; and Construction of pit latrine at Kigogola H/C at Ugx. 32,000,000.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>The LG reportedly submitted it procurement requests online to EGP. The assessor was however not able to access it</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence a letter referenced ADM.200/02, dated January 25, 2022 which cleared the procurement of Construction of a medical store, a kitchen with 3 in one saving store, walk way to the incinerator, 10000 litre and a fire fighting equipment at Ugx 296,869,608. There was also evidence minute MIN.021/2021 of the committee meeting which sat on July 22, 2021 to approve: the Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi SC at Ugx 31,833,214; and Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namagunga HC II in Seeta Namuganga SC at Ugx 34,960,100.</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>There was evidence of a letter reference FIN/MKN/105/01, date July 1, 2021 from the CAO, appointing the DHO, DE, the CDO and the environment officer to PIT of all sector projects.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The LG health sector did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</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>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 no evidence that Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer.</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The LG health sector did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The LG health sector did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</p> | 1 |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe. The 3 sampled projects were:

1. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Namasumbi by Muyizzi Ltd of Ugx 10,524,128 submitted on 10/6/2022 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 16/6/2022 and paid on 22/6/2022 (6 days);
2. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Mpoma HC II by Quality Ltd of Ugx 29,925,000 submitted on 20/5/2022 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 31/5/2022 and paid on 14/6/2022 (14 days); and
3. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Mukono General Hospital by Gabikan Ltd of Ugx 101,374,396 submitted on 19/4/2022 was certified by the DHO, Environment Officer and CDO on 28/4/2022 and paid on 4/5/2022 (6 days).

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that had complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract. The sampled files were for: **MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00002 Construction of a medical store, a kitchen with 3 in one saving store, walk way to the incinerator, 10000 litre tank and a fire fighting equipment**, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 16, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 299,078,501, the advert was made on October 4, 2021 ; evaluation was completed on November 22, 2021; and contract was signed on February 14, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 296,869,608;

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00016 Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi SC, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 16, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 16, 2021 with an estimate of 32,414,100, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on October 19, 2021; and contract was signed on December 6, 2021 at a contract price of Ugx 31,833,214;

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00015 Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine with a urinal at Namaganga HC II in Seeta Namuganga SC, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 16, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 34,960,100, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on October 20, 2021; and contract was signed on December 6, 2021 at a contract price of Ugx 33,917,006;

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

The GRC was advertised on the Health Noticeboard.

A Counter book with complaints registered was availed. The first case was registered on 02/08/21. It was from Kiyola HC II that was reported to start working around midday and closes at 3.00 p.m.

The lasty entry was dated 18/1/22 where clients were complaining about the ambivalent behaviour of Nabbuto (Enrolled Midwife) while offering services at Kojja HC IV.

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities.</p> <p>No dissemination was done. The officer answering the assessment, a one Mr. Balyejjussa, clearly agreed that this did not happen.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG had 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).</p> <p>There were incinerators in Kojja HC IV, Koome HC III, Church of Uganda Hospital Nagalama Hospital and Mukono General Hospital.</p> <p>Green Label Investments is active in collecting Medical wastes.</p> | 2 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management. A report dated 25th/Aug/2022 included refuse pits in waste management training done by the DLG. Another report dated 30th 09- 2022 included waste management among trainings done under Environmental Health Department.</p> | 1 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that costed ESMPs were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. Instead, a lumpsum value of UGX2.5 million was taken as standard for environmental amelioration. That is not proper.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of documentation on land acquisition status for Health projects implemented in past FY. It appeared there was some documentation about this in some offices but these could not be availed during the assessment time.</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 LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports. Support supervision and Monitoring Reports were presented for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HC III in Seeta, Namuganga S/C, dated 27/10/21; 2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi S/C, dated 12/01/22; and 3) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Buliika HC II in Nama S/C dated 05/03/22. | 2 |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was 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. Certifications Forms signed by four DLG Officers – CAO, District Engineer, DCDO and Environment Officer were presented for:

1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HC III in Seeta, Namuganga S/C, dated variously depending on the date such officer appended his/her signature;

2) Construction of a Medical store, kitchen with 3-in one saving stove, a walkway to the incinerator & a 10,000 Ltr water Tank with firefighting equipment at Mukono General Hospital, dated variously depending on the date such officer appended his/her signature; and

3) Construction of a 5-stance VIP Lined Latrine with a Urinal & a Bathroom at Mpoma HCII, variously depending on the date such officer appended his/her signature.

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|--------------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of Mukono district rural water sources as of November 12th, 2022 is 90%.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment the percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees (document water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs) as of November 12th, 2022 is 99%.</p> | 2 |
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p> | <p>The average score of water based on the availed lower local government assessment results for the current FY was 65.4%. The sub counties whose water score were shared included: Kyemenyde (50%), Mpatta (50%), Kasawo (80%), Ntunda (80%), Seetta-Namuganga (20%), Koome (100%), Nagojje (50%), Nama (80%), Nakisuga (80%), Mpuge (80%), and Kyampisi (50%).</p> | 1 |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Mukono District has 13 sub counties and 2 Divisions namely Koome Sub county (with a coverage of 07%); Kyampisi Sub County (with a coverage of 66%); Mpatta Sub County (with a coverage of 39%); Mpuge Sub county (with a coverage of 83%); Nakisunga Sub county (with a coverage of 88%); Nama Sub county (with a coverage of 37%); Kasawo Sub County (with a coverage of 85%); Kyemenyedde Sub County (with a coverage of 95%); Nabbale Sub County (with a coverage of 63%); Nagojje Sub County (with a coverage of 84%); Ntunda Sub County (with a coverage of 89%); Seeta Namuganga Sub County (with a coverage of 70%); and Mukono Municipality Central Division and Mukono Municipality Goma Division (Both under NWSC). Mukono District has a rural average water coverage of 66% which implies that four sub counties of Koome Sub county (with a coverage of 07%); Mpatta Sub County (with a coverage of 39%); Nama Sub county (with a coverage of 37%); and Nabbale Sub County (with a coverage of 63%).

- Annual Report 2021-2022 submitted under cover letter Ref - WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 19th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget - MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO - TSU

According to this Annual Report 2021-2022, all 34 projects were implemented in the year namely:

- Rehabilitation of 32 boreholes /point water sources (#32);
- Construction of Gravity water scheme in Koome=; and
- Construction/ Extension of Mayangayanga Gravity flow scheme.

Of these 34 projects, 12 projects (35%) were implemented in sub counties with coverage below district average. These included:

- Rehabilitation of ten boreholes /point water sources (#10), and
- Construction/ Extension of Gravity flow scheme in Koome

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

The Annual Work Plan 2021/2022 was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment under cover letter Ref - ADM/MKN/213/05 dated August 04th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget - MoFPED, District Water Officer -Mukono, and the FPO - TSU.

According to this work plan 24 projects were planned namely:

- Construction/ Extension of One Gravity Flow Scheme Piped Water Scheme (#01) in Kyazimba, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 174,344,015;
- Finalization of One Piped Water Scheme at Mayangayanga, Piped Water Scheme Nakifuma Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 295,668,721/=;
- Construction of Piped Water Scheme at Mpatta Water Scheme, Mpatta Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 157,079,000; and
- Rehabilitation of 21 boreholes /point water sources (#21) at a cost of UGX 100,000,000.

