



LGMSD 2021/22

Jinja District

(Vote Code: 511)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	87%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	100%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	70%
Educational Performance Measures	57%
Health Performance Measures	56%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	57%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	45%

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>Evidence from the list of 21 DDEG funded projects for the FY 2020/2021, indicate that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s).</p> <p>Infrastructural projects sampled are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of staff house at Lumuli HC II; 2. Construction of sanitary facilities at Busende HCIII-2 latrines stances of which one is for the PWDs and a bathroom; and 3. Construction of a waiting shade at kakira HC III. 	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 	Not Applicable	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>Evidence from the annual performance reports at the LG provided to the assessor indicate all the 21 projects funded under DDEG were 92% completed. Some sampled contracts are indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of staff house at Lumuli HC II, completion certificate no. 3452 on 17/04/201 ; 2. Construction of sanitary facilities at Busende HCIII-2 latrines stances of which one is for the PWDs and a bathroom, completion certificate no.455553 on the 19/03/2021; and 3. Construction of a waiting shade at kakira HC III, completion certificate no.87965 on the 15/06/2021. 	2

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	As per DDEG Grant Budget and Implementation Guidelines and as per the evidence of the list of DDEG projects presented to the assessor, 26 projects were undertaken and all conform and are eligible as per the guideline. The sampled projects are; 1. Completion of staff house at Lumuli HC II; 2. Construction of sanitary facilities at Busende HCIII- 2 latrines stances of which 1 is for PWDs and a bathroom; and 3. Construction of a waiting shade at kakira HC III.	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled DDEG funded projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the LG engineers estimates as detailed herein below;- Project: Construction of a two classroom block with an office and lightening arrestor in Bulugo Primary School; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00022 Contractor: Interbuild Technical services limited Award Amount = Ugx. 84,925,794= Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 81,372,000= Variation = 4.4% (+ve) Project: Construction of a 4 unit staff house and a four stance brick lined emptable VIP Latrine for staff at Kagogwa primary school; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00009 Contractor: Crescent General Company Limited Contract Amount = Ugx.116,141,134= Engineers estimate = Ugx. 116,171,000= Variation = 0.026% (+ve) Project: Construction of a five stance brick lined emptable latrine at Wansimba Primary School in Namagira Town Council; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00015 Contractor: Tubutute Investment limited Contract Amount = Ugx.27,305,145= Engineers Estimate = Ugx.27,317,500= Variation = 0.045% (+ve)	2

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	Out of 7 LLGs, 3 LLGs were selected;- Kakira Town Council, Buwenge Subcounty and Buwenge TC In staff list reviewed as of 30/6/2021, evidence shows that all information regards to positions filled in these LLGs are accurate as per staffing standards. The names, location, number and titles of staff in each LLGs were clearly stated as well as the gap that needs to be filled as per minimum requirements.	2
4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	From the evidence gathered and reports on all DDEG project, all major reports concerning the DDEG projects are available as per the completion report, page 9 on the 15/06/2021.	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	There was evidence provided in a letter dated 19/10/2021, Ref: CR/156/1 (Submission of staff wage FY2020/2021) to show that LG consolidated and submitted staff requirements for the coming FY2022/2023 to the MoPS with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. However, the letter was received after the required date of submission (21/10/2021).	0
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	Based on the daily consolidated staff attendance report submitted by the HR for Q1,2,3 and 4 for the FY2020/2021 submitted in September 2021, it was evidenced that the District conducted a Tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per MoPs guidelines on staff attendance.	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	After the review of all HODs appraisal reports, there was evidence to show that all the Seven HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPs. For example; - District Production Officer, Kasadha Tom Waimaga was appraised on 30th /July/2021; - Chief Finance Officer, Paul Mubiiwa was appraised on 30th /July/2021; - District Planner, Mubiru Nathan was appraised on 30th /July/2021; - District Engineer, Eng. Buyinza Joseph was appraised on 30th /July/2021; - District Natural Resources Officer, Mr. Baruzalire Fredrick was appraised on 30th /July/2021; - District Community Development Officer, Kyangwa Ivan Joab was appraised on 30th /July/2021.	1
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	After reviewing Minutes of Administrative and Rewards Committee meetings for the FY2020/2021, there was evidence provided to show that all Administrative and Reward sanctions were being presented before the Committee for hearing. However, no evidence of action taken based on recommendations was availed to confirm timely implementation of all cases as per guidelines.	0
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	File of Consultative Committee (CC) was provided and all communications and Minutes of the various meetings were reviewed. There was evidence to show that LG established a Consultative Committee for staff grievance redress which is functioning. However, the establishment does not comply with guidelines issued by MoPs. Instead of 10 members, the district has only 5 members all whom are from the LG staff without any Union representatives and other bodies.	1
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	There was evidence provided in the Master and department pay roll and staff payment slips that 100% of staff that were recruited during the FY 2020/2021 accessed Payroll within the 2 months of assumption of duties.	1

9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	No evidence was provided to show that all staff that retired in the FY2020/2021 accessed the pension payroll on time. Reasons verbally given was that most staff who retired in the FY2020/2021 delayed to get their pension due to unreconciled personal records like mismatch of information on the National ID.	0
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	DDEG to LLGs budget – 376,513,630 Evidence from the annual work plan and budget and documents for fund transfer analysed and reviewed, it was evident that direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in 3 equal installments as outlined below; 1st quarter – 125,504,543 on the 21/07/2020; 2nd quarter – 125,504,543 on the 16/10/2020; and 3rd quarter – 125,504,543 on the 16/01/2021.	2
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED): Score: 2 or else score 0	From receipt of expenditure limit, 1st quarter expenditure limit approved on the 21/7/20 and transfer on 21/7/20. 2nd quarter expenditure limit approved on the 13/10/20 and transfer on 16/10/20. 3rd quarter expenditure limit approved on the 11/1/21 and transfer on 16/1/21. All the above transfers were compliant.	2
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter: Score 2 or else score 0	1st quarter – on the 09/07/2020 and Invoicing happened on 01/08/2020; 2nd quarter – on the 06/10/2020 and Invoicing happened on 21/10/2020; and 3rd quarter – on the 08/01/2021 and Invoicing happened on 28/01/2020. The LG is not compliant concerning this indicator.	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>From the evidence obtained, and the field monitoring reports presented, it is concluded that all LLGs have been supervised or mentored at least Quarterly as follows;</p> <p>1st Quarter on 25/11/2020;</p> <p>2nd Quarter on 03/01/2021;</p> <p>3rd Quarter on 09/03/2021;</p> <p>4th Quarter on 07/06/2021.</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>From the evidence obtained and made available to assessor, reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, and used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions as follows;</p> <p>1st Quarter meeting minutes dated on 15/10/2021- minute number (Min 06/10/2020);</p> <p>2nd Quarter meeting minutes dated on 11/2/2021- minute number (Min 03/12/2020);</p> <p>3rd Quarter meeting minutes dated on 16/04/2021- minute number (Min 04/04/2021);</p> <p>4th Quarter meeting minutes dated on 10/08/2021- minute number (Min 08/08/2021)</p>	2
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence from the asset registers physically presented, checked and reviewed conforms to the format in the accounting manual, contains all significant assets and is up-to-date; All significant assets including land, vehicles,furniture, equipment among others are included.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Board of survey report for the FY 2020/2021 was in existence and was presented to the assessor who verified that was submitted to the OAG office on 01/09/2021, MoFPED on the 31/08/2021 and to the Accountant General on the 31/08/2021.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>Jinja LG has a physical planning committee in place with only 8 members</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Kakaire Alamanzani – Chair 2 Baruzalire Fredrick - Mamber 3 Mageruko Moris – Member 4 Luboyera Majeran – Member 5 Gidudu Patrick – Member 6 Kakuzo Tabitha – Member 7. Aliba Linda – Member 8. Batwaula Ephraim – Member <p>It is not fully constituted and the mandatory number is 13 members. And only one committee meeting sat on the 03/12/2020.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects; 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>From the Evidence of the desk appraisal reports and minutes of the desk appraisal committee, all prioritised investments are derived from the LG Development Plan. Desk appraisal reports reviewed are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 procurement of 34 computers for the parish chiefs on 17/03/2021; 2. Completion of the animal plant/clinic at DPO's office on 17/03/2021; 3. Construction of 4-Unit staff house in Busige P/S on 17/03/2021; and 4. Construction of district HQs in Kagoma on the 17/3/2021 among others. 	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>From the 3 sampled projects namely;</p> <p>1 Rehabilitation of a classroom block at Kaita Ndovu P/S on 17/03/2021;</p> <p>2. Completion of casualty , dental & eye clinic at buwenge general hospital on the 17/03/2021; and</p> <p>3. 5-stance brick lined pit latrines in Imam-Hassan, buwenge township and Iziru P/S on 17/03/2021.</p> <p>Scrutiny for Technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and designs customized for investment projects was done and this is on page 1&2 of each appraisal report on the 15/03/2021.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>From the evidence of the district project profiles for the FY 2021/2022 availed to the assessor, and TPC minutes, Min 07/03/2021 on 16/03/2021 indicates that all the project profiles for Investment were discussed.</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 the LG screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures before being approved for construction using checklists as evidenced by appraisal/screening reports.</p> <p>Completion of 3 stance pit latrine in Nalinaibi HC II, with a mitigation measure to restrict construction works to dry season to prevent erosion and silting of water surfaces.</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward in Buwenge, Vegetation surface affected with a mitigation to restrict construction to dry season, replant vegetation on construction area and fence off the structure. Renovation of abattoir limit vegetation clearance with a mitigation measure to replant the vegetation and restrict construction to dry season.</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all the infrastructure projects under DDEG for FY2021-2022 were incorporated in the LG approved work plan on 30th July 2021. More evidence showed that the departmental work plans were all submitted to Procurement and Disposal unit as per details herein:- The Water development department sector procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 20/may/2021; The Education department procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 29/June/2021; The Health department procurement plan was submitted on 30th July 2021; The Production and Marketing departmental procurement plan was submitted on 27th July 2021	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all infrastructural projects to be implemented in the FY2021/2022 using DDEG were approved by contracts committee before commencement of construction. The contracts committee meeting held on 11th August 2021 under minute, Min 00003/DCC/2021-2022 confirmed the same.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that Jinja LG established a proper project implementation team as detailed in a memo dated 4th August 2021 referenced CR/201/1; The memo nominated project teams headed by the project manager as below; Mwoga Robert, project manager; Namuwaya, SEO; Nansasi Christine SCI; Kyangwa Ivan, DCDO; Maganda Moses, SEO; Mawanda RACHEAL, LO; Gulale Fred, SPO.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that most of the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG engineers; the site supervision and technical payment reports prepared by the district technical teams support the same. biogas project in Wansimba primary school; Concrete benches construction at the dental clinic in Buwenge general hospital, and construction of an Emergency ward at Buwenge general hospital	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the technical staff of Jinja LG provided supervision and work completion reports for their infrastructural projects prior to verification and certification of works in the FY2020-2021 as detailed herein;-</p> <p>The Project of construction of a 4 unit staff house and a four stance brick lined emptable V.I.P latrine for staff at Kagogwa primary school was well supervised and a detailed verification and certification assessment report dated 10th may 2021 was prepared by the direct project supervisor, the District Engineer. The same report was verified by the District Education Officer, Internal auditor, District Community Development Officer and District Environment Officer. He observed that the work was completed with the right specifications and project due for payment;</p> <p>The second supervision report was for construction of a five stance brick lined emptable latrine at Wansimba primary school in Namagira town council, dated 27th October 2020; the report was generated by the technical supervisor, the District Engineer and verified by the internal auditor. He noted that the works were done to the specified quality and design; and</p> <p>The third supervision report was for construction of a two classroom block with an office and lightening arrestor in Bulugo Primary School dated 24/February/2021; these report was generated by Mr. Alex Obodha Batambuze, Civil engineer and verified by the District Internal Auditor</p>	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that Jinja LG had verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames. Most of the files availed were incomplete and lacked tallying payment certificates and reports.	0
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	The LG failed to avail evidence that LG has complete procurement files in place for contracts for FY2020/2021	0

