



## **Local Government Performance Assessment**

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	31%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	20%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	25%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	37%
Educational Performance Measures	56%
Health Performance Measures	48%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	43%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	15%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>From a sampled list of projects funded by DDEG funds the following projects were completed and in use by the intended beneficiaries</p> <p>a) Construction of a two-stance line pit latrine at Nairaka HCII located in Bukooma sub-county was completed in Q4 as observed from payment voucher dated 19th March 2020, No. 10784. The toilet was functional and used by patients at Nairaka HCII.</p> <p>b) Furniture procured for District Headquarters as per page 34 of the APR. It was in place and in use by the Planning unit, Luuka District.</p> <p>c) Furniture and Fixtures were procured and functional at Kiyunga Ward District headquarters, located in Nawampiti Subcounty.</p>	4
2	Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable.	0

## Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 were completed as per the work plan.

The LG had planned for 6 investment projects under DDEG funds and the status of completion was as follows,

1. Capacity building (Ref: AWP page 4, which was completed 100% as per page 34 APR)

2. Construction of Five stance in 10 Primary schools' at Nawansega Primary schools (Ref. AWP page 50, which was 100% completion as per page 61 of the APR)

3. Lightening arresters installed on 10 Primary schools on spot verification of lightening prone areas (Ref: AWP page 49, which was 0% completed as per page 60 APR)

4. Development of Physical plan for Bulanga and Kyanvuma Town boards (Ref: AWP page 70 which was completed 107% as per page 70 APR)

5. Furniture procured for District Headquarters at (Ref: AWP page 92 and was 167% completed as per page 34 of the APR)

6. Developing the 5 yr. DDP111, guiding 8 LLGs on SDP111, 2020/21 District Budget conference, LLGs sensitizing on 2020/21 Policy guidelines for Budgeting and 8 LLGs Participatory Planning (Ref: AWP page 92 which was completed 107% as per page 86 of the APR)

Percentage of completed projects was  $(5/6) \times 100 = 83\%$

Investment Performance	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:	There was evidence that the District had budgeted and spent on all eligible DDEG projects for the FY 2019/20 on eligible projects; Ref Q4 LG performance reports.
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	Score 2 or else score 0.	<p>The budget performance for the 6 DDEG projects was as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capacity building budget was 17,407,000 and 100% was spent (Ref: page 34 of the APR)</li> <li>2. Construction of Five stance in 10 Primary schools at Nawansega Primary schools' budget was Ugx. 20,000,000 and 100% was spent (Ref: page 61 of the APR)</li> <li>3. Lightening arresters installed on 10 Primary schools on spot verification of lightening prone areas budget was 15,993,000 and was 0% spent (Ref: page 60 of the APR)</li> <li>4. Development of Physical plan for Bulanga and Kyanvuma Town boards budget was Ugx 60,000,000 and 107% was spent (Ref: page 70 of the APR)</li> <li>5. Furniture procurement for District Headquarters at budgeted at Ugx. 15,000,000 and of which 167% was spent (Ref: page 34 of the APR)</li> <li>6. Writing 5 yr DDP111, guiding 8LLGs on SDP111, 2020/21 District Budget conference, LLGs sensitized on 2020/21 Policy guidelines for Budgeting and 8 LLGs Participatory Planning budgeted at Ugx 30,000,00 and was spent at 67% (Ref: page 86 of the APR)</li> </ol>

Investment Performance	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,	Under the DDEG funded projects for the previous FY there were None under infrastructure. What was provided was under supplies, services and sub counties apart from Construction of Five stance in 10 Primary schools at Nawansega Primary schools' whose budget was Ugx. 20,000,000 and 100% was spent with no variation.
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 2 or else score 0	

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to prove that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. This was because when the AT visited the 3 LLGs sampled, there was no staff to give the information on staffing standards to compare with that provided by the PHRO in order to tell the accuracy.</p> <p>1. At Waibuga S/C, only the chairperson LC3 Hajji Kalyango Salim was found in office and he didn't have access to the staffing information.</p> <p>2. When the assessor reached Bukanga S/C, he found Mr. Galubale John who introduced himself as a porter and so he had no information for assessment.</p> <p>3. Asimilar challenge was found at Bulongo S/C where Mr. Kasango Ivan a parish chief of Nakabugo in the office of SAS. He claimed that the staffing information was locked in the office of the SAS.</p>	0
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <p>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</p> <p><b><i>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</i></b></p>	<p>The infrastructure constructed using DDEG funds was in place for instance a two-stance line pit latrine constructed at Nairaka HCII located in Bukooma sub-county was completed in Q4 and was being used by patients at Nairaka HCII.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	Not applicable.	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable.	0

#### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	The LG had not submitted the consolidated staffing Requirements for the coming FY 2021/2022.	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	The LG had no attendance analysis for the period of July-December 2019 at the time of assessment. Only the attendance book opened in July 2018 to date 10/12/2020 was availed to the assessor.	0

Performance management	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:	The LG had 10 departments headed by 10 HoD. They were appraised according to the following reports.
Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous  FY: Score 1 or else 0	<p>1. The DEO did not have appraisal report for 2019/2020 in his file by the time of Assessment.</p> <p>2. Mr. Wangadya Moses the PAS head of Administration and Management did have performance report for FY 2019/2020</p> <p>3. Mr. Kipaalu Bogere George the CFO head of Finance was not appraised for 2019/2020</p> <p>4. Mr. Musena Aggrey the DPO did not have a performance report for 2019/2020</p> <p>5. Mr. Wandira Yosia the District planner did not have the performance report for 2019/2020</p> <p>6. Dr. WandiraChristopher the DHO was appraised by Mr. Wadada Lawrence the CAO on 7/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 74%</p> <p>7. Mr. Bikadho Hamis the DCDO did not have a performance report for 2019/2020</p> <p>8. Mr. Musisi Rajab the Ag. District Engineer head of Works did not have performance report for 2019/2020</p>