Only one contract could be compared ie construction of Kyazimbe Gravity Flow Scheme in Koome Sub County. The analysis for cost variation of this contract is as outlined below:

- Construction of Gravity flow scheme piped water scheme in Kyazimba, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 155,544,600/=; Contract Ref Muko 542/wrks/2021-22/00012 by MS KANAHA Technical Consultants Ltd signed on January 10th, 2022 - this is different from the engineering estimates by - 11%

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

The Annual Work Plan 2021/2022 was to Ministry of Water and Environment under submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/05 dated August 04th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer -Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.

According to this work plan 24 projects were planned namely:

- Construction/ Extension of One Gravity Flow Scheme Piped Water Scheme (#01) in Kyazimba, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 174,344,015;
- Finalization of One Piped Water Scheme at Mayangayanga, Piped Water Scheme Nakifuma Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 295,668,721/=;
- Construction of Piped Water Scheme at Mpatta Water Scheme, Mpatta Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 157,079,000; and
- Rehabilitation of 21 boreholes /point water sources (#21) at a cost of UGX 100,000,000.

Annual Report 2021-2022 submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 19th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.

According to the Annual Report, all 24 projects (100%) mentioned above were implemented before the end of the year 2021/2022 FY.

New_Achievement of Standards:

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning

o If there is an increase: score 2

o If no increase: score 0.

According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of the district rural water sources as of November 12th, 2022, is 90 % while functionality in the previous year was still 90%. This represents no increase (0%) in the functionality of water facilities in the district.

New_Achievement of Standards:

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).

o If increase is more than 1% score 2

o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1

o If there is no increase : score 0.

According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment the percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees (document water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCS) as of November 12th, 2022 is 99% while facilities with functional WSCs in the previous year was still 99%. This represents no increase (0%) in the functionality of water user committees in the district.

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3

The Annual Work Plan 2021/2022 was to Ministry of Water and Environment under submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/05 dated August 04th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer -Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.

According to this work plan 24 projects were planned namely:

- Construction/ Extension of One Gravity Flow Scheme Piped Water Scheme (#01) in Kyazimba, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 174,344,015;
- Finalization of One Piped Water Scheme at Mayangayanga, Piped Water Scheme Nakifuma Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 295,668,721/=;
- Construction of Piped Water Scheme at Mpatta Water Scheme, Mpatta Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 157,079,000; and
- Rehabilitation of 21 boreholes /point water sources (#21) at a cost of UGX 100,000,000.

The WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY (2021/2022) were accurately reported upon as reflected in the Annual Progress Report.

Three projects were sampled and visited for verification during the assessment. They included:

- Rehabilitation of a Hand Pumped Borehole DWD 532211 at Nama II Village, Nama Parish, Nama Sub County. Borehole is located at Coordinates: 36N0475804, UTM 0044425. Mr. Ali Tamale- the Chairperson (Tel 0759461015), was spoken to during the field work. At the time of verification, the borehole was functioning well to the satisfaction of the beneficiaries;

- Rehabilitation of a Hand Pumped Borehole DWD 24729 at Nkulagirire Village, Nabalanga Parish, Nabbale Sub County. Borehole is located at Coordinates: 36N0472771, UTM 0065956. Mr. Kamoga Frank (Tel 0758065767) and Ms. Constacio Nalumansi – both members of the beneficiary community were met during the field work. At the time of verification, the borehole was functioning well to the satisfaction of the beneficiaries; and

- Production well (Coordinates: 36N0480224, UTM 0055414) and Yard Tap Stand Post (Coordinates: 36N0480245, UTM 0055533) on the extension Mayangayanga RGC Water Supply System serving over 6 villages in Nakibano and Nange Parishes, Kimenyedde Sub County. The Yard Tap Stand located at home of Mr and Mrs Okware (Tel Musa 078271252, Mariam 0704809917).The YTS was functional at the time of verification while the standby production pump was not functional.

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

During the assessment, the four undermentioned quarterly reports were reviewed:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/312/02 dated October 8th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU
- Second Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/02 dated February 21st, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU
- Third Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated May 30th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU
- Annual Report 2021-2022 submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 19th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU

There was Evidence attached on the Annual Report to show that the LG Water Office collects and compiles information on sub-county water supply and sanitation situation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community. This was also found in the Form 4 that were filed to that effect copies of which were submitted to the Ministry on September 2, 2021; May 24th, 2021; January 27th, 2021 and October 14th, 2021.

Reporting and

b. Evidence that the LG

During the assessment, the four

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

undermentioned quarterly reports were reviewed:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/312/02 dated October 8th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU

- Second Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/02 dated February 21st, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU

- Third Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated May 30th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU

- Annual Report submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 19th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer -Mukono, and the FPO – TSU

The above mentioned reports were reviewed. There was no evidence found in the respective quarterly reports to show 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.) However, the quarterly print outs of DWO MIS were submitted separately - printed copies of Form 4 were filed to that effect. They had been submitted to the Ministry on September 2, 2021; May 24th, 2021; January 27th, 2021 and October 14th, 2021.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 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>This indicator is not applicable for Mukono district because assessment of Lower Local Governments just started in the District this Fiscal Year (September, 2022).</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p> | <p>The staff structure of the District Water Office provides for only 1 position, Water Officer and it was budgeted for. The monthly wage of UGX. 2, 200,000</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p> | <p>The District / Natural resources Department staff structure provided for the following positions,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. .District Natural Resources Officer monthly wage UGX 2,700,000 2. Senior Environment officer UGX 2,200,000 monthly. 3. Wet land Officer, UGX 2,200,000. monthly. 4. Two Forest Rangers UGX 326,756 - UGX 653,756, monthly 5. Wetland Officer UGX 2, 200,000 monthly 6. Forest Guard UGX. 213,832 monthly | 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>Appraisal reports were NOT availed for review</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3

Information on the identified capacity needs of staff arising from the performance appraisal process was not availed for review

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

Mukono District has 13 sub counties and 2 Divisions namely Koome Sub county (with a coverage of 07%); Kyampisi Sub County (with a coverage of 66%); Mpatta Sub County (with a coverage of 39%); Mpuge Sub county (with a coverage of 83%); Nakisunga Sub county (with a coverage of 88%); Nama Sub county (with a coverage of 37%); Kasawo Sub County (with a coverage of 85%); Kyemenyedde Sub County (with a coverage of 95%); Nabbale Sub County (with a coverage of 63%); Nagoje Sub County (with a coverage of 84%); Ntunda Sub County (with a coverage of 89%); Seeta Namuganga Sub County (with a coverage of 70%); and Mukono Municipality Central Division and Mukono Municipality Goma Division (Both under NWSC). Mukono District has a rural average water coverage of 66% which implies that four sub counties of Koome Sub county (with a coverage of 07%); Mpatta Sub County (with a coverage of 39%); Nama Sub county (with a coverage of 37%); and Nabbale Sub County (with a coverage of 63%).

The Annual Work Plan 2022/2023 was submitted to Ministry of Water and Environment under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 14th, 2022. It was received and approved at the Ministry of Water and Environment on August 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsohya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.

46 Hardware projects planned in 2022/2023 are contained in the work plan and reflected in the Budget Annexed (Page 1 - 3) to the work plan at a cost of UGX 762,388,720/=. The projects include:

- Drilling of Two Production Wells (#02) at a cost of UGX 54,000,000/=;
- Drilling 15 Hand Pumps Deep Boreholes (#15) at a cost of UGX 352,500,000/=;

- Rehabilitation of 27 boreholes /point water sources at a cost of UGX 121,500,000/=;
- Design of one Gravity Floor Scheme at Misenyi Village, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 23,409,107/=; and
- Construction/ Extension of one Gravity Floor Scheme (#1) at Misenyi, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 210,979,613/=

Of these projects, only thirteen projects were planned in locations with water coverage below the district average including:

- Drilling 4 Hand Pumps Deep Boreholes (#04) at a cost of UGX 94,000,000/=;
- Rehabilitation of 07 boreholes /point water sources at a cost of UGX 31,500,000/=;
- Design of one Gravity Floor Scheme at Misenyi Village, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 23,409,107/=; and
- Construction/ Extension of one Gravity Floor Scheme (#1) at Misenyi, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 210,979,613/=

This means that of the total budget of UGX 762,388,720/=, UGX 359,888,720/= (47.2% of the total budget) was budgeted for activities in sub counties with water coverage below the district average coverage.