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 availed that shows that the District designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints as evidenced by the Letter of appointment dated 10th July 2019, Ref.CR/214/19. There was also evidence that shows that centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC),was established a with relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant as evidenced by the Committee members appointment letters. In addition, Minutes of consultative committee were availed (one held on 22nd June 2021 and 18th March 2021).	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	The LG had a specified system for recording, investigating, and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints logbook with clear information and reference for onward action and public display of information at district. notice board was ascertained. However, most grievances were human resource related except a one case where Mr. Isabirye Sunday reported that there was an individual who blocked the main water channel for the irrigation system in Buwenge Sub County in Igombe village on 18th June 2021, a harmonization meeting was conducted on 30th June 2021 and the channel was redesigned.	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the District publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress as evidenced by the the communication found on the district notes board. However, the communication on the notice board was neither dated nor stamped.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	Evidence from the LG development plan, annual work plan, budgets and enhanced DDEG guidelines reviewed, Environment Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated, page 17.	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the minutes and attendance lists reviewed and assessed, DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs as indicated in a TPC Minute report dated 14th may 2020 minute number 08/05/2020</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) availed showed that there was no costing carried out and thus were not incorporated in the BOQs.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability without any encumbrances.</p> <p>Examples of projects:</p> <p>Buwenge general hospital construction of emergency ward, bio gas project at Wansimba primary school and restocking project at Nakabango district farm.</p>	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 availed to show that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. In addition, no field compliance reports were provided for all the sampled 3 projects. The sampled 3 projects of Buwenge seed school construction, construction of 5 stance brick lined VIP latrine and hand washing facility at Isiri primary school, and fencing of Mpungwe HC II.	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	No evidence was provided to show that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates.	0

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	Bank reconciliations reviewed are up-to-date to October 2021 and a sample of the two major selected accounts can confirm this. The 2 accounts selected are the Single Treasury Account and the General fund Account.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	Physical evidence of the quarterly internal audit reports was presented and verified as follows; 1st Quarter IA report was on 27/10/2020; 2nd Quarter IA report was on 14/01/2021; 3rd Quarter IA report was on 28/4/2021; and 4th Quarter IA report was on 29/7/2021. Therefore, all quarterly reports were produced for the previous FY.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports. Score 1 or else score 0	From the evidence gathered from the "status of implementation minutes on the 20/10/2021, 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 and therefore compliant with this indicator.	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 provided to the assessor to indicate 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>	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 local revenue collection ratio of planned Vs actual collection is 92% in 2020/2021</p> <p>The Budget estimates were UGX 2,200,455,000</p> <p>Actual collection was UGX 2,020,691,759</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>In the FY 2019/2020 own revenue sources generated UGX 2,194,424,122 and in the FY 2020/2021, it was 2,020,691,759 meaning a backward reduction of UGX 173,723,363 (Appx 8% reduction).</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Total collection was UGX 347,949,166 and the Remittance was UGX 262,952,783 to LLG share of revenue. Approximately 75% remittance. This supersede the mandatory 65%.</p>	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	The information regarding contracts was published on the website.	2
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence the LG performance assessment results and implications are published for the previous year through the following medium; 1 Jinja District newsletter -10th volume; 2. Website- www.jinja.go.ug ; 3. Radio talk shows; 4. Budget conference, among others	2
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0	Evidence of the Radio scripts were presented to the assessor, however, minutes from the budget conference and other forums were never captured	1
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	No tax rates, collection procedures and appeal procedures were published on the notice boards.	0
22	Reporting to IGG Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure	a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0	There were no IGG issues raised to date.	1

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>There was evidence that the LG PLE pass rates have increased between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 1.7%.</p> <p>Evidence from 2019 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DIS showed that 7987 candidates passed in Grades 1 - 3 out of the 10610 who sat, representing 73.6% pass rate.</p> <p>Evidence from 2020 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DIS showed that 7147 candidates passed in Grades 1-3 out of the 9711 who sat, representing 75.3% pass rate.</p>	2
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>There was evidence that the LG UCE pass rates have increased between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 11.6%.</p> <p>Evidence from 2019 UCE Performance Summary Report signed by DIS showed that 334 candidates passed in Grade 1- 3 out of the 833 who sat, representing 40.1% pass rate.</p> <p>Evidence from 2020 UCE Performance Summary Report signed by DIS showed that 415 candidates passed in Grades 1-3 out of the 803 who sat, representing 51.7% pass rate.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	N/A in 2020 assessment.	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>Evidence from the Education Department Performance Report for 1st to 3rd Quarter for Development Projects FY 2020/21 presented to the Social Services Committee JDLG on 19/02/21 (signed by DEO), and from MoES Sector Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments Guidelines, FY2021/22, Section 6: Sector Requirements for the Development Grant pages 19-20, the Education Development Grant was used on eligible activities, for example: construction of staff houses, latrines, classroom blocks, emptying pit latrines, and enhancing the biogas systems at Wansimba PS and Namaganga PS indicated in the DL Performance Report, which replaces budgeting for firewood.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from all the payment vouchers reviewed indicate DEO and Environmental officer signed but not the CDO. LG's argument is that their template had not accommodated him before.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

There was evidence that the variations of the three
sampled contracts for education infrastructure projects
for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the
MoES engineers estimates as detailed herein below;-

Project: construction of a 4 unit staff house and a four
stance brick lined empty V.I.P Latrine for staff at
Butangala primary school;

JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00023

Contractor: Jaluuko Hardwares and contractors limited

Contract amount = Ugx. 115,894,726=

Engineers Estimate: Ugx. 116,171,000=

Variation = 0.2% (+ve)

Project: Construction of a 5 stance brick lined VIP
Latrine with a hand washing facility at NALINAIBI
Primary school; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00018

Contractor: Pusinde technologies Uganda limited

Contract amount = Ugx 27,310,952=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 27,317,000/=

Variation = 0.02% (+ve)

Project: Construction of 5 stance brick lined empty
VIP Latrine at Nkondo Primary School;
JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00019

Contractor: Katumo Investment Limited

Contract sum = Ugx. 27,309,735

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 27,317,000=

Variation = 0.027% (+ve)

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

There was evidence that the education project
(Buwenge Seed Secondary school) that was planned in
FY2020-21 is being implemented as per the work plan;
the work contract that was awarded to VISVAR
INVESTMENTS Limited, MOES/WRKS/2018-19/00119-
LOT 27 on 23rd April 2019, was supposed to last for 36
months and due for hand over by 23rd April 2022, and
according to a joint supervision report dated 2nd
November 2021, 90% of the work had been achieved.
This means the project is progressing well so far though
not yet complete.