Performance management	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:	The rewards and sanction committee file CR/157/3 for minutes was seen. In one of the meetings held on 12/2/2020, the meeting discussed the following Agenda.
Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0	<p>1. Opening Prayer</p> <p>2. Self-Introductions</p> <p>3. Communication from the Chair</p> <p>4. Statement/defence from invited officers.</p> <p>5. Closure.</p> <p>Under Min. 3. Statements/defence from invited Officers, the committee in one of its 7 recommendations in the 3rd recommendation observed that Mr. Wakibitamu Benard a teacher of Kikumbi P/S had overstayed at the station and therefore recommended for a transfer to Budondo P/S.</p> <p>However, there was nNo appointment letters of members of this committee were seen to prove that the committee was formally instituted.</p>

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had not established the consultative committee for staff grievance redresses which is not functional	0
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.	The LG did provide information on the list of staff recruited in the Previous FY and payroll. It was established that nNot all staff recruited accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment.  1. Mr. Abu Menya an Assistant Instructor IPPS 10555412 was appointed on 7/8/2019 and accessed payroll in March 2020  2. Kilimani Zekeli an Assistant Education Officer IPPS 10696675 was appointed on 3/3/2020 and accessed apay roll in July 2020  3. Mr. Wakalimira Umaru an Education Officer IPPS 1069684 was appointed 3/3/2020 and accessed salary in July 2020  4. Mr. Kabanda Asuman an Assistant Education Officer IPPS 1069671 was appointed on 3/3/2020 and accessed salary in July 2020.	0
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	The LG provided the list of staff that retired during the previous FY but did not provide the evidence of the Pension payroll to enable the assessor find evidence if 100% of staff that retired had accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement.	0

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



10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The approved DDEG budget for the District FY 2019/2020 was Ugx. 418,041,000 (Ref: page 3 of the Approved performance report, dated 15/10/2020).</p> <p>From the verified vouchers below provided by the District it was observed that a total of</p> <p>29/8/2019 Vr.No. 4232 Bulongo S/C 10,680,000</p> <p>28/11/2019 Vr. No. 4243 Bukanga S/C 15,196,333</p> <p>28/11/2019 Vr.No.4457 Bukoma S/C 14,474,667</p> <p>7/2/2020 Vr.No.4056 Bukanga S/C 14,426,333</p> <p>13/2/2020 Vr.No.4215 Nawampiti S/C</p> <p>Total was 67,675,333</p> <p>Based on the verified vouchers, the percentage of DDEG transferred to LLG was <math>(67,675,333/418,041,000) \times 100 = 16.1\%</math>, thus the LG was non-compliant.</p>	0
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on when Luuka District received releases on DDEG transfers by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on when the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs by the time of the assessment</p>	0

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG made supervisory visits to assess the construction of DDEG projects during FY 2019/2020 as indicated below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 mentoring was held in August 2019 as noted from the report on population issues to the District and LLGs. The exercise was conducted by the Executive and TPC, at Subcounty level were Senior Assistant Secretaries, Community Development Officers, Extension Staff and Subcounty Executive Committee members Ref. Report dated Monday, August 12th, 2019 prepared by the District Planner.</p> <p>Quarter 2 was conducted in December as observed from a mentoring report on gender issues conducted in LLGs involving the District and 8 LLGs, TPC and Executive Committee members which was facilitated by both DCDO and Planning Unit, Ref. Report dated Tuesday, December 12th, 2019 prepared by the District Planner.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of Q3 and Q4 supervisory/mentoring visits conducted in the District.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the reports on monitoring visits were discussed by the TPC as indicated below.</p> <p>TPC meeting held on 16th June 2020, Ref: Min: 09/DTPC/06/2020; presentation and discussion of the monitoring report. The presentation was made by the District Planner who highlighted the progress of implementation of projects, page 2.</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><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The LG was still on a Manual Accounting System and maintained a one Single Assets Register as opposed to the requirement of 3 Categories of Assets Registers outlined on Pages of 167 – 170 of Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007. Furthermore, the Single Assets Register that was maintained did not conform to the prescribed Formats outlined in the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007.</p> <p>The single assets register contained assets like Motorcycles, Furniture Laptop Computers. For instance, there was a record of a Dell Desk top Computer which was acquired on 18th June 2020 and was in the Water Sector.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG used the Board of survey for FY 2018/19 as per section 34 of the PFMA Act 2015.</p> <p>The LG had the Board of Survey of FY 2018/19 which was submitted to the Accountant General, MoFPED and Auditor General on 21st October 2019 in a letter dated July 30th, 2019. The BOS made recommendations on page 22</p> <p>The board of survey report FY 19/20, incorporated recommendations that were part of the 2018/19 board of survey. These recommendations included disposal of over stayed items, listed items that were recommitted for board off, some motorcycles that had been physically available for disposal, (Ref; page 3 of the BOS FY 19/20).</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The Chief Administrative Officer had on 29th January ,2018, under reference No CR/2014/1 appointed 11 Members to the Committee, and they included the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wadada Lawrence designated as Chief Administrative Officer (Chairperson)</li> <li>2. Kiwala Rebecca designated as Physical Planner (Secretary)</li> <li>3. Musena Aggrey designated as Production Officer (Member)</li> <li>4. Kamyuka Francis designated as District Education Officer (Member)</li> <li>5. Tabandika Twaha designated as District Engineer (Member)</li> <li>6. Bikandho Twaha designated as District Community Development Officer (Member)</li> </ol>	2

7. Nangobi Hidaya designated as District Health Inspector (Member)

8. Barasa Patrick designated as Town Clerk Luuka Town Council (Member)

9. Makinabu Yahaya Lukwitira designated as District Water Officer (Member)

10. Naigubya Thomas designated as Physical Planner in Private Practice (Member)

11. Musenero Benard designated as District Environmental (Member)

Whereas the existing Committee was functional during the FY 2019/2020, it was not fully constituted as it lacked the Surveyor was found missing on the PPC as evidenced by the minutes of meetings held as presented below:

Quarter 1 meeting was held on 12th September 2019, Ref 04/2019(5 of 16/12/2019) presentation and approval of building plans for construction of classroom blocks. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department in a letter dated 24th September 2020.

Quarter 2 meeting was held on 16th December 2019: Ref 04/2019(5 of 16/12/2019) presentation and approval of building plans for construction of classroom blocks. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department in a letter dated 24th September 2020.

Quarter 3 meeting was held on 12th February 2020, Ref 01/2020(5 of 12/02/2020) presentation and approval of building plans. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department in a letter dated 24th September 2020.