8

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

There was no evidence that the DWO publicized to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current financial year 2022/2023.

0

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 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities was presented in way of Monitoring reports for the new systems and Form 4 for the existing facilities.

Printed copies of Form 4 were filed to that effect. They had been submitted to the Ministry for respective quarters on September 2, 2021; May 24th, 2021; January 27th, 2021 and October 14th, 2021. They are 2030 facilities including Protected Springs (#661), Shallow wells (318), Boreholes (442), Rainwater Harvesting Tanks (177), Dams #03, Public Stand Post (139), and Yard Taps (290)

While reports for the 34 new facilities include:

- Report on Monitoring Gravity Flow scheme for Bugombe Kyazimba water scheme dated June 29th, 2022;
- Report on Monitoring on Borehole rehabilitation Dated September 09th, 2021;
- Report on monitoring of capital projects by Works, water and Natural Resources Committee Dated May 11th, 2022; and
- Water and Sanitation Monitoring and support Report Dated August 5th, 2021

Of the total 2064 facilities, 2030 (which represent 98%) were monitored quarterly.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings presented to the assessors for review. The evidence comprised of Minutes contained in the software reports attached to the respective Quarterly reports for Quarter 1, Quarter 2, Quarter 3 and Annual Report as outlined below:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/312/02 dated October 8th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU. The attached minutes show that the DWSCC Meeting was conducted on October, 7th, 2021.
- Second Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/02 dated February 21st, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU. The attached minutes show that the DWSCC Meeting was conducted on January 06th, 2022.
- Third Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated May 30th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU. The attached minutes show that the DWSCC Meeting was conducted on April 11th, 2022.
- Annual Report 2021-2022 submitted under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 19th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU. The attached minutes show that the DWSCC Meeting was conducted on June 08th, 2022.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the DWO publicized to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current financial year 2022/2023.</p> | 0 |
|---|---|--|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 | <p>The Annual Work Plan 2021/2022 was to Ministry of Water and Environment under submitted under cover letter Ref – ADM/MKN/213/05 dated August 04th, 2021 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on March 14th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsobya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer -Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.</p> <p>According budget attached to the work plan, NWR budget was UGX 113,348,000/= of which UGX 60,130,000/= was spent on software activities which included Activities 1.1-1.4 with an allocation of UGX 8,380,000 and Activities 6.1-6.19 with an allocation of UGX 51,750,000. UGX 60,130,000/ allocated for software activities represented 53% of the entire NWR budget of UGX 113,348,000/=.</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&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p> | <p>There was evidence that for the for the previous FY 2021/2022, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities. This evidence is in the Report for the Water and Sanitation activities dated April 4th, 2022 and the list of the reestablished and reactivated Water users committee 2021/2022, signed by the CDO. List indicated that 103 members, 19 of whom were female which represents 18% of the members trained.</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>There was is evidence of existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG. Printed copies of Form 4 were filed to that effect. They had been submitted to the Ministry on September 2, 2021; May 24th, 2021; January 27th, 2021 and October 14th, 2021.</p> | 4 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (Page 136, 138) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 30/9/2021 for the projects implemented in the year 2022/23. The projects appraised included:

- 1.Design of Misenyi GFS in Koome SC at Ugx23,000,000;
- 2.Construction of Misenyi gravity flow scheme in Koome SC at Ugx 200,000,000; and
- 3.Drilling of 17 boreholes in Lower Local Government of Nama,Ntunda, Mpatta,Nakisunga at ugx399,000,000.

| | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p> | <p>The Annual Work Plan 2022/2023 was submitted to Ministry of Water and Environment under cover letter Ref – WAT/MKN/752/02 dated July 14th, 2022. It was received and approved at the Ministry of Water and Environment on August 27th, 2022. Letter was signed for Chief Administrative Officer by Ms. Ndagire Jessica Nsohya with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Mukono District, Resident District Commissioner - Mukono, the Director of Budget – MoFPED, District Water Officer - Mukono, and the FPO – TSU.</p> <p>45 Hardware projects planned in 2022/2023 are contained in the work plan and reflected in the Budget Annexed (Page 1 - 3) to the work plan at a cost of UGX 342,982,588/= . The projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drilling of Two Production Wells (#02) at a cost of UGX 54,000,000/=; • Drilling 15 Hand Pumps Deep Boreholes (#15) at a cost of UGX 352,500,000/=; • Rehabilitation of 27 boreholes /point water sources at a cost of UGX 121,500,000/=; • Design of one Gravity Floor Scheme at Misenyi Village, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 23,409,107/=; and • Construction/ Extension of one Gravity Floor Scheme (#1) at Misenyi, Koome Sub County at a cost of UGX 210,979,613/= <p>There was no evidence that these projects had community application forms.</p> |
|----|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p> | <p>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports dated 8/10/2021, for the projects implemented in the year 2022/23. The projects appraised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Design of Misenyi GFS in Koome SC at Ugx23,000,000; 2.Construction of Misenyi gravity flow scheme in Koome SC at Ugx 200,000,000; and 3.Drilling of 17 boreholes in Lower Local Government of Nama,Ntunda, Mpatta,Nakisunga at ugx399,000,000. |
|----|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p> | <p>There was evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the Current FY were screened for environmental and social risks before being approved for Construction. Screening and ESIA were done for Koome Gravity Flow Scheme by the Environmental officer of Mukono DLG. A report dated 24/09/20 was produced and was available at the District Water office.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. The projects was the Construction of Bugombe Kyazimbe Pipeline at Ugx155,544,600.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p> | <p>There was of MIN.021/2021 of the contracts committee meeting that sat on July 22, 2021 to approve the procurement of the water sector projects for the last FY.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p> | <p>There was evidence of a letter referenced FIN/MKN/105/01, dated July 1, 2021 appointing the Water officer, the Senior Environment officer, the CDO on the PIT for the Water sector projects.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p> | <p>Designs for Two different infrastructure were provided during the assessment for review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Design of Ull Hand Pump was used for the contract for rehabilitation of the deep boreholes. The designed drawing and scope of works showed stainless steel piping, sanitary seals with a concrete top lining cast with surface water outlet channels. The Borehole pedestal was concrete base onto clay brick with cement seals. This matched the site photos from the in the Supervision Reports and the observation made in the field. • The Design for the construction of piped water supply system in Mayangayanga in Nakifuma sub county. <p>The technical designs provided had been followed during the construction of the infrastructure for mini piped water supply system at Mayangayanga Rural Growth Center, in Nakifuma Sub county.</p> <p>The design drawings provided a steel framed elevated tank stands, two pump houses masonry built, a chain link, transmission line, distribution line and tap stands and solar panels. This matched the site photos from the in Supervision Reports and observation during the field visit.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p> | <p>There was evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects. This is evidenced by the compilation of monitoring and supervision reports that were shared during the assessment including among other others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on Monitoring Gravity Flow scheme for Bugombe Kyazimba water scheme dated June 29th, 2022; • Report on Monitoring on Borehole rehabilitation Dated September 09th, 2021; • Report on monitoring of capital projects by Works, water and Natural Resources Committee Dated May 11th, 2022; and • Water and Sanitation Monitoring and support Report Dated August 5th, 2021 | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0 | <p>There was evidence that the DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe. The sampled projects were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works by Victoria Eng services ltd on the construction of Mayaangayanga pipeline worth Ugx 334,176,733 submitted on 18/5/2022 were verified works and initiated for payments by the DWO on 18/5/2022 (1 day) and paid on 24/5/2022; 2. Works by Quality ltd on drainage at HQ worth Ugx 4,000,000 submitted on 8/10/2021 were verified works and initiated for payments by the DWO on 15/10/2022 (7 days) and paid on 23/11/2022; and 3. Works by Kanah ltd on the construction of Bugombe Kyazimba worth Ugx 118,000,000 submitted on 2/2/2022 were verified works and initiated for payments by the DWO on 3/2/2022 (1 day) and paid on 10/2/2022. | 2 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>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:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments. The was MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00012, Construction of Bugombe Kyazimba Pipeline, whose: procurement requisition was made on September 23, 2021; the procurement approval was made on September 27, 2021 with an estimate of 159,999,000, the advert was made on October 4, 2021; evaluation was completed on November 23, 2021; and contract was signed on January 10, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 155,544,600</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|--|---|