In addition, the District Engineer confirms that the
project is due for hand over on 30th November 2021.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that all Primary teachers were recruited as per MoPs guidelines both as new recruits and on replacement basis, e.g. on DL Notice Board CAO Circular CR/2014/1, RE: Existence of Vacant Positions in the Education Sector, dated 27th April, 2021.</p>	3
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>Evidence of Primary and Secondary Schools' Asset Register FY2020/2021 availed was presented in MoES prescribed format, and signed on 30-06-2021.</p> <p>However, the Schools' Asset Register for FY 2019/2020 was not availed to calculate the percent of schools that met prescribed minimum standards for the two previous years.</p> <p>Therefore, the percentage of schools that met prescribed minimum standards was not calculated.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

• Else score: 0

- From the DL List availed, out of the 3 sampled Schools, i.e. Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS and Buwenge SDA PS, Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS had some teachers that were on Schools' lists provided by the DL but absent on the School Noticeboards. Some teachers had retired, others had been posted to the respective schools, while others had been transferred within the period (FY 2020/2021). For example: -

-
- At Muguluka PS: -
 1. Tibatya Margaret had been transferred on 24th May, 2021 by the CAO (CR/161/1) and letter was acknowledged by the Headteacher on 31/05/2021, but was still on the School Staff List on Notice Board and on the DL list; and
 2. Kasiisa Eva had been transferred to Muguluka PS from Mpumwire PS by the CAO (CR/161/1) on 22/06/2021 and letter was acknowledged by the Headteacher on 31/08/2021, but the DL List and School Notice Board were not updated.

At Wairaka PS: -

1. Nakabugo Teddy had retired in Sept. 2020, and was not on the School Staff List on Notice Board, but was still listed on the DL list;
2. Nansimbi Veronica Ivone had retired on 27/08/2021, and was not on the School Staff List on Notice Board, but was still listed on the DL list;
3. Mukuve Badiru had been transferred to Wairaka PS, and was not on the School Staff List on Notice Board, but was still listed on the DL list;
4. Mwogeza Juliet Comp. No. 146701 and Reg. Number V/2009/4901 was posted to Wairaka PS and reported on 17/06/2021, but the DL did not have this update as at 2/Nov/21.

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>Evidence showed that the LG consolidated Asset Register for FY2020/2021 did not accurately report on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools. For example:-</p> <p>a) Muguluka PS Noticeboard had the inventory pinned as at 2/Nov/21 number of latrines, i.e. 13 stances for boys, 18 for girls and 2 for teachers; water sources: 2 boreholes, 5 tanks, and 1 tap water; Furniture: 396 desks, 10 chairs, 6 tables and 7 cupboards; Classrooms: 6 blocks, 16 classrooms; and Teachers' House: 4 permanent and 3 requiring innovation.</p> <p>On the other had, the DL consolidated Asset Register for FY2020/2021 reported 16 classrooms and 8 new ones, 31 latrines and 2 new ones, 395 desks and one new one, and 7 staff houses, 3 for rehabilitation and 12 new ones.</p> <p>b) Wairaka PS had School Asset Register filed as at 6/10/20 to include a list of books from Fountain Publishers and from Longhorn Publishers, the rest of the assets were not reported on as in the the DL consolidated Asset Register for FY2020/2021.</p> <p>c) Buwenge SDA PS had School Asset Register filed as at 6/10/20 to include a list of books from Fountain Publishers and from Longhorn Publishers, the rest of the assets were not reported on the DL consolidated Asset Register for FY2020/2021.</p>	0
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> <p>i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was no evidence to show whether the LG ensured that all registered primary schools had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they had submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO January 30 in the 3 sampled schools, that is: Wairaka Primary School, Muguluka Primary School and Buwenge SDA Primary School.</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 the School inspection reports for FY 2020/2021 to indicate that schools were supported to develop SIPs. No evidence was availed from the 3 sampled schools, that is: Wairaka Primary School, Muguluka Primary School and Buwenge SDA Primary School for further verification.</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 that EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the FY2020/21 year were sent online to MoES. Verified data submissions from MoES was hamornised with list of schools submitted by the LG in the performance contract, FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>However, with the creation of Jinja City, all City Schools formally under the DLG still appeared on the DLG list. Evidence was availed by the CAO (REF: EDU/213/3) dated 29/01/2021 to the Commissioner Planning titled: "Update on the Status of Schools that belong to the City and the District." The letter was acknowledged on the 04/02/21 by the Office of the Principal Stastician, MoES.</p>	4

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence from LG Notice Board for FY 2020/2021 as at 02/11/21; LG Education Workplan 2020/2021 showed that school teachers were budgeted for as per staffing norms/guidelines, i.e. a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 (MoES Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments Sector Guidelines, FY2020/21, Subsection 4.1 Budgeting Requirements for the Wage Grant, p. 12).</p> <p>Further evidence on noticeboards of the 3 sampled schools, i.e. Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS and Buwenge SDA PS was availed as at 02/11/21.</p>	4
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the LG Teacher Deployment List FY 2020/2021 showed that teachers had been deployed as per the MoES Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments Sector Guidelines, FY2020/21, Subsection 4.1 Budgeting Requirements for the Wage Grant, p. 12.</p> <p>Further evidence on the Notice Boards in the Samples Schools, i.e. Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS and Buwenge SDA PS showed teacher deployment, e.g. on time tables and on various Committees.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed on LG Notice Board (FY 2020/2021) and sampled School, i.e. Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS and Buwenge SDA PS Notice Boards as at 02/11/21 showed that teacher deployment data had been disseminated or publicized.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence showing that all H/T appraisal reports had been submitted to the DEO. There was no evidence of copies of H/T appraisals from SAS for the previous school year, i.e. FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Apart from four secondary Schools whose Head Teachers have been appraised, no evidence was available to show that D/CAO (or Chair BoG) appraised all secondary school head teachers with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM.</p> <p>Examples of Schools whose Head Teachers were appraised included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wanyange Girls head teacher; - MM College -Wairaka, head teacher; - Busede College- Bugaya Head Teacher and - Lubani SS. head Teacher. 	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>From the reviewed appraisals reports obtained from the LG HR department, there was evidence to show that all staff in the LG Education department were appraised in the FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>Example of staff appraised included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balirina Paul Mugaju, DEO was appraised on the 26th /August /2021; - Namuwaya Lydia, Senior Education Officer was appraised on 15th August 2021 - Kisambira elia, Principle Inspector of Schools was appraised on 15th August 2021 - Nabeta alice, Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 15th August 2021 - Baliraine Godfrey. Education Officer Special Needs Education was appraised on 11th July 2021 - Mukonya John, Office Messenger was appraised on 6th August 2021 - NAMBI Zakia, Secretary was appraised on 30th July 2021 - Namuwaya Aidha, District Sports Officer was appraised on 5th July 2021 	2

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence showed that DEO submitted the training plan developed for 2020/2021(stamped and signed by the DEO on 16/4/21) to raise awareness on budget and budget implementation guidelines, training of new SMCs, reduce spread of COVID-19, and increase usability of computers. These were considered staff capacity gaps at school level.</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that CAO submitted to Commissioner Planning (MoES) an update on Status of Schools that belong to the City of Jinja and the District dated 29 January 2021 and received on 4th Feb 2021 (ref EDU/2013/3).</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Evidence showed that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines, e.g. Quarterly Reports by DEO to District Planner for Q1 Accountability Report (11/11/20) and Q2 (29/01/21), Q3 (19/04/21), Inspection Report on Status of Schools submitted by CAO to PS Education, REF: CR/213/3 dated 30/08/21), Schools Inspection Report for Term II 2020 on Compliance to COVID-19 SOPs to PS Education, REF CR/213/1, dated 21/12/20 and Procurement Workplan to FY2020/21 submitted to CAO (15/05/20).

Activities conducted complied to MoES sector guidelines for FY2021/22 Subsections 5.1.5 Activities to be funded under the program 0784 – Education and Sports Management (p.16) and 5.2 Budget Implementation Requirements for the Non-wage Recurrent Grant(pages 17&18) alongside expenditures on the inspection and monitoring functions. Evidence of signed and stamped Annual Workplans and Accountability in FY 2020/21 at the LG Education Department and at the Sample Schools availed. For instance, evidence showed that inspection was undertaken at Muguluka PS on 9/0/20 based on the DES Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards for ECD Centers tool of 2020; and at Wairaka PS on the 19/3/20 using DES School Feedback Report on Monitoring of Inspection Activities.

2

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

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

There was no evidence availed to show that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters for FY 2020/2021.