Quarter 4 meeting was held on 13th May 2020, Ref 02/2020(4 of 13/05/2020) presentation of structure and detailed physical development plans. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department in a letter dated 24th September 2020.

The physical development plans were approved under the council minute Min 04/ LDC/5/2020

The LG had submitted 4 sets of the minutes for the meetings held in FY 19/20 to MoLHUD.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District had conducted desk appraisal of DDEG funded investment projects in FY 2019/2020 by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
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>There was no evidence provided that the LG conducted field appraisals to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of FY 2019/20 by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that project profiles were developed and prepared for investments in the AWP and the formats were in line with the LG planning guidelines by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
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>At the time of assessment, the LG did not have evidence that they screened for environmental and social risks/impacts and put mitigation measures in place where required before being approved for construction. The assessment team was informed by the Environment Officer that the screening process was on going with CDOs at sub counties hence the forms were not ready at the time. Therefore, the LG scored zero.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the 19 Infrastructure projects for the FY2020/2021 implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan of 2020/2021 and approved by the Luuka District Local Government Council Meeting held on 14th May 2020. MIN6/LDC/05/2020. The Plan was submitted to PPDA-Eastern Region Office (Home) on 16th July 2020 and MFPED received it on 16th July 2020.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>Approved AWP on 14th May 2020. MIN6/LDC/05/2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of ceiling of Nawampiti Sub-county council hall. S. No 1 page 11</li> <li>• Completion of one classroom at Busiuro Muslim Primary school (Waibuga Sub-county) S. No 4 page 11</li> <li>• Opening and shaping of 3 km road i.e. Weregere to Mawumo (Waibuga sub-county). S. No 2 page 11</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no procurement for infrastructure projects under DDEG that were initiated at the time of assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>At The time of assessment there was no evidence that the LG had a properly established Project Implementation Team as specified by the guidelines.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the District Engineer, there were no DDEG funded infrastructure projects in FY 2019/2020.</p>	0

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	According to the DE, since there were no DDEG funded infrastructure projects in FY 2019/2020 we could not secure procurement files, completion certificates and supervision reports.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The LG had verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract for instance:  Partial completion of a fence at Nawampiti HCII (Nawampiti sub-county) the works was completed and issued with interim certificate No.2 dated 25th January 2020 and payment effected on dated 23rd December 2019 as per the voucher No: 9093. Interim /Final payment certificate dated 31st December 2019.  Construction of a two-stance line pit latrine at Nairaka HCII (Bukooma sub-county) the works was completed and issued with Interim/Final Payment certificate dated 19th March 2020 and payment effected on 25th March 2020 as per the voucher No: 10784.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had a significant complete Procurement plan for FY 2020/2021 on file. Procurement files available: For instance:  Completion of two classroom at Nawampiti Primary school (Nawampiti sub-county): Min 04/DCC/08/2020(O). The advert was ODB dated 14th July 2020 in the Daily Monitor. The Evaluation report dated was 17th August 2020 and the BEB Notice was on Wednesday 19th August 2020. Awarded to M/s Sonsole General Contractors Ltd.  Completion of two classroom at Nakabaale Primary school (Irongo sub-county): Min 04/DCC/08/2020(m). The advert was ODB dated 14th July 2020 in the Daily Monitor. The Evaluation report dated was 17th August 2020 and the BEB Notice was on Wednesday 19th August 2020. Awarded to M/s Wazibas General Contractor and Designers Ltd.	1

## 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	The LG had no evidence of a designated person to coordinate grievance / complaints for the FY 2019-2020. Therefore, the LG scored zero.	0
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	At the time of assessment there was no evidence that the LG had specified a system for  Recording. investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action, therefore the LG scored zero.	0
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	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. There was no grievance redress committee in place therefore the LG scored zero.	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	There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions had been integrated into LG Development Plans for example, in the Development plan on page 243 under construction of Waribo P/S, environment and social issues were integrated.  In health, the EIA were highlighted under the upgrade of Bukendi HCII to HC III, page 247 of the DDP plan  For construction of boreholes 14 holes, EIA was integrated on page 253 of the DDP plan.  Although the Environment, Social and climate interventions had been planned for in the DDP Plan and BOQs, there was no evidence of integrating them into the workplan.	0



15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines. A copy of a letter dated 23rd August 2019, Ref: CR/214 inviting all Town Clerks and Sub-county chiefs to attend a meeting geared towards dissemination of DDEG guidelines. A copy of the distribution list indicated that LLG representatives acknowledged receipt of the guidelines. For example, Nyende Alex, SAS for Kityerere Sub-county and Kiyanja Jaliru, SAS for Malongo Sub-county signed for the DDEG guidelines on 23rd August 2019.</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>There was no 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 because the physical development plans for Bulanga and Kyanvuma had not yet been implemented. Therefore, the LG scored zero.</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 was evidence of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change for example tree planting at boreholes sites after drilling for example at Bukaana-Luganda sites, Bugomba-Buchebwa and Budoma-Butitiri sites, tree planting was done East and West sides of the boreholes after drilling.</p>	3
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 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 that all projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access and availability. For example, in FY 2019-2020 there was a project of Emptying of latrines at Busiro CoU primary school, Busiro Muslim primary school and Namadope primary school all of which were under religious bodies but had no formal consent for the DDEG activity. Therefore, the LG scored zero.</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 of supervision and monitoring reports to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for the emptied school latrines at Busiro CoU primary school, Busiro Muslim primary school and Namadope primary school. The assessment team noted that this was done without involving the Environment officer. Therefore, the LG scored zero.	0
----	--	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of Environment and Social Certification forms completed and signed by the Environment and CDO.	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	There was documentary evidence at the time of Assessment that the LG carried out bank reconciliations up to the end of FY2019/2020. Similarly, bank reconciliations had been carried out up to date as at 30th November 2020 as follows;  • Luuka General Fund A/C No. 4812100010 with Centenary Bank was reconciled up to 30th November 2020.  • Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Recovery A/C No. Centenary Bank 4812100065 as per cash book updated was reconciled up to 31st October 2020.  • YLP Recovery A/C. No. 9030011089703 Stanbic Bank as per cash book was reconciled up to 31st October 2020.  The LG was compliant as it had reconciled all its bank accounts up to October 2020.	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	The LG produced quarterly reports as follows :  Quarter 1 was produced on 7/11/2019  Quarter 2 was produced on 29/01/2020  Quarter 3 was produced on 28/04/2020  Quarter 4 was produced on 30/07/2020	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Internal Audit reports for four quarters which incorporated status of implementation of previous internal audit reports were submitted on the following dates ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 was submitted on 07th November 2019; Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 was submitted on 25th June 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 3 was submitted on 30th July 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 4 was submitted on 30th July 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> </ul>	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 evidence that the Internal Audit reports for four quarters were acknowledged by the LG Accounting Officer and the LG PAC on the following dates ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 was submitted on 07th November 2019; Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 was submitted on 25th June 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 3 was submitted on 30th July 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> <li>• Quarter 4 was submitted on 30th July 2020, Ref; acknowledgement by date stamping, by the Speaker Council, LGPAC and CAO.</li> </ul> <p>The internal audit reports were reviewed by the LG PAC as evidenced by quarterly meetings.</p> <p>Meeting held 16th December 2019, Min 04/LDPAC/12/2020 examined responses for the 1st quarter IA report 2019/20</p> <p>Meeting held on 19th June 2020 MIN 03/LDPAC/6/2020 examined responses for IA reports for quarters 1 and II, DPAC recommendations made on page 1 to 4</p> <p>Quarter 2 IA was reviewed on 19th June 2020, Ref: MIN 03/LGPAC/1/6/2020, the PAC examined audit report, q2 2019/2020 of DPAC recommendations, six issues under education, health and recommendations made pages 1 to 4</p> <p>Minutes of meeting held on 22nd June 2020</p>	0