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p> | <p>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:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>A detailed Grievance Log Book for FY 2021/22 existed at the Microscale Irrigation project (under UGIFT project. It had columns for Serial No., Logged by? When? Logged to?, How it was logged? (Verbal, Phone Call, Report, Meeting with each beneficiary?) How it was resolved? Date it was resolved and Status of the Case (Ongoing/Concluded?)</p> <p>There was also a GRC posted on the Noticeboard.</p> | 3 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 14 | Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0 | There was evidence that the DWO and Environment Officers disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs. A page leaf was available at the Water Office with clearly many signatures of those who received the Guidelines for Water Source and Catchment Protection. It was dated 18/08/2021. | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0 | No such Plans were drawn. The Water Officer agreed that these will only have to be initiated. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0 | There was no evidence to show that 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. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0 | There was evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices on the following: 1.Works by Victoria Eng services ltd on the construction of Mayaangayanga pipeline worth Ugx 334,176,733; 2.Works by Quality ltd on drainage at HQ worth Ugx 4,000,000; and 3.Works by Kanah ltd on the construction of Bugombe Kyazimba worth Ugx 118,000,000. | 2 |

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 evidence that the CDO and Environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. Undated Screening Forms for screening done by Mutalya Joseph Innocent for UGIFT project availed for the following sampled Farmers:

- 1) Chrstopher Nkengeero of Bunakijja village;
- 2) Nsonera pascal of Bunakijja village;
- 3) Napokoli Nicholas of Kiwafu village;
- 4) Adiru Francis Emmanuel of Kikandwa village;
- 5) Aogon Fabian of Tikajjunge village; and
- 6) Bwogi Moses of Bulika village.

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|---|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono LG had up-to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between microscale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>This is evidenced by a document titled “Mukono District LG Irrigation Data as at 03/11/2022”.</p> <p>In FY 2020/2021 the irrigated area was 276 acres disaggregated as 124 acres for non-micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 152 acres for beneficiaries.</p> <p>In FY 2021/2022 the irrigated area was 307 acres disaggregated as 127 acres for non-micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 180 acres for beneficiaries.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 | <p>There was evidence that Mukono LG had increased acreage of newly irrigated land in FY 2021/2022 as compared to FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>In FY 2020/2021 the irrigated area was 276 acres.</p> <p>In FY 2021/2022 the irrigated area was 307 acres.</p> <p>Percentage increase = $100 \times (\text{Irrigated area in FY 2021/2022} - \text{Irrigated area in FY 2020/2021}) / \text{Irrigated area in FY 2020/2021}$.</p> <p>Percentage increase = $100 \times (307 - 276) / 276$</p> <p>The percentage increase was 11.2%.</p> | 2 |

Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

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

There was evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities.

This is evidenced by documented titled Funding for UgIFT micro scale irrigation program for FY 2021/2022 signed by SAE on 1/11/2022 detailing the amount received and the activities implemented.

The LG received UgX 2,074,949,824. The activities on which the funds were spent included:

- 2 awareness raising workshops for DEC, Council, RDC and DISO.
- Awareness meetings to DTTC, all sector heads production and all sub county agricultural extension staff.
- 1 micro scale irrigation awareness meeting per sub county in all 18 LLGs of the district.
- 22 radio adverts.
- 4 adverts made in print media.
- 85 micro scale irrigation sites contracted and supervised in all sub counties.
- 5 sensitization meetings for farmers at 5 LLGs conducted.
- 6 exchange visits conducted.
- 4-bench marking visits conducted in Kayunga, Buikwe and Wakiso.
- 9 field days conducted for selected farmers at the established demonstration sites.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | There was no evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment was working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: All the Farmers acceptance forms were signed after payment was effected as below: | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | <p>a) AKVO ltd Ugx 4,432,080 for the design and supply of installation for Mayanja , was paid on 22/6/2022 yet farmer signed acceptance form on 3/9/2022;</p> <p>b) RIMA ltd Ugx 10,134,000 for the design and supply of installation for Matovu , was paid on 22/6/2022 yet farmer signed acceptance form on 13/7/2022; and</p> <p>c) Grow ltd Ugx 11,051,048 for the design and supply of installation for Giggwa , was paid on 22/6/2022 yet farmer signed acceptance form on 14/8/2022.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 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 | There was evidence that supplier quotes were within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimate. The evidence is in a document titled "the evaluation of contract sum for UglFT microscale irrigation project batch 1 and batch 2" for FY 2021/2022. | 1 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | <p>2 supplier quotes were examined and the variation found to be within +/-20% of the Engineers estimate:</p> <p>1. Muko542/WRK/21-22/Lot 43 Baata Engineering Co. Ltd. Quotation is UgX 14,235,000 against engineer's estimate of UgX 14,00,000 giving a variation of 16.79%.</p> <p>2. Muko542/WRK/21-22/Lot 43 W&S Consults International Limited. Quotation is 17,954,200 against engineer's estimate of UgX 18,000,000 giving a variation of -0.25%.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 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 | There was evidence that not all micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY. Only 24 out of 85 representing 28.2 % were installed/completed within the previous FY. This is evidenced by the completion certificates DAO/Focal person, SAE/Contract Manager and CAO within June 2022. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure | The LG had approved structure of 38 extension workers. The position filled was 36 leading to 2 vacant position. Thus 94.7% of filled positions of extension workers | 1 |
| | Maximum score 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF | During the assessment, field visits were conducted and assessment done three completed irrigation sites in 1) Kasawo S/C Namaliri parish, Gavu village 0.6255377 deg N, 32.824007 deg East; 2) Nama S/C, Namubiru parish, Lwanyoyi village 0.37413 deg N, 32.789043 deg. East; 3). Nakifuma Nagalama TC Namyoya village. | 2 |
| | Maximum score 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment met the standards by MAAIF. The equipment at all the visited sites are in good shape, properly installed and functioning. | |

Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional

- If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the 24 installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional.

This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO through DPO dated 30/06/2022 for Q4.

During the assessment, field visits were conducted and assessment done for functionality on done three completed irrigation sites in 1) Kasawo S/C Namaliri parish, Gavu village 0.6255377 deg N, 32.824007 deg East; 2) Nama S/C, Namubiru parish, Lwanyoyi village 0.37413 deg N, 32.789043 deg. East; 3). Nakifuma Nagalama TC Namyoya village.