0

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence on the Jinja DL Headteachers' WhatsApp Group showed that the DEO communicated/publicized within three working days of the release in sampled schools, the circular attached to the WhatsApp was dated 29/10/21 and was received same day, implying that the LG was compliant on this indicator.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>LG Education department inspection plan FY2020/2021 was not availed to assess whether the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections. Rather the Inspection Plan dated 30/06/2021 availed was not for the assessment period.</p> <p>However, there was evidence of One Preparatory meeting conducted, e.g. Minute 16/2020 from Departmental Meeting held on 25/03/2020. The meeting among others was scheduled to plan for school inspections.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>Evidence from the LG Minutes. e.g. Minute 16/2020 from Departmental Meeting held on 25/03/2020 and from the 3 sample schools showed that some schools were inspected and monitored. However, there was no consolidated report from the DEO on school inspection and monitoring availed to enable the calculation of registered UPE schools that had been inspected and monitored in FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>The evidence from the DEO/MEO's monitoring report (compiled in October 2021) availed was outside the assessment period, i.e. FY 2020/2021.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that inspection reports at the LG and in the 3 sampled schools, i.e. Wairaka PS (Urban), Muguluka PS (semi-urban) and Buwenge SDA PS (rural) were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions were subsequently followed-up in FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the respective Schools Inspection Files showed that copies of the inspection reports from the previous two terms were left behind, e.g. dated 26/02/2020; 21/02/2020; 19/3/2020 (Wairaka PS).</p> <p>Jinja DLG submitted Term 1 and Term 2 (2020) School inspection reports to DES (DES List, submitted to Assessor by DES on 30/Nov/21).</p> <p>Evidence that the DEO/MEO obtained a letter of acknowledgment from DES dated 21/09/2020 was availed.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the minutes obtained from the Clerk to Council on the 28/05/20, 23/4/2021 and 3/5/2021 indicate that the Committee responsible for Education met and discussed service delivery issues including Inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results during the FY 2020/2021.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, e.g. Invitation Letter to DIS through CAO for a Radio Talkshow on Busoga FM 90.6 on Schools Nutrition Program during COVID 19 Lockdown, dated 10/07/20; on Home Learning during COVID 19 Lockdown, dated 03/08/20; Kabembe PS letter to DEO on Report on Parents Mobilization dated 13/08/21.</p>	2
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence provided by the LG provided 2020 Asset Register showed that school facilities and equipment was in alignment with MoES and DES (March 2010) basic standards. The information in LG asset register was valid relative to that obtained in the asset registers. Actual physical observation in the sampled schools (Wairaka PS, Muguluka PS and Buwenge SDA PS) showed availability of assets including classrooms, latrines, desks, and teacher accommodation.</p>	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>From the evidence of the desk appraisal reports and minutes of the desk appraisal committee, all prioritized annual work plan investments for education are derived from the LG Development Plan and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. The desk appraisal reports were conducted on the 17/03/2021.</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>Scrutiny for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and had their designs customized for investment education projects was done and this is on page 1&2 of each appraisal report.</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 Buwala Seed secondary school was incorporated in the LG procurement plan. The seed school is planned for UgX. 851,223,000/= for the first year release.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Buwenge seed secondary school was approved and cleared by solicitor general on 03/05/2019 under reference MBLO65/125/02.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the projects constructed in the FY2020/2021 were overseen by an implementation team as demonstrated by the letter dated 14th may 2019 under reference CR/209/1.</p> <p>The Letter entitled; The Role of stakeholders in the Construction of Buwenge seed secondary school at Buwenge Town Council, spelt out clear roles and key responsibilities of each stakeholder that was constituted of a team of the project manager, contract manager, project site committee, Day to Day supervision committee, Grievance handling committee, clerk of works among others</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was sufficient evidence that the standard technical designs provided by MOES were followed, this was confirmed during the physical inspection visit on Tuesday, 2nd November 2021 to Buwenge seed secondary school, the assessor noted that the work was well done and supervised and good standards were noted on the doors, windows, floor, concrete slabs at the laboratories, chalk boards among others.</p> <p>Also, a review of a technical work progress report dated 12 July 2021, written and signed by the project manager (the District Engineer-Jinja District), Mr. Buyinza Joseph noted that: all structures including substructure, building frame, walls, rod structure, windows, and external doors, wall finishes excluding painting and floor finishes were all of good quality; Samples of desks, chairs and tables were observed to conform to the required standard.</p> <p>Further, in a progress report dated 26th august 2021; the clerk of works who doubles as the site engineer, Mr. Ogwang Moses wrote to the District Engineer and DEO indicating that they had achieved 90% of the same works</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that not many monthly site meetings were conducted for Buwenge seed secondary school in the FY2020-21; the last recorded meeting was conducted on 26th August 2021.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that all engineers, environment officers, CDOs participated at the critical stages of construction as indicated by the report dated 18th June 2021. In that same report, the Senior Environment officer, Mr. Moses Maganda and the Community Development Officer jointly prepared an environmental and screening report that indicated that the project was in a low lying area with green vegetation and Loamy soils.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	Contracts reviewed to confirm and determine whether payment requests were initiated and executed as per contract implementation results are: 1. JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00015- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Wansimba P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/9/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145 and request was done 9/11/20 and payment done on the 16/11/2020; 2. JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00019- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Nkondo P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/12/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145 and request was done 9/11/20 and payment done on the 10/11/2020; and 3. JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00020- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Nyenga P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/12/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145 and request was done 9/11/20 and payment done on the 24/04/2021, among others.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence of a delayed submission of the Education departmental procurement plan for FY2021-2022 from the DEO to PDU as it was only submitted on 29/June/2021 instead of 30th April 2021.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There was evidence that the procurement files for Buwenge seed secondary school are complete with all the reports and payment certificates. The signed contract was awarded to VISVAR INVESTMENTS LTD, MOES/WRKS/2018-19/00119-LOT 27, at Ugx. 1,917,427,720/= with award reference OOO37/DCC/2018-19; there after the Contractor then tendered in an acceptance letter for the same on 24/April/2019, referenced as VIL/JINJA/2019/001.	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in education projects.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence showed that the Education guidelines were available in all the sample schools, i.e. Wairaka PS (Urban), Muguluka PS (semi-urban) and Buwenge SDA PS (rural), these included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards Indicators for Education Institutions, March 2010; 2) MOES Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines (FY 2020/21); 3) Education Act 2008; 4) School Manual on Teacher Effectiveness and Learner Achievement; and 5) Talking Compounds with Environment-related messages, e.g. 'Keep the School Clean.' 	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The ESMPs availed were not costed.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>No proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects was provided.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was 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. For example, the Progress Report for Financial year 2020/2021 dated July 2021 provides evidence of supervision and monitoring activities.	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	No E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates. Sampled projects: Construction of 5 stance latrine in Bituli primary school, Nyenga primary school and Nalinaibi primary school.	0

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 an average increase in deliveries of 4% in the sampled facilities (Buwenge HC IV, St Benedicts HCIII and Buvgenbe HC IV) in the FY2020/21 over the FY2019/20 performance.</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>From the evidence presented and reviewed by the assessor, Health Development Grant for the previous FY was used on eligible activities as per the Health grant and budget guideline, page 7. A case in point is the budget for UGX 500m to Buwenge general hospital derived from the health transitional development grant that was received. This was only used for the hospital.</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>Payment vouchers reviewed are for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Renovation of DHO's office at UGX 19,726,337; 2. Buwenge general hospital at UGX 160,138,246; and 3. Nalinaibi HCII in Busende sub-country at UGX 14,858,306. <p>All certification was done before LG made payments to supplier but CDO was not signing</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled Health Infrastructure projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the MOH engineers estimates as detailed herein below;-

Project: Completion of existing building at Buwenge general hospital, JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00356

Contractor: SEMWO Construction company limited

Contract amount = Ugx. 539,640,106/=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 500,000,000/=

Variation = 7.9% (-ve)

Project: Completion of maternity ward at Buwenge HC IV; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00355

Contractor: GI-TI CONSULT LIMITED

Contract amount = Ugx.109,049,700=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx.110,000,000=

Variation = 0.9% (+ve)

Project: Partial completion of staff house at Lumuli HC II, JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00401

Contractor: MJ Suppliers and contractors limited

Contract amount = Ugx. 8,738,523/=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 8,750,641/=

Variation = 0.1% (+ve)

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1
- less than 80 %: Score 0

The district has not benefited from this projects as yet

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	As per the HR staff List, approved staff structure and appointment letters of staff in HCIII&IV reviewed, 3/4 of the staff in HCIII&IV were recruited as per staffing structure. " FY 2020/2021, Employee List" dated 14th October, 2021. Ref No: CR/115/.	1
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	N/A; the district has not benefited from this projects as yet.	2
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure				
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure				

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Lists for Buwenge and Bugembe HCIVs were verified by various methods at the facility including staff attendances in meetings and departmental staff lists and staff duty rosters on departmental notice boards. The DHO's office did not provide St Benedict's HCIII 's list of health workers as the office does not deploy staff at the PNFP. However, the HCWs lists form the file on the noice board at the facility were reviewed during the visit.	2
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	There was no construction carried out on the designated Health facilities (HCIII or IV)	0
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure				
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The budgets and work plans for the FY 2020/21 were received before 31st March 2021 by the DHO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buwenge HC IV on the 18th November 2020 2. Bugembe HC IV on the 2nd November 2020 3. St Benedict's HC III on 15th October 2020 	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DHO office failed to provide the Annual Facility Budget Performance reports for Buwenge HC IV, Bugembe HC IV and St Benedicts HCIII.</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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Some issue incorporated in the PIPs for Buwenge HC IV. Most issues identified during the DHT visits were managed within the FY 2020/21 and were not carried over into the plans for 2021/22 plans.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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>All the HMIS 105 reports for the 3 sampled facilities Buwenge HC IV, Bugembe HC IV and St Benedict's HC III for the FY2020/21 were submitted before the 7th day of the month following the end of performance period as required. However, the all the quarterly HMIS 106 reports were submitted later than the reporting time of the 7th day of the month following the end of the quarter.</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>Not all RBF invoices for Buwenge HC IV, Bugembe HC IV and St Benedict's HC III were submitted in time. Among the reasons was that funds were received by the facilities late which caused late implementation and late submission of invoices for the next quarter.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Submission of RBF invoices to MOH were not fully ascertained. Some invoices were undated while submissions were through different channels. Some were hand delivered to the Regional office, Some were scanned and sent to MOH by email directly while others were reportedly delivered to MoH.</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>From the evidence presented and reviewed by the assessor, quarterly reports were presented as follow;</p> <p>1st Quarter on 12/11/2020;</p> <p>2nd Quarter on 29/01/2021;</p> <p>3rd Quarter on 10/06/2021; and</p> <p>4th Quarter on 24/08/2021.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>However, not all submissions are in line with the one-month maximum submission after each quarter.</p>	
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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>PIP were developed for all the facilities including the lowest performing facilities.</p> <p>Walukuba HC IV was the lowest performing facility with a quality score of 68.16% with PIP signed on 17th November 2020</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>Walukuba HC IV Q2 2020/21 narrative report indicated that 6 of the 10 indicators were achieved with a mitigation measure of screening for pregnancy at all service points to increase antenatal care in first trimester to 165</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>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The 3 sampled facilities; Buwenge HCIV, Bugembe HCIV and St Benedict's HCIII budgeted for their health staff in the FY 2020/21 following the format and guidelines and deployed staff accordingly.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Staffing levels.</p> <p>Bugembe HC IV = Total 52 (prescribed 48) However, some prescribed positions not filled.</p> <p>Buwenge HC IV = Total 62 (prescribed 48) However, some prescribed positions not filled.</p> <p>St Benedecits HC III = Total (Prescribed 19) All positions filled.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>Using various methods including (staff duty rosters, meeting attendance lists and CME attendances) it was established that HCWs are deployed where they are posted.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Staff lists were displayed on notice boards and staff duty rosters at the 3 sampled health facilities and a full staff list was displayed on the public notice board at St benedict's HC III</p>	2