Min03/LDPAC/LDPAC/1/6/2020 examined responses for the 2nd quarter IA for FY 2019/20 & DPAC recommendations. Issues page 1 to 3

Quarter 2 IA was reviewed on 23rd June 2020, Ref: MIN 03/LGPAC/2/6/2020, the PAC examined audit report, 2019/2020 of DPAC and four issues under education, health followed up and recommendations, pages 1 to 2

Quarter 3 IA reviewed on 25th June 2020, Ref: MIN03/LDPAC/5/6/2020 examined 3rd quarter internal audit for the FY 2019/2020 & DPAC recommendations. Issues discussed procurement, pages 1 to 3

The LGPAC produced a District Public accounts Committee report after it had discussed 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Quarter Internal Audit Reports, the report was dated 20/10/2020 and was submitted to the L.C.V, Audit Unit and CAO on 20/10/2020.

There was however no evidence that the Internal Audit Report for Q4 had been reviewed by the LG PAC, thus the LG scored zero.

## 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>From the Final financial statements 2019/20, page 19 of the statement of appropriation of accounts, the Original Budget for Local revenue was projected at Ugx 90,157,410 and the Actual local revenue collection realized was Ugx 91,910,978 Ref: page 19 of the statement of performance of revenues FY 2019/20. This translated into a revenue collection ratio of 101% which was 1% above the target and within an acceptable range of +/-10% range.</p>	2
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2018/2019 was Ugx.114, 898,362 as shown on page 15 of the Final Accounts FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2019/2020 was Ugx 91,910,978, Ref: page 19 of the statement of appropriation of accounts.</p> <p>Thus Ugx. 91,910,978 (FY 2019/2020) minus Ugx. 114, 898,362 (FY 2018/2019)</p> <p>There was a decrease of Ugx 1,753,568</p> <p><math>(1,753,568 / 114, 898,362) \times 100 = 1.5\%</math></p> <p>This was decrease in revenue by 98.4%. This was outside the required range of 5-10%.</p>	0

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sec 85 of LGA (2) "In rural areas, revenue shall be collected by the sub county councils, and a sub county council shall retain 65 percent, or any other higher percentage as the district council may approve, of the revenue collected by it and pass the remaining percentage over to the district"</li> <li>• (4) "A district council may, with the concurrence of a divisions, collect revenue on behalf of the divisions council but shall remit 65 percent of the revenue so collected to the relevant sub county."</li> <li>• In this regard to (4) above the DLG collected Local Service tax from District staff Payrolls and Private companies in the District which amounted to Ugx 81,122,500, (Ref: page 27 of Final Accounts 2019/20)</li> </ul> <p>However, there was no evidence on transfer of Local Revenue to LLGs by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.			

### Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	The procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts were published on the LG notice board by PDU and endorsed by the CAO.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure			
21	LG shares information with citizens	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 indicating that the LG publicized information to citizens on LGPA results and implication of the report during a TPC meeting held on 24th September 2019, Ref: Min: 05/DTPC/09/2019, page 4. The population officer Kiiza Lydia disseminated to all HoDs and in attendance were representatives from LLGs.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure			
21	LG shares information with citizens	c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the LG conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation by the time of the assessment.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure			

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>By the time of the assessment, there was no evidence on display of information related to tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal to the public.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared an IGG report which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on preparation of the IGG report.</p> <p>The LG had not encountered alleged fraud cases and corruption that needed the intervention of the IGG.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG PLE pass rate had not improved by negative 14.5% between the previous school year but one and the previous year. For example, in 2018 the total number of candidates for PLE was 5,730. The total number of those who passed between Grade 1 and III was 3,985 which gave a % of <math>3,985/5,730 \times 100 = 69.5\%</math></p> <p>In 2019 the candidates who sat for PLE were 5,987 and those who passed between Grade I and III were 3,289 pupils. Therefore, the % increase was <math>3,289/5,987 \times 100 = 54.9\%</math></p> <p>Therefore, Increase was <math>54.9\% - 69.5\% =</math> negative 14.5%</p> <p>There was no increase in performance .</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The UCE pass rate had not improved by a negative 6,9% between the previous school's year but one and the previous year, for example:</p> <p>In 2018, the number of candidates who sat for UCE was 1,441. Those who passed between Division 1 and 3 were 455.</p> <p>Therefore, the pass rate was <math>455/1,441 \times 100 = 31.5\%</math>.</p> <p>In 2019, the number of candidates was: 1,577.</p> <p>The total number who passed between grade I and III was 480 out of 1,577 candidates.</p> <p>Therefore, the pass rate was <math>480/1,577 \times 100 = 30.4\%</math></p> <p>Therefore, the performance improvement was <math>30.4\% - 31.5\% =</math> negative 1%.</p>	0