The equipment at all the visited sites are in good shape, properly installed and functioning.

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information

Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

Three LLGs, Kasawo SC, Nakisunga SC and Kasawo TC were sampled to establish the accuracy of information on extension workers. The lists of sampled LLG obtained from the HR Unit had 4 names (and 2 vacancies). The lists obtained from the sampled LLGs had a total of 11 extension workers

Kasawo SC staff list had four extension workers. 1. Veterinary Officer - Kyobe Solomon, 2. Fisheries Officer Mpasu Farouk, 3. Agriculture Officer - Nakayiki Maria and 4. Agriculture Officer Mukasa Charles. The list obtained from HR had only the Entomological Assistant - Wanyama Robert

Kasawo TC had three extension workers; 1. Agriculture Officer Kabenge Abbas, 2. Fisheries Officer - Kamuli Emmanuel, 3. Veterinary Officer Kizito Nicolas. and 4. Agriculture Officer - Kabenge Abbas. The list obtained from HR had only the Assistant Agriculture officer - Kabenge Abbas

Nakisunga SC had; Four extension workers 1. Agriculture Officer - Kasumba Andrew, 2. Veterinary Officer - Simbwa David, Animal Production Officer - Noeline Happy and Assistant fisheries officer - Okaba Hudson. The list obtained from HR had only 1. Okaba Hudson and 2. Happy Noeline

Information on filled positions of extension workers was therefore NOT accurate

Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information

Maximum score 4

b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that information on microscale irrigation system installed and functioning was accurate.

During the assessment, field visits were conducted and assessment done for functionality on done three completed irrigation sites in 1) Kasawo S/C Namaliri parish, Gavu village 0.6255377 deg N, 32.824007 deg East; 2) Nama S/C, Namubiru parish, Lwanyoyi village 0.37413 deg N, 32.789043 deg. East; 3). Nakifuma Nagalama TC Namyoya village.

The information checked was the layout of the irrigation systems, the type of irrigation system and the list of equipment installed. During the site visits, the systems were test run and found to be functional.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, the functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services, and farmer Expression of Interest.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | <p>This evidence was seen in quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The reports contain information on the status of the newly installed micro-scale irrigation sites, the activities being undertaken at the installed sites and the site inspection reports on the functionality of the new irrigation systems.</p> | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that that Mukono LG had entered up-to-date LLG information into MIS. This evidence was contained in printed MIS reports where data had been entered into MIS/Irritrack quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | <p>The MIS report showed a total of 242 had submitted expression of interest of which 221 were successful from the LLGs as at 30.06.2022.</p> | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>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>There was evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | <p>prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The information from LLG includes EOI's submitted and information on farm visits conducted categorized into total farm visits, successful farm visits and unsuccessful farmer visits.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that Mukono LG had developed a Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest-performing LLGs. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that Mukono LG had implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for lowest-performing LLGs. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | The LG Budgeted for thirty six (38) extension workers as per the approved staff structure of the Production Department. The total budget is UgX 44,000,000. | 1 |
| | 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

Maximum score 6

ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that LG deployed 36 extension workers as per guidelines and currently engaged in program implementation activities. The evidence was seen in the staff lists for FY 2021//2022 signed by the DPO.

Some of the extension officers deployed are:

1. Nyanja Paul deployed as Agricultural Officer Nama Sub County
2. Bernadette Kizito deployed as Agricultural Officer Nakifuma-Nagalama Town Council.
3. Mukasa Charles deployed as Agricultural Officer Kasawo Sub County.
4. Kasumba Andrew deployed as Agricultural Officer Nakisunga Sub County..

1

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0

The deployed extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed as per the monitoring reports reviewed, as follows;

Kasawo SC; The Agriculture Officer, Veterinary Officer and Fisheries Officer produced and availed for review 3 unified activity reports for the 2nd , 3rd and 4th quarters , FY 2021/22. They were reviewed, they did not have submission letters depicting the dates of submission

Kasawo TC; The Agriculture Officer, Veterinary officer and the Fisheries Officer presented for review 3 consolidated activity reports as follows:1st quarter - 5th October 2021, 2nd quarter - 4th February 2022 and 4th quarter - 15th July 2022

Nakisunga SC; The Agriculture Officer, Veterinary Officer, Animal Production Officer and Assistant Fisheries Officer presented a 4 consolidated activity reports which were reviewed. They had no submission Later depicting the dates of submission.

2

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> | <p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Extension workers\' deployment was publicized and disseminated to LLGs and were displayed on the Production Department\'s notice board as well as on those of the sampled LLGs</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | <p>Kasawo SC; Veterinary Officer - Kyobe Solomon, Fisheries Officer - Mpasu Farouk and Agriculture Officer - Nakiyingi Maria</p> | |
| | | | <p>Nakisunga SC; Agriculture Officer - Kasumba Andrew, Veterinary Officer - Ssimbwa David, and Assistant Fisheries Officer Okaba Hudson</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kasawo TC Agriculture Officer - Kabenge Abbas, Veterinary Officer - Kizito Nicholas and Fisheries Officer</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kimuli Samuel</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>The LG had 36 filled positions of extension workers. 10 appraisal reports were sampled. The sampled extension workers were appraised on the following dates;</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 4</p> | | <p>Fisheries Officer - Kasawo SC - 20th July 2022, 2. Assistant Fisheries Officer - Katosi TC - 23rd August 2022, 3. Animal Production Officer - Nakisunga SC - 12th August 2022, 4. Agriculture Officer - Naama SC - 8th August 2022, 5. Assistant Agriculture Officer - Namataba TC - 8th August 2022, 6. Animal Production Officer - Ntenjeru - Kisoga TC - 23rd August 2022. , 7. Agriculture Officer - Kimenyedde SC - 8th September 2022,</p> | |
| | | | <p>8. Entomological Assistant - Koome SC - date not indicated, 9. Animal Production Officer Ntunda - date not indicated, and 10. Agriculture Officer - Nakifuma-Naggalama TC - date not indicated</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Information on corrective action taken arising from appraisals was not availed for review</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 4</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | Information on training activities was not availed for review | 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 | Information on training database was not availed for review | 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 | There was evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services. Total grant for the year 2021/22 was Ugx1,774,842,682 page 18, Equipment was Ugx 1,351,000,000(75%) and complementary Ugx 423,842,680 (25%) as required. T | 2 |
| 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 | Out of Ugx1.2 billion Ugx39,975,166 (3%) was spent on monitoring and supervision and Ugx 108,742,134 (9%) was spent on awareness of LLGs. These percentages were all lower than the given maximums. | 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>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The co-funding was not reflected in the LG budget.</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>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>There was evidence that the LG used the farmer co-funding of Ugx 91,758,315 following the micro scale irrigation grant guidelines.</p> | 2 |
| <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG had embarked on dissemination of information on use of the farmer co-funding</p> | 2 |
| <p>This evidenced by minutes from meetings DTPC meeting held on 21.12.2022 at the Mukono CAO's board room attended by 30 members. information on use of the farmer co-funding is on page 20.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</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> | <p>There was evidence that the DPO monitored the installed microscale irrigation equipment.</p> | 2 |
| <p>This evidence is in the monthly and quarterly monitoring reports submitted to CAO by DPO dated 28/10/22, 30/06/2022, 27/12/22, 31/03/2022.</p> | | | | |
| <p>All the 24 micro-irrigation sites installed were monitored during FY 2021/2022.</p> | | | | |
| <p>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</p> | | | | |
| <p>• 70-89% monitored score 1</p> | | | | |
| <p>Less than 70% score 0</p> | | | | |
| <p>Maximum score 8</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the host farmers of the demonstration sites to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> <p>The report contains summary of the work completed during the reporting period highlighting the farm visits, technical training activities conducted, number of farmers covered by gender, challenges encountered during the reporting period, the corrective measures, details of the irrigation system that have been installed. and emerging issues that need to be addressed.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services as per guidelines.</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> <p>The reports contain information on technical backstopping of agricultural officers by district focal staff in all the 18 LLGs. Training activities include hands on training on operation of the installed irrigation equipment and good agronomic practices.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that 5 farmer field schools in Kimenyedde s/c, Nakifuma Nagalama T/c, Kasawo S/c, Koome Islands and Seeta- Namuganga s/c had been established in Mukono LG and 13 are under preparation.</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> <p>The farmer field schools are composed of micro-scale irrigation beneficiaries and those who have expressed interest.</p> <p>The farmers congregated at the farmer field schools once a week and were trained practically on irrigation and agronomy practices throughout the season.</p> | 2 |
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize and sensitize farmers as per guidelines.</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> <p>Some of the activities conducted included 1 micro scale irrigation awareness meeting per sub county in all 18 LLGs of the district, 22 radio adverts, 5 sensitization meetings for farmers at 5 LLGs conducted, 6 exchange visits conducted and 9 field days conducted for selected farmers at the established demonstration sites.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has trained staff and sensitized political leaders at District and LLG levels</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|----------|