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>After reviewing the sampled personal files of 10 health and appraisal reports, there was evidence to show that DHO Conducted annual Performance appraisal of all the health facility In-charges during the FY2020/2021.</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>After reviewing staff personal files and appraisal reports obtained from the HR department, there was evidence provided to show that all Health Facilities workers were appraised against there agreed performance plans.</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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>In the rewards and sanction minutes of meetings and department appraisal reports reviewed, there were no evidence to show that Corrective measures based on the appraisal reports were taken by the DHO</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>No evidence of a training data base or CME register was provided.</p> <p>However, training was carried out on Covid-19, SRH and on water and sanitation.</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>No evidence of a training data base was provided for assessment.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 email evidence from Brenda Apio of MOH acknowledging receipt of the Letter from the LG confirming health facilities receiving PHC grants on the 9th of June 2021.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines.</p>	0
<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>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>From receipt of expenditure limit, 1st quarter expenditure limit approved on the 09/07/2020 and warranting done on 04/08/2020; 2nd quarter expenditure limit approved on the 06/10/2020 and warranting done on 15/10/2020; and 3rd quarter expenditure limit approved on the 08/01/2021 and warranting done on 27/01/2021.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The LG is not compliant.</p>		

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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>There was no evidence that 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.</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>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 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.</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>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>DHMT Minutes reviewed indicated that the information gathered informed subsequent plans and actions.</p> <p>Example minutes of EDHMT of 7th October planned for facility trainings on COVID-19 that were carried out</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Attendance lists and topics discussed confirm multi sectoral involvement.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Minutes indicate supervision while Supervision report books confirm supervision visits were carried out, activities and actions taken.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Supervision reports at the facilities confirm support to HC IV to support the lower level 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 no formalised support supervision report provided by the DHO. However, reports and recommendations were left in the supervision Log Books. this was verified at all the 3 sampled facilities. Evidence of facilities carrying out recommendations verified.</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>Supervision reports verified in Supervision logs at all the sampled sites..</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>Evidence from the annual budget performance report indicate that overall district health office budget was UGX 2,233,625,000 and allocation to promotion and prevention was UGX 325,526,000, which is 14%.</p> <p>Therefore 30% allocation is not justified</p>	0

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 16th November, 2020 first quarter Jinja District environmental health and health promotional performance report demonstrated that the DHT implemented health promotion activities.</p>	1
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Covid-19 activities' plans followed on the decisions of the DHT</p> <p>Meeting minutes available.</p>	1
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The equipment register conform to the standards for sampled Buwenge HC IV, DBugenbe HC IV and St Benedcits HC III.</p>	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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the evidence presented to the assessor and minutes of DTPC reviewed prioritized investments in Health Sector for the Previous year were derived from LG Development Plan and eligible for Expenditure under sector Guidelines.</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting reviewed are as follows;</p> <p>1. DTPC meeting held on 12/08/2020; and</p> <p>2. DTPC meeting held on 10/09/2020.</p>	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>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>No evidence was availed to show that the LG conducted field appraisals.</p>	0
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>The evidence availed showed that the LG did not carry out any construction of health facilities. However, from the the environmental and social screening forms availed, there was evidence that the health facility investments under renovation were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Health Department procurement plan for FY2021-2022 was submitted on 30th July 2021 as opposed to the proposed 30th April 2021 ; but the project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</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>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Health Department procurement plan for FY2021-2022 was submitted on 30th July 2021 as opposed to the proposed 30th April 2021 ; but the project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</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>N/A; The project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</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>N/A; the district has not benefited from this projects as yet</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>N/A; The project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</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>N/A; the district has not benefited from this projects as yet.</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>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>N/A; the district has not benefited from this projects as yet.</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>N/A; The project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 3 sampled projects are;</p> <p>1 Borehole drilling and supervision at UGX 55,700,000. Request done 20/5/21 and payment done on 10/6/21</p> <p>2. Drilling, Casting and Installation of 16 boreholes in Jinja District. Request done on 7/5/21 and payment done on 10/6/21</p> <p>3. Renovation of the district water office in Jinja at UGX 29,331,972. Request done 19/3/21 and payment done on 21/5/21</p> <p>Not compliant</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>N/A; The project of Health Centre II upgrade to Health Centre III is not being implemented in the district</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in health projects</p>	0
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the LG disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities and follow up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs as evidenced by Sites acknowledgement receipts dated 19th August 2020 and Follow up of implementation monitoring quarterly visits reports provided. Examples of guidelines disseminated included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines on waste management (extract from 2013 guidelines); • Extract of key MoH medical waste management guidelines and composition of IPC committees dated 19th August 2020; and • Distribution of healthcare waste guidelines dated 19th August 2020, among others. 	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	<p>From the Sampled health facilities budgets there was a dedicated/operational budget for health care waste management, which included budgets for Bin liners (240l) of different colours.</p> <p>The evidence availed showed that there was a Service contractor (Green Label) for medical waste handling having an MoU with district, dated 30/01/2020.</p> <p>The LG has a functional waste management system at sites not served by service provider. This is evidenced by the facilities such as waste pits, placenta pits for medical waste management</p>	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste on waste management (to health workers) as evidenced by the report dated 15th,October,2020	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p>	<p>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>The evidence showed that the ESMPs were not costed and thus not incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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 provided to show that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability without any encumbrances.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show 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.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