2	<p>Service Delivery</p> <p>Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LLG performance assessment was not assessed in the previous FY.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment</p> <p>Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The education development grant had been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines. For example, the grant was used for construction of 2 classroom blocks costing UGX 59,040,000 each at Bigundu P/S, Nabyoto P/S and at Walibo P/S.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment</p> <p>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>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. For example, the DEO certified works for construction of 2 classroom block costing UGX 59,040,000 at Nabyoto P/S on 22/3/2020, Environment Officer on 24/3/2020 and DCDO on 24/3/2020. The balance payment of UGX 20,289,503 was made on 25/3/2020. The requisition for payment at Walibo P/S for 2 classroom block was endorsed by the DEO on 25/3/2020, Environment Officer on 24/3/2020 and DCDO on 24/3/2020 and payment of UGX 53,697,680 was made on 27/3/2020 Voucher No.1001132105 under SFG grant.</p>	2



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

According the contracts, the following were  
established: For instance:

a) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Walibo  
primary school (Waibuga sub-county) Procurement  
Ref No. Luu593/wrks/19-20/00002

Contract No. Luu/593/EDUC/SFG/19-20/004; with  
MoWT estimates was UGX, 58,000,000, while  
contractors' estimates were UGX. 58,956,340 with a  
variation of UGX.4, 102,320 equivalent to 7%.  
Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since the  
variation in the contracts was within +/-20%.  
Contractor: Sage guard Technical services Uganda  
Ltd.

b) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Nabyoto  
primary school (Bukooma sub-county) Procurement  
Ref No. Luu593/wrks/19-20/00003

Contract No. Luu/593/EDUC/SFG/19-20/005; with  
MoWT estimates was

UGX, 58,000,000, while contractors' estimate were  
UGX. 58,956,340 with a variation of UGX. -956, 340  
equivalents to -1.6%. Therefore, the LG scores the 2  
points since the variation in the contracts was within  
+/-20%.

Contractor: Muza General Enterprises Ltd.

c) Construction of a 2-classroom block at Bigunhu  
primary school (Bukanga sub-county) Procurement  
Ref No. Luu593/wrks/19-20/00008

Contract No. Luu/593/EDUC/SFG/19-20/003; with  
was UGX, 58,000,000, while contractors' estimates  
were UGX. 58,969,910 with a variation of UGX. -  
969, 910 equivalents to -1.67%. Therefore, the LG  
scores the 2 points since the variation in the  
contracts was within +/-20%.

Contractor: Sunland General Investments Ltd.

Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There were three sampled Education projects, for the previous FY all completed on time, For instance:
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>a) Construction of a 2-classroom block at Walibo primary school (Waibuga sub-county) Procurement Ref No. Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00002</p> <p>Contract No. Luuk/593/EDUC/SFG/19-20/004</p> <p>Commencement: 19th January 2020 expected to 19th April 2020 but, 25th March 2020,</p> <p>Certificate No. 1. Dated 25th March 2020,</p> <p>For payment Issued on date: 25th March 2020,</p> <p>LPO: Nil</p> <p>Voucher No. 7122. Dated 2ND April 2020</p> <p>Substantial Completion certificate date 25th March 2020.</p> <p>Certificate of Practical completion dated: still has defects to rectify.</p> <p>b) Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nabyoto primary school (Bukooma sub-county) Procurement Ref No. Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00003</p> <p>Contract No. Luuk/593/EDUC/SFG/19-20/005</p> <p>Commencement: 12th February 2020 expected to 12th May 2020 but, 20th October 2020,</p> <p>Certificate No. 1, 2 and 3. Dated 13th March 2020, 13th April 2020, and 20th October 2020 respectively,</p> <p>For payment Issued on date: 20th October 2020,</p> <p>LPO:</p> <p>Voucher No. Missing. Dated missing</p> <p>Substantial Completion certificate date 20th October 2020.</p> <p>Certificate of Practical completion dated: still has defects to rectify.</p>

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"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had recruited 1,320 teachers with an approved current year 2020/2021 budget of UGX 8,231,864,683 to pay 1,320 teachers.</p> <p>Therefore <math>1,320/1320 \times 100 = 100\%</math>.</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"> <li>• If above 70% score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>82 Primary schools out of 89 Primary schools in the LG met the basic requirements and minimum standards. Therefore <math>82/89 \times 100 = 92\%</math></p> <p>The percent was above 70%. For example, the 3 sampled schools, Budhangula P/S, Naigobya P/S and P/S had the following: National Flag and Flag pole, a Mission statement, a School Motto, a Vision, a School Management Committee and school records.</p>	3

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed according to teacher deployment list dated 11/7/2020. For example, in Naigobya P/S had a head teacher and 13 teachers, Nakabugu P/S had a head teacher, and 15 teachers and Budhabangula P/S had a head teacher and 19 teachers.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure, namely, land, buildings, furniture, latrines, equipment and cooking utensils in all 89 registered primary schools dated 12/11/2019.</p>	2