T Some of the activities conducted included 2 awareness raising workshops for DEC, Council, RDC and DISO, Awareness meetings to DTPC, all sector heads production and all sub county agricultural extension staff and 4-bench marking visits conducted in Kayunga, Buikwe and Wakiso.

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>There was evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format.</p> <p>This evidence is in the hard copy Document titled Mukono District Irrigation Inventory 2021-2022 UgIFT Micro Scale Irrigation Project.</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|---|----------|

The register contains information on the name of farmer, equipment, description, quantity, and status.

The register was last updated on 30th October 2022.

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 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>There was evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment. The database was last updated on 12.07.2022. 710 farmers were entered into Irritrack. 10 applications were sample and found to be part of the database.</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 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>There was evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI):</p> <p>431 farmers have been visited in all the 18 LLGs out of which 232 were successful. This evidenced by extracts from the MIS attached to the Quarterly report dated 30/06/2022 for Q4</p> | 2 |
| 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:</p> <p>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>There was no evidence of f eligible farmers displayed on the notice boards of LLGs</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>There was evidence that the supply of materials and equipment for micro and small irrigation schemes at Ugx 84,402,000 was incorporated the Procurement Plan for the current FY</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of a letter referenced Muko542/Wrks/21-22/00032 inviting Ms Rima Ltd., AJVO International Ltd, WAS Consult International Ltd., BAATA Engineering Company, and Grow More Seeds and Chemicals Ltd to quote for the Supply and installation of Solar powered Irrigation demonstration systems in Vickie Bagenda\'s site,</p> | 2 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of evaluation reports for the selection of the suppliers. The sampled reports were for: Supply and installation of solar powered Microscale irrigation education demo sites, dated April 28, 2022; Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Sendagire Samuel, dated April 19, 2022; and Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Segawa Godfrey, dated April 19, 2022.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0 | There was evidence of minutes of the procurement committee meeting which sat on July 28, 2022 to approve the micro-irrigation systems | 1 |
| 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 | There was evidence of signed contracts with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier. The contracts were for: Supply and installation of solar powered Microscale irrigation education demo sites signed on May 25, 2022 at Ugx 45,644,457 with Rima (E.A) Limited; Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Sendagire Samuel, signed on May 30, 2022 at Ugx 45,644,457 with Grow More Seeds and Chemicals Ltd ; and Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Segawa Godfrey, signed on May 30, 2022 at Ugx9,552,159 with W&S Consult International Ltd. | 2 |
| 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 | There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet generated by Irritrack App. However, there were no standard technical designs issued to LGs from MAAIF. It was thus, not possible to check and determine whether: the various aspects of the systems are as per designs. | 2 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0 | There was evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of the irrigation demonstration sites by the District Agricultural Engineer. This evidence was seen in quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO through DPO dated 30/09/2022 for Q1, 30/12/2021 for Q2, 31/03/2022 for Q3 and 30/06/2022 for Q4. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment suppliers during testing the functionality of the installed equipment</p> <p>The equipment suppliers were Baata Eng ltd, W&S Consult International Ltd, Akvo International Ltd, Grow more seed and chemicals Ltd and Rima EA Ltd</p> <p>This evidence was seen in contract supervisory reports and report on technical inspection, testing and handover of completed sites by SAE to DPO and CAO dated 30/07/2022.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>There was evidence that LG has overseen the hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer.</p> <p>This evidence is in the quarterly reports prepared by District Agricultural Engineer to CAO dated 30/06/2022 for Q4.</p> <p>The handover of irrigation equipment took place between 10th to 15th June 2022.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Local Government made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes as below:</p> <p>a) AKVO ltd Ugx 4,432,080 for the design and supply of installation for Mayanja , submitted on 10/6/2022 was paid on 22/6/2022 (12 days);</p> <p>b) RIMA ltd Ugx 10,134,000 for the design and supply of installation for Matovu , submitted on 8/6/2022 was paid on 22/6/2022 (14 days); and</p> <p>c) Grow ltd Ugx 11,051,048 for the design and supply of installation for Giggwa , submitted on 6/6/2022 was paid on 20/6/2022 (14 days).</p> | 2 |

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

There was evidence of complete procurement files for each micro-scale irrigation projects. The sampled projects were for:

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/00032 Supply and installation of solar powered Microscale irrigation education demo sites, whose:

procurement requisition was made on April 12, 2022; the procurement approval was made on April 12, 2022 with an estimate of 46,765,443, the advert was made on April 12, 2022; evaluation was completed on April 28, 2022; and contract was signed on May 25, 2022 at a contract price of Ugx 45,644,457;

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/Lot 187 Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Sendagire Samuel, whose:

procurement requisition was made on January 2, 2022; the procurement approval was made on February 28, 2022 with an estimate of 12,300,000, the advert was made on February 28, 202; evaluation was completed on April 19, 2022; and contract was signed on May 30,2022 at a contract price of Ugx 13,485,050; and

MUKO542/wrks/2021-22/Lot 153 Design supply and installation of solar powered drag hose Microscale irrigation education demo sites at Segawa Godfrey, whose: procurement requisition was made on January 2, 2022; the procurement approval was made on February 28, 2022 with an estimate of 12,300,000, the advert was made on February 28, 202; evaluation was completed on April 19, 2022; and contract was signed on May 30,2022 at a contract price of Ugx 9,552,159;