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>The evidence from the Ministry of Water & Environment MIS shows that the water sources functionality in Jinja DLG for 2020/21 is at 87%..</p>	1
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>The evidence from the Ministry of Water & Environment MIS shows that the functionality of WSCs in Jinja DLG for 2020/21 is at 88%.</p>	1
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>Not applicable in this assessment as the LLG have not been assessed before.</p>	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>The evidence from the 4th quarter report 2020/21 shows that the sub county in Jinja DLG with coverage below the district average of 77% was Mafubira (25%). The total investment budget 2020/21 in this sub county was Ugx 96million against a total budget of Ugx 392 million thus 24%. Which is below the threshold. This sub county has since been moved to Jinja City Council.</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled water supply and public sanitation infrastructural projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the LG engineers estimates as follows;</p> <p>Project: Construction of a public water borne toilet at Buwenda growth Centre; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00178</p> <p>Contractor: Vimar technical investments limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 59,644,280/=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 60,000,000/=</p> <p>Variation = 0.6% (+ve)</p> <p>Project: Borehole drilling, casting and installation of 16 boreholes in Jinja district; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00176</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 304,240,500=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 328,000,000=</p> <p>Variation = 7.2% (+ve)</p> <p>Project: Rehabilitation of 08 boreholes in Jinja district; JINJ511/WRKS/20-21/00179</p> <p>Contractor: Jinja hand pump mechanic team</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 48,000,000/=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 48,000,000/=</p> <p>Variation = 0%</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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>The evidence from the AWP 2020/21 shows that Jinja DLG planned to drill 16 boreholes, rehabilitate 23 boreholes, and construct one water borne toilet. The evidence from the 4th quarter performance report shows that 100% of the WSS infrastructure projects that were planned were completed in the assessment year.</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>The evidence from the Ministry MIS shows that rural water sources functionality in Jinja DLG for the year 2019/20 was at 87% which is the same as for the assessment year and so there was no increase.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>The evidence from the Ministry MIS shows that the functional WSCs in Jinja DLG for the year 2019/20 was at 88% which is the same as the assessment year and so there was no increase.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>Evidence from the APR shows a list of 16 boreholes drilled, 23 boreholes rehabilitated and 1 water borne sanitation facility constructed at Buwanda. The evidence obtained from the field visit made by the assessor in three different sub counties i.e. Sulube Julius no. DWD 78379 in Butagaya sub county, Mulinda Samuel no. DWD 78441 in Budondo sub county and Kironde no. DWD78373 in Buwenge sub county shows that they were completed and were functional.</p>	3
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The evidence from the four quarterly reports dated 5/10/2020, 8/01/2021, 16/04/2021 and 7/07/2021 respectively shows that the DWO collects and compiles information on sub county water and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs involvement.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence in the four quarterly reports that the DWO's office uses the Ministry of Water & Environment forms to manually capture the data which is sent to the ministry quarterly where it is entered into the MIS. The compiled information is further used for planning.</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable under the year of review.</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>Based on the evidence presented; Local Government quarterly performance reportfy2020/221, vote:511 Jinja District: B1: overview of workplan Revenue and expenditures by source - District unconditional grant (wage): DWO has budgeted Ugx; 266,051,000/= per year for staff in the department.</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>Based on the evidence presented; Local Government quarterly performance reportfy2020/221, vote:511 Jinja District: B1: overview of workplan Revenue and expenditures by source - District unconditional grant (wage); District Natural Resource Officer budgeted for Ugx:251,536,000/= per year for all staff in the department.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence presented showing that District Water Office staff were appraised as per the last FY agreed performance plans.</p> <p>Example of staff who were appraised included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kisige Fred, District water officer was appraised on 22nd August 2021; - Kagongo David, Assistant Water Officer/SANITATION was appraised on 18th August 2021; - Babirye Jane, Assistant water officer/ Mobilization was appraised on 8th August 2021; - Chombo Alex Fredric, Assistant engineer officer was appraised on 18th August 2021; - Namisango Eseza, Office Attendant was appraised on 12th August 2021; - Mugoya Henry, Driver was appraised on 12th August 2021. 	3
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented on capacity needs assessment report and no evidence of training activities carried out in the assessment year for the sector staff. The training plan was not presented and neither was the district training database made available for checking.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>There was evidence from the AWP and budget 2021/22 that the sub county of Mafubira with a coverage of 25% was the one below the district average of 77% but has been absorbed into Jinja City Council with zero allocation during the current FY.</p>	0
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence about the communication of the allocations of the water infrastructure projects to the LLGs displayed on the DWO notice board in form of a letter to the sub county chiefs dated 28th June, 2021 as well as the sub counties acknowledgement of receipt of the information by endorsements on the copies in the office.</p>	3
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>The Jinja DLG had 1,233 water sources in the assessment FY and the evidence from the software reports embedded in the four quarterly reports dated 5/10/2020, 3/01/2021, 16/04/2021 and 7/07/2021 respectively shows that 294 sources were monitored every quarter which is 24% and this is below the 80% threshold.</p>	0
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence presented in form of minutes of the quarterly DWSCC meetings with issues from monitoring being followed up as follows: on 19/6/2020 (minute no. DWSCC/06), on 4/09/2020 (minute no. DWSCC/08), on 10/2/2021 (minute no. DWSCC/08) and on 10/6/2021 (minute no. DWSCC/08).</p>	2
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				

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 evidence which shows that DWO communicated to the LLGs of their respective allocations of the infrastructure projects for the FY 2021/22 by letters to all the sub county chiefs dated 28/6/2021 which was available on the DLG notice board. Furthermore, there was evidence of copies of the letters with acknowledgements by the sub county chiefs.</p>	2
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>There was evidence from the AWP 2020/21 of Jinja DLG which shows that the allocation to software activities was Ugx 34 million against a total NWR of Ugx. 80 million giving 43% which is above the recommended minimum of 40% in the sector guidelines.</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 in the 4th quarterly report dated 7/07/2021 of the training of the 16 WSCs of the new sources. The field visit made by the assessor to WSCs of three sources in different sub counties i.e. Sulube Julius no. DWD 78379 in Butagaya sub county, Mulinda Samuel no. DWD 78441 in Budondo sub county and Kironde no. DWD78373 in Buwenge sub county, showed that although the recall of training content was present, the challenge of behavioural change is still present as evidenced from poor hygiene at the sources as well as dirty containers used by the communities.</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: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that shows that the district maintains a spread sheet asset register which includes only deep boreholes, no sanitation facilities and other technology water supplies centrally in the CAO's office. Some of the entries in the asset register were: deep borehole no. DWD 78377 CALLED Dhabangi Sabastian of Lumuli C village in Butagaya sub county, borehole no. DWD78380 called Buyinza Isa of Butiki Kyekidde village in Mafubira sub county and borehole no. DWD 78373 called Kibikyo Peter of Magamaga East village in Buwenge sub county.</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>No evidence presented to the assessor to form a conclusion on this indicator.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The evidence from the AWP for 2021/22 for Jinja DLG shows that 12 boreholes are planned to be drilled. The evidence from the file of applications shows that all the beneficiary communities to benefit from the projects have submitted their applications to the DWO. Some of these applications were: Buwagi village in Budondo sub county undated, Mutai Kanyale village in Buwenge sub county dated 28/6/2021 and Kanama village in Busede sub county dated 5/7/2021.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>From the evidence presented and reviewed by the assessor, technical feasibility and environmental social acceptability were done on the following sampled projects</p> <p>By way of the reports as follows;</p> <p>1 Technical feasibility of Watsan facility 2021/2022;</p> <p>2. Field report for Balbert water solution – consultancy services for ground water hydrogeological survey from 16 boreholes;</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The evidence shows that all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY (Drilling of bore holes) were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction however ESMPs were not costed and thus not incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 and sanitation infrastructural projects were incorporated in the consolidated work plan because the water development department procurement plan was submitted to PDU by Mr. Kisige Fred, District Water Officer on 20/may/2021 with a submission letter reference of WAT/205/1.</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 evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure projects for the FY2020-2021 were approved by contracts committee before commencement of construction on 22nd September 2020 under Minute; min 00016/DCC/2021-2022</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 that Jinja LG established an implementation team for the infrastructural projects as specified in the sector guidelines The team is headed by the project manager, The District Water Officer appointed on 6th July 2021 under reference CR/105/3</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>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>There was evidence presented of the standard WSS designs from the DWO. The evidence obtained from the three water sources visited i.e. Budodo sub county (No. DWD 78441 dated 16/4/2021), Butagaya sub county (No. 78379 dated 24/2/2021) and Buwenge sub county (No. 78373 dated 18/2/2021) shows that the designs were used for the water sources as observed from the platform, pedestal and drainage.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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 District Engineer, DWO, Environment officer and CDO participated in the supervising WSS projects with reference to joint monitoring report dated 12th September 2021</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that DWO has verified the works and initiated payments of the below sampled contracts;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Borehole drilling and supervision at UGX 55,700,000. Request done 20/05/2021, DWO verified and certified work on the 25/06/2021 and payment done on 10/06/2021; 2. Drilling, Casting and Installation of 16 boreholes in Jinja District. Request done on 07/05/2021, DWO verified and certified work on the 08/06/2021 and payment done on 10/06/2021; and 3. Renovation of the district water office in Jinja at UGX 29,331,972. Request done 19/03/2021, DWO verified and certified work on the 25/03/2021 and payment done on 21/05/2021. 	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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 that each contract for water infrastructure investments had all relevant records including the payment reports and certificates as per the file no. CR/502/2</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence availed that showed that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:	0
14	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 no evidence availed to show that the DWO and the Environment Officer had disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence to show that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented.	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 evidence from the agreements file which showed that the 16 constructed water sources had agreements of the land owners accepting the use of the land for construction of the facilities. These included kironde of Magamaga West village in Buwenge sub county dated 14/12/2020 with borehole no.DWD 78373 and Sulube Julius of Nawaguma B village in Butagaya sub county dated 28/01/2020 with borehole no. 78379.	3
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	No evidence was availed to show that the E&S certification forms are completed and signed by the CDO.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	There was evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports as evidenced by progress activity report for financial year 2020/2021 dated July 2021.	2

Micro-scale
irrigation
performance
measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4 Maximum 20 points for this performance area	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	There was evidence that the LG had up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs. Reports of FY 2019/20 and 2020/21, indicating irrigated land were availed. Irrigated lands for both financial years were 48.5 acres and 74.5 acres respectively.	2
1	Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4 Maximum 20 points for this performance area	b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one: • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0	Comparison of the data on irrigated land for the past two FYs showed an increase of 53.6%, this is from 48.5 acres in FY 2019/20 to 74.5 acres in FY 2020/21.	2
3	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	The evidence availed indicated that the budget performance reports (dated 19/March/2021) prepared by Mr. Mukaya Muhamudu (senior agricultural engineer) and verified by Mr. Kasadha Tom (DPO) showed that development component was used on procurement of irrigation equipment and establishment of demonstrations sites.	2
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Evidence from the farmer acceptance forms presented and reviewed by the assessor to confirm equipment is working well before LG payments to equipment suppliers indicate that farmers sign the forms before before payments. A case in point is the movable sprinkle system, Solar Irrigation system, Drip irrigation system and micro sprinkler system all were evidence by the beneficiaries, Mr. Kayuba Fred and Kitamirike Jonathan on 3/5/21	1

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Farm visit report showing agricultural engineer's price list was not availed although the supplier contracts were provided. Hence could not compute variations in prices.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	There was evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were completed as indicated by contract between supplier and Jinja district signed on 02/02/2021 and the supplier was paid on 11/05/2021, having completed works.	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	There was evidence in the staff List per LLG provided to show that all LLG extension workers have been recruited as per staffing structure, however, in the 2020/2021 FY no recruitment was made due to funds limitation.	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF. No designs from MAAIF were availed. The only designs available were hand drawn by senior agricultural engineer and there was no evidence that MAAIF approved those designs.	0
4	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	Only one demonstration site (Host farmer: Kiyuba Fred at Buwenge sub county) out of the two installed sites was functional. The second site (Host farmer: Kitamirike Johnson at Mafubila sub county) had a nonfunctional pumping unit.	0