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had ensured that all 89 registered primary schools complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p> <p>For example, Budhangula P/S submitted the report on 19/11/2019 signed by Head teacher, Kiasambira John and Isabirye Jacob, Chairperson of SMC, Naigobya P/S submitted the report on 2/11/2019 signed by Basilirya Charles, Head teacher and Rev.Isabirye Jacob, Chairperson of SMC.Nakabugu P/S submitted the report on 4/11/2019 signed by Waiswa Juma Balikudembe, Headteacher and Kasila Abdul Chairperson SMC.</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No School Improvement plans were prepared by the 3 sampled schools namely, Naigobya P/S, Budhabangula P/S and Nakabugu P/S, at the time of assessment.</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"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had collected return forms from all the 89 registered schools from the previous year, dated 12/8/2019 and acknowledged on 12/8/2019.</p> <p>Therefor <math>89/89 \times 100 = 100\%</math>.</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>There was evidence that the LG had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>For example, the approved current year budget was UGX 8,231,864,683 to pay 1,320 (Headteachers and teachers).</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had deployed 1,320 teachers as indicated in deployment list dated 11/7/2020. For example, in Naigobya P/S had a head teacher and 13 teachers, Nakabugu P/S had a head teacher and 15 teachers and Budhabangula P/S had a head teacher and 19 teachers.</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>There was evident that the teacher deployment data was disseminated and displayed at the district education offices dated 11/7/2020. However, the 3 sampled schools did not display the information on their noticeboards outside. The information was instead, displayed in their offices.</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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There were no appraisal reports for Head teachers provided to the assessor as evidence that all Primary School Head Teachers had been appraised</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There were no performance reports for Head teachers provided to the assessor as evidence that all Secondary School Head Teachers had been appraised and reports submitted by D/CAO.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>1. Mr. Kamyia Francis the DEO had no performance report for 2019/2020 at the time of assessment.</p> <p>2. Ms. Nabwire Jane the SIS was appraised by the DEO on 30/6/2020 and endorsed by the DEO on 18/10/2020</p> <p>3. Mr. Galandi Moses Mabuzi the Inspector of Schools was last appraised by the DEO on 1/9/2019 and endorsed by the PAS on the same date with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>4. Ms. Nantale Nasabu the Senior Education officer had no Appraisal report for 2019/2020 at the time of assessment.</p> <p>5. Mr. Basaliywa Nicholas the sports officer was last appraised by the DEO on 24/7/2018</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared a training plan dated 23/8/2019 to address the capacity gaps namely, Continuous Professional Development(CPD) for teachers under Min.2/2019.</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>The LG had confirmed in writing the list of 89 schools, their enrolment of 60,742 pupils and 1,320 teachers and budget allocation of 8,231,864,683 in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th as indicated in the submission on 29/7/2020 ref.CR/D/161/1.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations of UGX 47,336,000 for 2019/2020 to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines as indicated in the Annual work plan and budget for 2019/2020.</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on when the LG submitted warrants for school's capitation for the last 3 quarters by the time of the assessment</p>	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>There was evidence that the Capitation release information was publicized on the notice boards at the DEO's office and in the schools sampled.</p> <p>For example, in Quarter 1, Naigobya P/S received UGX 3,658,609 on 28/8/2019, Budhangula received 4,480,000 in quarter1 dated 2/9/2019, Nakabugu P/s received 2,700,000.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department had prepared inspection plans during the meeting held on 12/6/2019 under Min.2/2019/004 where it was agreed that inspection would be done collectively.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <p>• If 100% score: 2</p> <p>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>• Below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>In a report on page 2 dated 16/12/2019, the schools inspected were 82 out of 89 in 2019. The inspection report was submitted to MOE on 16/12/2019 and acknowledged on 17/12/2019.</p> <p>Therefore <math>82/89 \times 100 = 92.1\%</math></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 evidence that the inspection reports had been discussed and used for corrective actions which were subsequently followed-up. For example, in a meeting held on 12/6/2019, under Min.2/2019/004, it was resolved that inspection would be done collectively.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DIS and DEO had presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) on 16/12/2019 and acknowledged on 17/12/2019. These were quarterly reports for 2019.</p> <p>For example, Naigobya P/S was inspected in term 3 on 24/9/2019, Nakabugu P/S was inspected in term 3 on 29/11/2019. However, Budhabangula had no records for inspection in term 3.</p>	0

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results during the previous FY

The LG had a multisectoral committee composed of three sectors which included Finance and Administration, Social Services, and works.

The committee was composed to discuss urgent matters that needed attention in a short time frame prior to the approval of the budget for FY 2019/2020. For instance;

A Multisectoral Committee which sat on 14th May 2020, Min 05/LMSC/5/2020 agreed to include the construction of Budhuba P/S which was incorporated among the unfunded priorities, page 2

A Multisectoral Committee which sat on 18th December 2019 Min 12/LMSC/5/2019 discussed the Education sector budget and agreed to construct a pit latrine at Budhuba /S among unfunded priorities.

A Social services Committee held on 2nd March 2020, Min 03 & 04 /LDS/2/2020 discussed education sector reports for 2nd quarter and recommendations were made on recommendations page 3. The DEO launched the construction project of schools at Mawundo, Bigunhu and Nabyoyo P/S Page 3

A Social services committee held on February 27th, 2020; page 2 made education sector recommendations which included transfer of teachers who had overstayed at particular stations.

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0

Evidence showed that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children in a meeting conducted on 2/10/2019 for head teachers and School Management Committees (SMCs) to discuss the performance in schools under Min. In a 14/4/2020 report, page 3. The training was on the roles and responsibilities of SMCs as education managers conducted on 9/3/2020 at Nawansega Coordinating Centre in Luuka district.

## 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>An up to-date LG assets' register which set out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards was not available in two sampled schools. For example, Nakabugu P/S and Budhabangula P/S had no School Asset Registers. However, Naigabya P/S had a School Asset Register dated 20/10/2020.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence indicating that the investments projects for education were derived from the development plan and prioritized in the AWP.</p> <p>According to the District 5 Year Development plan, the District had planned to construct two classroom blocks, Ref: page 218 of 273.</p> <p>This was reflected in the District approved workplan on page 49 and the Approved Budget Estimate indicating that 4 primary schools were in the procurement process which included: Bigunho, Walibo, and Nabyoto Primary schools.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of desk appraisal of education projects by the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Thus, the LG was non-compliant in this area.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence indicating that education projects were field appraised for: (i) technical feasibility; ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs during FY 2019/20.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

Education infrastructure projects were incorporated in the Luuka District LG procurement plan in the 01st Minutes of the DCC held on 10th July 2020 at the PDU offices under Min. 04/DCC/07/2020 in the approval of procurement plan, bidding document, procurement method, advert, evaluation, etc.

It was later incorporated and approved by the district council in meeting held on 14th May 2020; Minute: MIN6/LDC/05/2020.