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono LG Production department had displayed on the Production department notice board details of avenues to address grievances at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The display shows the grievance avenue, the type of grievance and where to address the grievance (contact persons and suggestion box).</p> <p>Notices are put contacts on all noticeboards in the district. LG also has a suggestion box where farmers or anyone can raise a complaint anonymous Complaints are recorded in the complaint in the book. Relevant action is taken immediately. the grievances which cannot be handled immediately or those we have failed to solve are submitted to the grievance district committee to handle further.</p> | 2 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>24 Cases were recorded in the Grievance Log.</p> | 1 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The column for 'How the case was resolved\' showed the way investigations were done.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was a 'Feedback' column in the Log Book that provided for notes on Feedback. For example, for farmer with complaint on Design, supply and installation of a solar powered drag hose irrigation system. the Contractor, Ms. W & S CONSULT INTERNATIONAL who supplied Farmer ID: MKN.2020-10-17/M/12024, the Feedback was given on 08/06/22.</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The Log Book showed how the Grievance Redress System operated and how cases were handled. It had columns for 'Complaint, name of Complainant, Date, Officer Responsible and Feedback. This process covered the the Grievance Redress Framework. For example, for the case of a faulty pump supplied by Ms. W & S CONSULT INTERNATIONAL, it covered the details of Farmer Unique ID: MKN.2020-10-17/M/12024, dates of 08/06/22, Feedback of the faulty pump being returned by the supplier and Feedback given to the same farmer.</p> | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers.</p> <p>This evidence is in the 85 MoUs between LGs and beneficiary farmers on various dates in FY 2021/2022. The MoUs were signed by CAO, approved farmer and witnessed by Subcounty chairperson and Spouse.</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>No costing was required for individual farmer projects screened. The projects were microscale in nature and no screening and costing was required. The following were such farmers sampled that did not need screening:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Chrstopher Nkengeero of Bunakijja village; 2) Nsonera pascal of Bunakijja village; 3) Napokoli Nicholas of Kiwafu village; 4) Adiru Francis Emmanuel of Kikandwa village; 5) Aogon Fabian of Tikajjunge village; and 6) Bwogi Moses of Bulika village. | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no need for monitoring of irrigation impacts so far 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. Water volumes involved were very small, far less than 1000 cubic metres per day, requiring no need for monitoring. And farmers had not yet started using artificial fertilisers.</p> | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | <p>iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. Signed Certification Forms were presented for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Design, supply and installation of a solar powered drag hose irrigation system. Contractor: W & S CONSULT INTENATIONAL. Farmer Unique ID: MKN.2020-10-17/M/12024. Dated: 08/06/22; and 2) Design, supply and installation of a solar powered drag hose irrigation system. Contractor: W & S CONSULT INTENATIONAL. Farmer Unique ID: MKN.2020-11-01/M/14663. Dated: 08/06/22. | 1 |

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. Signed Certification Forms were presented for: Certification was presented for:

1) Design, supply and installation of a solar powered drag hose irrigation system. Contractor: W & S CONSULT INTENATIONAL. Farmer Unique ID: MKN.2020-10-17/M/12024. Dated: 08/06/22; and

2) Design, supply and installation of a solar powered drag hose irrigation system. Contractor: W & S CONSULT INTENATIONAL. Farmer Unique ID: MKN.2020-11-01/M/14663. Dated: 08/06/22.

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i> | The Senior Agriculture Engineer position was vacant | 0 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i> | If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0. | There were no microscale irrigation projects that required screening. Since there were no microscale irrigation projects that required screening, ESIA was not necessary. | 30 |

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0. | The Civil Engineer (Water) position was vacant | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0. | The position of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization was not on the staff structure | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Borehole Maintenance Technician was not on the staff structure | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0. | Information on the status of appointment of the Natural Resources Officer was not availed for review | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Information on the status of appointment of the Environment Officer was not availed for review | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Appointment details of the Forestry Officer was not availed for review | 0 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----|
| 2 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0. | According to records from the District Planner, there was only one Water and Environment project supposed to have been implemented by Mukono DLG in the previous FY. This was construction of Bugomba - Kyazimba Pipeline. But the Environment and Community Development officers said they were not aware of such a project and had never done any work on it. | 0 |
| 2 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0. | Since the Environment and Community Development officers said they were not aware of the Water project and had never done any work on it, no such ESIA could be done. | 0 |
| 2 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0. | The DLG did not implement Water projects that required such Permits. They said extraction volumes were lower than the 1,000 cubic metres per day that would require for the Permit. | 10 |

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>District Health Officer, Mulindwa Stephan was substantively appointed as per the appointment Mi.no MKN/P 12684 dated 22nd June 2022</p> | 10 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p> | <p>Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, Ddumba Isaac was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MDC 016/2014 (A) dated 18th February 2014</p> | 10 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Assistant District Health Officer, Adyebo Christine Environmental Health was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MDC 017/2014 (A) dated 18th February 2014</p> | 10 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Information on the appointment status of the Principal Health Inspector was not availed</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Information on the appointment status of the Health Educator was not availed</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|-----------|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. | Biostatistician, Mwesigwa Ivan was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no 78/2011 dated 13th June 2011 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. | District Cold Chain Technician, Baluku Jackson was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MD135/2015 dated 1st July 2015 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0 | | |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for health projects implemented by Mukono DLG. There were three Health projects implemented by the DLG in the previous FY. These were screened by Mujuni the DNRO and Ntege the DCDO on Environmental Screening Forms as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namuganga HC III in Seeta, Namuganga S/C, dated 27/10/21; 2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Namasumbi HC II in Kyampisi S/C, dated 27/10/21; and 3) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a urinal at Buliika HC II in Nama S/C that was undated. | 15 |
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>The Screening showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary.</p> | 15 |

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-----------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | District Education Officer, Kikomeko Rashid was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no Md280/ 2021 | 30 |
| | <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | The LG had six (6) strict Inspectors of Schools. They were all substantively appointed as per their appointment letters; 1. Namayanja Anita - MD/75/2020 dated 3rd March 2020, 2. Kimbugwe Henry - MD81/2022 dated 14th March 2022, 3. Ochieng Mathew - MD/28/2022 dated 1st April 2022, 4. Cherop Irene - MD/80 / 2022 dated 14th March 2022, 5. Gasuza Issac - MD/2022 dated 14th March 2022 and 7. dated 14th March 2022, 5. Gassuza Isaac - MD83/2922 dated 14th March 2022, 6. Yiga Moses MD/82/2022 dated 14th March 2022 and 6. Sserwadda Sunday Sandra - MD/79/ 2022 dated 1st April 2022 | 40 |
| | <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | | | |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) | If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for Education projects implemented by Mukono DLG. There were 15 Education projects implemented by the DLG. Sampled Screening Forms, signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO were as follows: 1) Construction of a classroom block at Namulugwe P/S, dated 28/06/21; 2) Construction of a classroom block at Kyabakadde RCC, dated 28/06/21; 3) Namina PS, that was undated; 4) Mwanyanjiri, that was undated; and 5) Kazinga UMEA PS, that was undated. | 15 |
| | <i>The Maximum score is 30</i> | | | |

2

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

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

The Screening showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary.