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Based on the approved Traditional staff List, there was evidence that all information on the position of extension workers were accurate in the 3 selected LLG, ie. Kakira TC, Buwenge SC and Buwenge TC.	2
Maximum score 4				
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The evidence seen showed that only one site (Host farmer: Kiyuba Fred at Buwenge sub county) was functional except for solar system which could not work because of the high turbidity of water. However, the other demonstration site (Host farmer: Kitamirike Johnson at Mafubila sub county) was nonfunctional due to malfunctioning pumping unit.	0
Maximum score 4				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that information about functionality of demonstration farms is collected on monthly basis as evidenced by monthly supervision reports (of April, July, August, September, October, 2021). In addition, reports on expression of interest by farmers from LLGs were availed.	2
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG had entered up to-date LLG information into MIS. Most recent report availed was written on 30/10/2021. With 694 expressions of interest (EOI). The target was 200 EOIs. Those that were successfully submitted and pinned on production noticeboard were 338. Therefore, they achieved over the target. This was verified/stamped by district production officer dated 30/10/2021.	1
Maximum score 6				

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. The budget performance report availed showed that as of 19th/March/2021 (FY 2020/21) information from LLGs in the MIS was captured.	1
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) for the lowest performing LLG was developed. The staff had no idea of how to prepare the PIPs.	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	No reports on implementation of PIPs were availed.	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	There was no evidence that extension workers were budgeted for. This was because the budget performance report (FY 2021/22) for microscale irrigation was not availed at the time of assessment. In addition, the staff list of extension workers of Jinja LG was not availed at the time of assessment.	0
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	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	No evidence was availed to show that extension workers were deployed as per guidelines. In addition the staff list was not availed. According to the DPO, the staff recruitment is low due to inadequate wage bill. The recruited extension workers were 18 at LLGs as opposed to the required 24.	0
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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	As per staff file reviewed and the current staff list, all Extension workers in the selected 3 LLGs are deployed and working at their duty stations.	2
<p>For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Kakira TC – 3 SAS were deployed i.e. Biwoye Victo - Fisheries Offiver, Merino Isaac - Assistant Agricultural Officer and Kebanakolanga Abraham - Assistant Veterinary Officer. - In Buwenge SC – 2 SAS were deployed i.e Kagwa Saphan - Agricultural Officer and and Ataliba Sarah-Assistant Veterinary Officer. - In Buwenge TC – 2 SAS were deployed i.e Juma Mulekezi, Assistant Veterinary Office and Mudasi DerickAssistant Agricultural Officer. 				
Maximum score 6				
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence provided on the notice boards to show list of extension workers deployed	0
Maximum score 6				

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>After review of staff personal files and appraisal report, there was evidence showing that performance appraisals for all the extension workers were conducted at the sub counties and their appraisal reports submitted to the PHRO office.</p> <p>Example of appraised staff included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kategere Robert, Agricultural Officer, Butagaya sub county was appraised on 2nd August 2021 - Wakibi Geoffrey, Assistant Agricultural Officer Butagaya sub county was appraised on 1st August 2021 - Mudasi Derrick, Assistant Agricultural Officer, Buwenge Town Council was appraised on 16th August 2021 - Kagwa Shafan, Agricultural Officer, Buwenge Sub county was appraised on 16th August 2021 - Kyebogola Stuart, Agricultural Office, Buyengo Town Council was appraised on 8th August 2021 - Sunday Jerome , Agricultural Officer, Busede Sub county was appraised on 11th August 2021 - Merino Isaac, Assistant Agricultural Officer, Kakira Town council was appraised on 10th August 2021 	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was presented to show any corrective action taken by District Production Coordinator after submission of appraisal reports during the FY2020/2021.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that training activities were conducted. Undated training plan for FY 2020/21 was provided together with certificates from MIS report.</p>	1

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	Evidence availed was a training database dated 30th June 2021 and a report on participants and modules attended.	1
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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	Evidence presented to the assessor, from the District Production Officer, and reviewed, indicated that capital development was allocated UGX 637,816,130, and complementary UGX 74,515,344. Micro-scale irrigation total budget from annual budget was UGX 850,421,507; Therefore, capital development is 75% and complementary is 25% as per the guideline.	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	From the evidence presented from the sector performance contract, page 3, Awareness was allocated UGX 31,890,807, 10% procurement at UGX 21,260,538, and 75% to enhance farmer capacity at UGX 42,521,075.	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	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	From the evidence presented and reviewed, the performance contract and annual budget for the previous FY did not have a component of co-funding.	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) 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>Co-funding not included in the 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>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 LG disseminated information on use of farmer co-funding. The minutes of 10th September 2020, drafted by Jalia Nabaggala (senior planner) and signed by Mr. Kanyesigye William (CAO) were availed. The minutes in minute number Min. 06/09/2020 indicated that DPO presented information on requirements for a farmer to benefit from microscale irrigation program. In addition, information showing co-funding details was pinned on noticeboard dated 11th November 2021. However, there was no evidence that brochure 3 showing co funding was shared with farmers.</p>	2
<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>Monthly monitoring reports by DPO for the months of April, July, August, September, October 2021 (FY 2020/21) were availed. DPO monitored all the two demonstration sites for the above mentioned period.</p>	2
<p>Maximum score 8</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>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</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>Although the two farmers belonging to the demonstration sites were knowledgeable about servicing and maintenance of irrigation equipment, there was no evidence availed to show that these farmers had been trained.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 8</p>				

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	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	No minutes for training were provided. In addition, the extension workers were not available for interview. The one attached to LLG where the demonstration site was installed was reported to be sick.	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Maximum score 8

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that the LG has run farmer field schools as per guidelines.	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Maximum score 8

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines. Reports on use of local radios at village level were provided. Busoga 1 radio was also used for mobilization. Due to COVID 19, the farmer to farmer events were not conducted thus no attendance lists were provided. However, the MIS report logged in as mk.muhamoud@gmail.com of MAAIF for FY 2020/2021) shows that 2472 farmers were mobilized.	2
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Maximum score 4

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Training reports and signed attendance lists (dated 9th/sept/2021; 13th/sept/2021; 15th/October/2021) to show proof of trainings of staff and political leaders were provided	2
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Maximum score 4

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The score was zero for all LGs during the LGMSD exercise 2021 (as guided in the updated data collection checklist dated 26th/October/2021).	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Maximum score 8

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>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>Applications from LLGs were part of the database dated 30th/October/ 2021. Copies of farmers who applied from LLGs were pinned on the noticeboard.</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>Evidence availed included farm visit reports and agreements to proceed for quotations (dated 24th/Feb/2021; 13th/May/2021; 03rd/March/2021).</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: 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>Based on the Evidence provided the LG publicized the list of eligible farmers on the LLG Notice boards, However, the date of publicity was not indicated as well as the name of signing officer. No internal memo to this effect was also shown as evidence.</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 micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. This was confirmed because the production and marketing departmental procurement plan was submitted on 27th July 2021</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 no evidence availed to show that Jinja LG had requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers prequalified by MAAIF for the FY2021/2022</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Jinja LG has concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria for the FY2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that micro-scale irrigations were approved by the contracts committee for the FY2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Jinja LG has signed any contract with any lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the FY2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	No design output from IrriTrack was provided instead hand drawn designs from the senior agricultural engineer were provided. Thus the installed equipment could not be verified against the design outputs from IrriTrack. Designs approved by DAIMWAP were not provided either.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	The evidence availed was a site book showing that on 30th /05/2021 the senior agricultural engineer over saw equipment testing on one demonstration site. However, no supervision report was availed. in addition, the officer was to have conducted supervision on two sites.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Site book dated 28th/May/2021 showed the senior agricultural engineer overseeing testing of irrigation equipment for Kiyuba's demonstration site. However, there was no evidence that the LG oversaw the irrigation equipment supplier in the second demonstration site.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	The visitors/site book had no documentation showing the Jinja LG oversaw hand over of sites to host farmers.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Payments for the above were made on 13/4/21 to Denko Basooka International (U) Ltd within agreed time frame.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Jinja LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA law	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	The nature and avenues to address grievances are captured in the register however, there was no display on production noticeboard.	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that LG had disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines. MoUs between LG and farmers were availed. The MoUs highlighted issues of proper storage of equipment, use, transportation and disposal of agrochemicals..	2
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that shows that costed ESMPs were developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment however costed ESMPs were not incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to show that 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 was done.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to show 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	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to show that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	0

Micro-scale irrigation
minimum conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Mr. Mukaya Muhamudu was substantively recruited a Senior Agricultural Engineer on 21st /January/2020.</p>	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for micro-irrigation projects as evidenced by availed Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening forms for two demonstration units of Igombe and Nakabango on 14th October 2020.</p>	30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letter obtained form the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Kisige Fred was substantively recruited for the position of Civil Engineer (Water) on 19th /January/2018 under Ref. No. CR/156/1.</p>	15
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence availed by the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division in staff letter of assignment to show that Ms. Babirye Jane, substantively recruited as the CDO was assigned to act in the position of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization by the CAO on 16th /December/17 under Ref. No. CR/156/1. However, no evidence was provided to show staff confirmation in the position.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of a Borehole Maintenance Technician doesn't exit in the LG current structure. This evidence was availed in the staff approved structure for FY2020/2021 provided by the HR department.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of a Natural Resource Officer doesn't exit in the LG current structure, the District Natural Resource Officer was recruited to carry out all Natural Resources functions in the department. This evidence was availed in the staff approved structure for FY2020/2021 and updated staff list as of September 2021 provided by the HR department.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letter obtained form the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Gidudu Patrick was recruited and given an appointment letter for the position of Environment Officer on 22nd/March/2019 under Ref. No. CR/156/1.</p>	10