The department of Education submitted their sector infrastructure projects to PDU including:

a) Construction of education office District headquarters: Procurement Ref No: Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00014

b) Construction of a two classroom block at Butimbwa Primary school (Waibuga sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00003

c) Construction of a two classroom block at Bugomba Primary school (Nawampiti sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00004

d) Construction of a two classroom block at Ikumbya Catholic Butimbwa Primary school (Ikumbya sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00013

e) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Irongo Primary school (Irongo sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00007

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>As per the education infrastructure investments they had contracts committee minutes.</p> <p>The 01st Minutes of the DCC held on 10th July 2020 at the PDU offices under Min. 04/DCC/07/2020 for the approval of procurement plan, bidding document, procurement method, advert, evaluation, etc.</p> <p>Contract Committee Chairperson: Mr. Mathius Wabwire Panyako- the Senior Medical Officer.</p> <p>The department of Education submitted their sector infrastructure projects to PDU including:</p> <p>a) Construction of education office District headquarters: Procurement Ref No: Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00014</p> <p>b) Construction of a two classroom block at Butimbwa Primary school (Waibuga sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00003</p> <p>c) Construction of a two classroom block at Bugomba Primary school (Nawampiti sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00004</p> <p>d) Construction of a two classroom block at Ikumbya Catholic Butimbwa Primary school (Ikumbya sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00013</p> <p>e) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Irongo Primary school (Irongo sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2020-21/00007</p> <p>However, for the current FY, there were no education infrastructure investments requiring SG approval.</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 no evidence of PIT</p>	0
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>Of the Education/ school infrastructure projects followed the MoES technical designs. Spot on checks on the following infrastructure projects revealed:</p> <p>a) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Walibo primary school (Waibuga sub-county)</p> <p>Considering the works executed on the sub structure, building frame, walls, roof structure, doors and windows, floor finishes, wall finishes, lightening arrestor were as per scope to the required quality</p>	1

and specifications.

b) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Bigunhu primary school (Bukanga sub-county)

Considering the works executed on the sub structure, building frame, walls, roof structure, doors, floor finishes, wall finishes, lightening arrestor were as per scope to the required quality and specifications. However for the windows that had a defect, I found a contractor on site rectifying the problem.

c) Ikubya Seed Secondary School (Ikubya Sub-county)

The Ikubya Seed Secondary School is 78% complete when you consider the BOQ specifications, more works required on some sub structures of the Teachers housing unit, stance pit latrines, walls requiring plastering and painting, roof structure incomplete on some blocks e.g. administration block, doors, and floor finishes lacking. The playground is still pending and fixing the drainage and water runoff.

There were D/Engineer's reports on the education project works as shown below:

- Status report on the district building construction project in Luuka District for the month of , January 2020, February 2020, March 2020, May 2020, June 2020
- Progress report No 2. On construction of a 2 classroom block at Bigunhu primary school in Bukanga sub-county dated 17th April 2020.
- Progress report on construction of a 2 classroom block at Nabyoto primary school in Bukooma sub-county dated 20th October 2020 2020.
- Progress report on construction of a 2 classroom block at Walibo primary school in Waibuga sub-county dated 25th March 2020 2020.
- Site meeting for the construction of Ikubya Seed SS in Ikubya sub-county dated 6th September 2019 at the site. Members present CAO, Site Engineer, DEO, District Internal auditor, PAS, Chief of Ikubya, Environmental officer, etc.
- Site meeting for the construction of Ikubya Seed SS in Ikubya sub-county dated 31st January 2020 at the site. Members present Chairperson LC5, Procurement officer, DEO, Site Engineer, Chairperson LC 3, CAO, DE, DISO representing the RDC.
- Progress report for the construction of Ikubya Seed SS in Ikubya sub-county dated 25th June 2019 and 27th October 2020 by the project manager to CAO.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

There was evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY. For instance Reports and Minutes from site monitoring visits:

a) Status report on the district building construction project in Luuka District for the month of , January 2020, February 2020, March 2020, May 2020, June 2020

b) Progress report No 2. On construction of a 2 classroom block at Bigunhu primary school in Bukanga sub-county dated 17th April 2020.

c) Progress report on construction of a 2 classroom block at Nabyoto primary school in Bukooma sub-county dated 20th October 2020 2020.

d) Progress report on construction of a 2 classroom block at Walibo primary school in Waibuga sub-county dated 25th March 2020 2020.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted *score: 1, else score: 0*

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

- Site meeting for the construction of Ikubya Seed SS in Ikubya sub-county dated 6th September 2019 at the site. Members present CAO, Site Engineer, DEO, District Internal auditor, PAS, Chief of Ikubya, Environmental officer, etc.

- Site meeting for the construction of Ikubya Seed SS in Ikubya sub-county dated 31st January 2020 at the site. Members present Chairperson LC5, Procurement officer, DEO, Site Engineer, Chairperson LC 3, CAO, DE, DISO representing the RDC.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that payment requests for sector infrastructure projects were initiated and executed as per Contract and implementation results.

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

Kenwood General Enterprises and Construction Ltd contracted to construct Busala Primary School raised a request for payment worth Ugx 13,017,996 on 28 /05/ 2020. Completion certificate prepared by the District Engineer on 17/06/2020. The requisition was approved by the District Engineer, forwarded to the DEO, and authorized by the CAO on 22/06/2020. Payment was affected on 25/06/2020 worth 10,685,977, Vr. No. 30523824.

Payment made within one month.

Ms Safeguard Technical Services contracted to construct two classrooms at Walibo Primary School raised a request for payment worth Ugx 53,897,680 on 19/03/ 2020. Completion certificate prepared by the District Engineer and DEO on 25/03/2020. Measurement of completion works dated 25/03/2020. The requisition was approved by the District Engineer, forwarded to the DEO, and authorized by the CAO on 26/03/2020. Payment was affected on 16/04/2020 worth 51,202,796 Vr. No. 7122.

Payment made within one month.

Sunland General Investments U Ltd to construct Bigunhu Primary School raised a request for payment worth Ugx 28,600,000 on 21 /02/ 2020. Completion certificate prepared by the District Engineer and DEO on 3/03/2020. The requisition was approved by the District Engineer, forwarded to the DEO, and authorized by the CAO on 6/03/2020. Payment was affected on 8/03/2020 worth 25,986,282 Vr. No. 29974702.

Payment made within 10 working days.

For all sampled payments to suppliers, payments were made within 30 days and based on implementation results confirmed by the Project Manager.