15

The Maximum score is 30

**Crosscutting
Minimum Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0 | Chief Finance Officer , Nabwire Robinah was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter MD/202/2018 dated 1st January 2018 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0 | District Planner, Ssebaduka Collins was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MD/88/2018 dated 1st April 2011 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0 | District Engineer, Mugisa John was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no.126/2011 dated 1st July 2011 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | District Natural Resources Officer Mujuni William was substantively appointed as per the appointment; Min. No 28/2010 (4) dated 1st June 2010 | 3 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>District Natural Resources Officer Mujuni William was substantively appointed as per the appointment; Min. No 28/2010 (4) dated 1st June 2010</p> | 3 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>District Community Development Officer, Ampaire Christine was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no 54/2005(C30) dated 16th December 2005</p> | 3 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>District Commercial Officer, Owembabazi Beatrice was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MD.271/2019 dated 2nd December 2019</p> | 3 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>Senior Procurement, Batenga Prossy was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no 10/2019 dated 1st February 2019</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Procurement Officer, Nabiseke Caroline was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no. MD/274/2019 dated 3rd December 2019</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Principal Human Resource Officer, Semambo Annet Bwanika was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no 106/20 (3) dated 15th October 2012</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The Senior Environment Office, Mutalya Joseph was substantively appointed as per the appointment as per the appointment Min. no. MD/279/2019 dated 3rd December 2019</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Senior Land Management Officer, Mbaziira Robert was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MD/31/2012 (ii) (b) dated 1st October 2012</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Senior Accountant, Kalembe Olivia was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no 119/2010 (2) dated 1st December 2010</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Principal Internal, Abongi Albert was substantively appointed as per the appointment min. no 87/2009 dated 1st October 2010</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the | n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0 | Principal Human Resource Office (Secretary DSC, Kazibwe Steven was substantively appointed as per the appointment Min. no MD/196/2018 dated 1st January 2019 | 2 |
| | District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | | | |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure). | The LG had sixteen (16) LLGs, eleven (11) Sub counties and five (5) Town Councils and therefore 11 Senior Assistant Secretaries and 5 Senior Assistant Town Clerks. Their appointment status as per their appointment details as follows; | 0 |
| | Maximum score is 15 | | <p>SAS</p> <p>1. Nantale Caroline MD/39/2015 dated 10th May 2015, 2. Nsereeko Kawuma – 54/2005 (01) dated 16th December 2005. 3. Nakito Mawoya – 70/2009 (5) dated 1st October 2009, 4. Nsubuga Louis – 129/2011 dated 1st July 2011, 5. Namakoola Sarah – 48/2008 (4) dated 10th March 2008, 6. Mukasa Charles – MD 38/2015 dated 22nd May 2015</p> <p>SATC</p> <p>1. Kalagi Emmanuel – MDC/32/2014 dated 1st March 2014, 2. Katamba Fred – MD/27/2019 dated 1st July 2018, 3- Kiganda Lule – MD/129/2022 dated 10th March 2022, 4. Ombasa Dennis – MD/118/2014 dated 1st February 2015</p> <p>TC</p> <p>Kizito Francis – MD/134/2020 dated 22nd May 2020</p> <p>The LG had only 6 out of 11 SAS substantively appointed, 4 out of 5 SATCs and 1 TC Performing duties of a SATC</p> | |

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had sixteen (16) LLGs, eleven (11) Sub counties and five (5) Town Councils and therefore 11 CDOs and 5 Senior CDOs. Their appointment status as per their appointment details was as follows;

CDOs

Nansubuga Rhona - MD/72/2014 dated 1th August 2014, 2. Nakato Priscilla - MDC/29/2014 (1) dated 4th March 2014, 3. Nsubuha John - MD/135/2013 dated 3nd May 22013, 4. Nasngi Immaculate MD/178/2019 dated 1st July 2019, 5. Eskandi Seezi - MD/91/2020 dated 1st April 2020, 6. Namirembe Josephine - 70/2011 (vii)) dated 13th June 2011, 7. Misisi Bam Robert - 70/2011 (v) dated 13th July 2011, 8. Iradukunda Wilson - 70)/2021/ (x) dated 19th September 2011, 9. Nalugwa Edith - 74/2011 (51) dated 13th June 2011, 10. Kyegombe Esterico - MD/70/2921 (xi) 1. dated 22nd December 2011, 11. Tusiime Clare - MD/14/2020 dated 1st March 2020, 12. Kizza Margaret - MD/224/2020 (i) dated 13th December 2018 and 13. Mukibi Joseph - 179/2019 dated 1st July 2019,

The LG had only 13 Community Development Officers and n and no Senior Community Development Officers for the Town Councils

0

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had sixteen (16) LLGs and nd therefore 16 Senior Accounts Assistants or Account Assistants. They were all substantively appointed as per their appointment details was as follows;

Senior Accounts Assistants;

Nalubaale Rose - MD/137/2929 dated 19th June 2020, 2. Akena Godfrey - MDC/179/2013 (10) dated 1st July 2013. 3. Sanyu Scovia - 27/2011 dated 1st March 2011, 4 Muwanga Stephen - MDC/179/2013 (7) (i) dated 1st July 2003, 5. Nabirye Damali - 54/2005 (169) dated 1st August 2005, 6. Nulyanyi Moses - 54/2005 (171) dated 1st August 2005, 7 Nakiwala Prossy - 67/2011 dated 1st March 2011, 8. Nantumbewe Pauline - 25/2011 dated 1st March 2011, 9. Zawedde Anne 54/2005 (E31) dated 16th December 2005, 10 . Nerima Florence 23/2911 dated 1st March 2911, 11. Babalanda Tebitta 188/2008 (i) dated 1st July 2008,

Accounts Assistant

12. 24/2000 (vii) dated Nalukenge Beatrice - 30th March 2000, 13. Nabulime Catherine - 22/2005 (18) dated 23rd May 2005, 14. Mbabazi Mary Scovia 38/93 dated 24th Jue 1992, 15. Senkabirwa Charles - MDC/29/2014 (3) dated 4th March 2014, 16. Katende Jalia - 7/2000 (iv) dated 17th February 2000

5

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG released 85% of funds allocated in the year 2021/22 to Natural Resources department. The LG budgeted Ugx 210,354,578 (LG Approved Budget 2021/22) and Ugx 178,584,848 was spent (LG draft Financial statements for the year 2021/22 page 12).</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>The LG released 86% of funds allocated in the year 2021/22 to Community Based Services department. The LG budgeted Ugx 332,380,781(LG Approved Budget 20201/22) and Ugx221,515,778 was spent (LG draft Financial statements for the year 2021/22 page 12).</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.</p> <p>There were two DDEG projects implemented and Environmental Screening was done as follows:</p> <p>1) Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S. Screening for this project was done and the Screening Form was signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO. The Form was not dated; and</p> <p>2) Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county. There was no screening Form for this. Screening for this project was done and the Screening Form was signed by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO. The Form was dated 01/07/21.</p> | 4 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>The Screening showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary.</p> | 4 |
|---|---|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Mukono DLG had Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). Costing for Construction of a classroom block at Bukasa Namuyadde P/S was done on 16/06/21 whereas that for Construction of a classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kiyunga UMEA P/S in Kyampisi sub county was done on 01/07/21. The costing was done by Mutalya Joseph Innocent, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, District CDO.</p> | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

Financial management and reporting

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------|
| 5 | <p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p> | <p>LG had a clean audit opinion for the Financial Year 2021/22</p> | 10 |
|---|--|--|--|-----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----|
| 6 | 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). | 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), | The LG submitted status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General audit issues for the year 2020/21 on 17 December 2021 and 25 February 2022 respectively to PS/ST, before the February 2022 deadline. | 10 |
| | maximum score is 10 | score 10 or else 0. | | |
| 7 | Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY | If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY, | The LG submitted an annual performance contract of 2022/23 on 20 July 2022 before the deadline of August 31st, 2022. | 4 |
| | Maximum Score 4 | score 4 or else 0. | | |
| 8 | Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year | If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year, | The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for the year 2021/22 on 24/7/2022 before the deadline of August 31, 2022. | 4 |
| | maximum score 4 or else 0 | score 4 or else 0. | | |
| 9 | 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 | 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, | The LG did submit all the quarterly budget Performance Reports for the year 2021/22 by the deadline of August 31, 2022: Q1 was submitted on 23/10/2021 ; Q2 was submitted on 24/1/2022; Q3 was submitted on 29/4/2022 ; and Q4 was submitted on 24/7/2022. | 4 |
| | Maximum score is 4 | score 4 or else 0. | | |