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	From the reviewed appointment letter obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Zakia Namususwa was recruited Forestry Officer and awarded appointment letter on 22nd/March/2019 under Ref. No. 156/1.	10
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>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</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all borehole drilling projects. This was evidenced by individual Environment and Social screening forms.</p>	10
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

2	<p>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</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>From the projects availed, there was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects were small and their impact to the environment was minimal.</p>	10
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

2	<p>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</p>	<p>c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG availed drilling permits. However, there was no need for abstraction permits since no piped water system had been implemented in the previous FY.</p>	10
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

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>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Dr. Nantamu Dyogo Peter on 2nd May 2013 as the District Health Officer.</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>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Ms. Mirembe Frances Jean on transfer and promotion on 27th February 2014 for this position.</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>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Bugagaire Nathan for this position on promotion on 22/2/2017.</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>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Were Edward on 2/5/2018 for this position.</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>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Robinah Mubeeke Mwangale on 15/9/2009 for this position.</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>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Baluka Sheila and awarded him letter of appointment on promotion for this position on 23/4/2015.</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>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>From the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that the district has substantively recruited Mr. Isabirye Mulani and given him an appointment letter on promotion for this position on 9/4/2015.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening as evidenced by the availed Environment and Social screening forms for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of DHO's office at UGX 19,726,337; 2. Buwenge general hospital at UGX 160,138,246; and 3. Nalinaibi HCII in Busende sub-country at UGX 14,858,306. 	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>From the list of projects availed, there was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects were small and their impact to the environment was minimal.</p>	15

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	Based on the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Paul Baliraine Mugaju was recruited on 18th December 2020 for this position.	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.	Based on the reviewed appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Mr. Kasanbira Erias was recruited as the District Inspector of Schools for all Districts on 23rd April 2020.	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 that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening. The evidence availed was the Environment and Social screening forms for the following projects;	15
	The Maximum score is 30		<p>1 JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00015- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Wansimba P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/9/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145;</p> <p>2. JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00019- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Nkondo P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/12/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145; and</p> <p>3. JINJ511/WRKS/2020-2021/00020- Construction of 5 stance bricklined emptable latrines at Nyenga P/S. start date: 15/9/20 and end on 30/12/2020, contract price UGX 27,305,145.</p>	

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

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

There was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects fall under the category (C) of small projects and impacts to the environment were minimal.

The Maximum score is 30

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	In the staff appointment letter dated 8th /September /2021 under Ref. No. CR/156/1, there was evidence availed to show that Mr. Paul Mubiiwa was recruited Chief Finance Officer.	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	Evidence provided in form of an appointment letter Showed that Mr. Mubiru Nathan was recruited District Planner on 6th /December /2017 under Ref. No. CR/156/1.	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	Eng. Buyinza Joseph was recruited District Engineer based on evidence of an appointed letter provided dated on 7th /September /2017 provided by the HR department.	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	Evidence of an appointment letter dated 18th /December /2020 under Ref. No. CR/156/1 was availed by the HR team to show that Mr. Baruzalire Fredrick was recruited District Natural Resources Officer.	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.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Kasadha Tom Waimaga was appointed on promotion as the District Production Officer in a letter of appointment dated 31st /May /2018 under Ref. No. CR/156/1.	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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Kyangwa Ivan Joab was recruited District Community Development Officer as per evidence shown in his appointment letter dated 11th /April /2015 under Ref. No. CR/156/1.	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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	From the evidence provided in an appointment letter dated 6th /January /2019, Mr. Mganzi James was recruited District Commercial Officer on accelerated promotion under letter Ref. No. CR/156/1.	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.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	In the appointment letter dated 25th /July /2008, evidence shows that Mr. Gulaale Fred was recruited into the position of a Senior Procurement Officer under Ref. No. CR/156/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	As per evidence provided in the appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, Ms. Nansasi Kaliga Christine was recruited Procurement Officer on 14th /June /201.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	From the appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence shows that Mwere Robinah was recruited as the Principal Human Resource Officer on 17th /June /2015.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	From the appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, there was evidence to show that Mr. Muganda Moses was recruited Senior Environment Officer on 19th /March /2018.	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>From the staff letter of appointment availed by the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, it was evidenced that Mr. Waiswa Fred was recruited and awarded appointment letter on promotion as the Senior Land Management Officer on 17th /December /2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was provided in an appointment letter dated 26th /September /2017 to show that Mr.Kwesiga Gershom was recruited the Senior Accountant.</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>There was evidence provided in a letter of appointment to show that Mr. Bulyerali James Waiswa was recruited Principal Internal Auditor in 2014 under letter Ref. No. CR/156/1.</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>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the appointment letters obtained from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, evidence showed that, Mr.Waibi Fredrick Noah was recruited Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) on 9th /May /2017.</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

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).

There was evidence provided in staff appointment letters reviewed from all the 6 LLGS to show recruitment of SAS as per LG customized structure.

examples of SAS recruited included;

- Waigulo Lawrence was recruited for Butagaya Subcounty on 18th/December/2008;

- Stephen Akwehaire was recruited for Buwenge Sub count on 18th /May /2015;

- Buyinza Sula was recruited for Busede Sub county on 19th /March /2018;

- Baliraire Christopher was recruited for Mafubira Sub county on 9th /May /2017;

- Kakare Alamanzani was recruited for Jinja Town Council on 18th/December/2020 and

- Buyunja Suula was recruited for Budondo Sub county on 30th/June/2020.

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.

From the staff personal files reviewed and appointment letters there was evidence to show that 9 CDOs in all 6 LLGs (Budondo, Buyengo, Busede, Buwenge, Mafubira and Butagaya) were recruited;-

List of CDOs recruited include;

- Lydia Nawangoma Deborah was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 31st /January /2019;

- Nabirye Coleta was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 10th /April/2015;

- Naigaga Rosty was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 13th /January/2019;

- Nampuma Rose was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 21st/October/2015;

- Babirye James was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 25th/May/2015;

- Mirember Gladys was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 8th /August /2016;

- Kyenda Racheal was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 9th /December /2019;

- Kakaire Emmanuel was recruited as a Community Development Office on 12th /February/2013 and

- Tamubula Olivia was recruited as a Community Development Officer on 16th /June/2010.

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.

There was evidence to show that Senior Accounts Assistants in all the 7 LLGs (Dudonda Sub County, Mafubira Sub Count, Bufagaya Sub County, Busede Sub County, Buwenge Sub County, Kakira Sub County and Buwengo Sub County) were recruited as per customized structure.

The list of Senior Accounts Assistants recruited included;

- Buzaare Kaggwa Wilson was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Dudonda Sub County on 8th/February/2018;

- Balikowa Fred was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Mafubira Sub County on 26th/December/2015;

- Tibenkana Moses was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Bufagaya Sub County on 28th/December/2005;

- Katumba Christine was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Busede Sub County on 28th/December/2005;

- Nanzirri Samson was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Buwenge Sub County on 18th/February/2021;

- Mbawali Harriet was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Kakira Sub County on 6th/June/2012; and

- Bwamiki Gerald John was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant for Buwengo Sub County on 28th/December/2015.

Environment and Social Requirements

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

Evidence from the previous FY final accounts availed, the Natural Resource Budget was UGX 375m, warranting for this area was UGX 373m, and actual spent was UGX 346m.

0

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	Community Based Services Department Budget was UGX 497m, warranting for this area was UGX 475m and Actual spend was UGX 462m. The unspent UGX 13m was for wages as recruitment has not taken place.	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	In this regard 100% was not released.	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening and this was evidenced by the Environmental, and Social screening forms availed for Renovation of Buwenge Town Council Abattoir dated 17th July 2020. Renovation of Musima HC II in Mafubira sub county on 14th October 2020 and Biogas system project in Wansimba primary school on the 14th October 2020 in Butagaya SC.	4
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0	The LG projects did not necessitate Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects fall under the category (C) of small projects and their impact to environment was minimal.	4
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0	The evidence availed showed that the ESMPs had not been Costed.	0
	Maximum score is 12			

Financial management and reporting

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p>	<p>The LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Internal Auditor General 's findings for the previous financial year 2019/2020 on 17th November 2020 before the deadline of 28th February 2021. Likewise, the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Auditor General 's findings for the previous financial year 2019/2020 on 8th February 2021 before the deadline of 28th February 2021</p>	10
	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>			
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>Evidence was unavailable to support this indicator</p>	0
	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>			
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p>	<p>Evidence from the inventory schedules obtained from the MoFPED indicate that the annual performance report was submitted although no actual dates of submission provided. However, from the LG verification, submission of an annual performance report of 2021/22 was on 24/August/2021 before the deadline of August 31st, 2021.</p>	4
	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>			
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p>	<p>Evidence provided to the assessor and reviewed indicate that all the quarter 4 budget performance reports were submitted within deadline of 31st August 2021 on the basis that the fourth quarter was submitted on 24/8/2021.</p>	4
	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>			