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, score: 1, else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Education department submitted its procurement plans to PDU</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Procurement files for school infrastructure projects evidence on file shows that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records in the Previous FY.</p> <p>4th Minutes of the District Contracts Committee Meeting held on 2nd December 2019 in the PDU offices.</p> <p>Completion of a three classroom and construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Nawasenga primary school (Bukooma Sub-county) Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00006. Min 04/DCC/12/2019(b)</p> <p>Advert: 29th October 2019</p> <p>Requisition forms PPF1: 15th July 2019</p> <p>The Evaluation report dated 25th November 2019</p> <p>BEB Notice: 3rd December 2019</p> <p>Letter of Bid Acceptance: Tuesday 17th December 2019</p> <p>Bidder's acceptance: 18th December 2019</p> <p>The contractor Morgan General Investments Ltd</p> <p>Contract agreement: 18th Janaury 2020</p> <p>Amount: UGX. 64,771,852</p> <p>Completion of a 2 classroom block at Busaala primary school (Buloongo sub-county)</p> <p>Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00005. Min 04/DCC/12/2019(i)</p> <p>Advert: 29th October 2019</p> <p>Requisition forms PPF1: 15th July 2019</p> <p>The Evaluation report dated 25th November 2019</p> <p>BEB Notice: 3rd December 2019</p> <p>Letter of Bid Acceptance: Tuesday 17th December 2019</p> <p>Bidder's acceptance: missing</p> <p>The contractor Kenwood General Enterprises and Construction company Ltd</p> <p>Contract agreement: 30th December 2019.</p>	1

Amount: UGX. 32,998,700

Construction of a two classroom block at Bigunhu primary School (Bukaga sub-county)

Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00003.  
Min 04/DCC/12/2019(f)

Advert: 29th October 2019

Requisition forms PPF1: 15th July 2019

The Evaluation report dated 25th November 2019

BEB Notice: 3rd December 2019

Letter of Bid Acceptance: Tuesday 17th December 2019

Bidder's acceptance: 23rd December 2019

The contractor SunLand General Investments Ltd

Contract agreement: 11th February 2020

Amount: 58,969,910

## 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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework because the LG had not yet established a grievance redress committee.</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>There was no evidence that LG had disseminated the Education Guidelines on Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Primary schools and Secondary schools in 3 sampled schools namely, Naigobya P/S, Nakabugo P/S and Budhabangula P/S at the time of the assessment.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and had them</p> <p>Incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. The Assessment Team had no access to Contract documents for Bukoova primary school, Busiro primary school and Kiwalazi primary school, apparently they were submitted to Ministry of Education and Sports for accountability purposes. Therefore the LG scored zero.</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, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects for FY 2019-2020.</p> <p>Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions for education projects for FY 2019-2020 like;</p> <p>Construction of a two (2) classroom at Bukoova primary school in Bukooma sub county.</p> <p>ii. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Busiro primary school in waibugo sub county.</p> <p>iii. Renovation of a classroom at Busala primary school in Bulongo sub county</p> <p>iv. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Kiwalazi primary school in Irongo sub county. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

There was evidence that Environment and social certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer however the CDO had not endorsed the certifications prior to executing the project contractor payments for example;

i. Certification form dated 17th June 2020 for renovation and completion of a two (2) Classroom Block at Busala primary school in Bulongo sub county. Project contractor: M/s Kenwood General Enterprises and Construction company limited. Project activities: Opening the ground, construction. Negative environment and social impacts: soil erosion, destruction of vegetation, scarcity of wood. Mitigation measures: Grow trees, leveling of the borrow pit. Implementation progress: Leveling the borrow pit, planting trees. The Environment Officer recommended for payments. The LG scored zero because the indicator required that certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>AT Sampled 3 health facilities: Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo HC III and Bukoova HC III and compared the total OPD for FY 2018/19 with that of 2019/20; and also compared total deliveries for FY 2018/19 to those of 2019/20.</p> <p>OPD</p> <p>A) Total FY 2019/20 = 65,536</p> <p>B) Total FY 2018/19 = 54,182</p> <p>Difference = (A-B) = 11,354</p> <p>% Change = <math>[(A-B)/B] \times 100\% = 21\%</math></p> <p>Deliveries</p> <p>A1) Total FY 2019/20 = 2,266</p> <p>B1) Total FY 2018/19 = 1,896</p> <p>Difference = 370</p> <p>Percent increase = <math>[(A1-B1)/B1] \times 100\% = 20\%</math></p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	na	0

2

2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Note: To have zero wait for year one

b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:

- Above 75%; score 2
- 65 – 74%; score 1
- Below 65% ; score 0

Luuka district had 7 Health facilities participating in Result Based financing (RBF) during Fy 2019/20. When they were assessed during the last quarter of FY2020/2021 (July-September 2020) they scored as given below: Kiyunga HC IV scored 79%

Bukanga HC III scored 81.5%

Waibuga HC III scored 81.5%, Ikonja HC III scored 71.6%

Irongo HC III 84%

Ikumbya HC III 80.9%

Bukoova HC III scored 70.6%, and Average score =  $(549.1/7) = 78.4\%$

3

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

According to the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report, Luuka District the budget for the Health Development Grant was Ugx. 60,377,000, Ref: Page 18 of the APR.

From the Quarterly performance report, page 56, it was noted that Luuka District had budgeted for Ugx, 60,377,000 on upgrading of Bukendi HC II

This was 100% expenditure on the activities stipulated as per the health grant guideline.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

From sampled vouchers, certification of works for all Health Projects Contracts were done before payment to suppliers in FY 2019/2020. For instance;

Mpakibi Investments Ltd contracted to renovate Irongo HCII in Irongo S/C. Environment and Social certification form dated 12/07/2019 was signed by the District Engineer and District Environment Officer. Requisition dated 27/07/2019 raised by the contractor. Certificate No. 2 worth 4,909,724 dated 27/07/2019 was prepared by the District Engineer, verified by the Internal Auditor, and approved by the CAO on 28/07/2019. Payment worth Ugx. 4,909,722, Vr. No. 01834 was effected on 28/6/2019.

Mwayi Investments Ltd contracted to renovate Kiwalazi HCII in Irongo S/C. Requisition dated 28/07/2019 raised by the contractor. Certificate No. 2 worth 4,909,724 dated 28/07/2019 was prepared by the District Engineer, verified by the Internal Auditor, and approved by the CAO on 28/07/2019. Payment worth Ugx. 8,642,746, Vr. No. 03825 was effected on 28/07/2019.

However, from all payments, there was no evidence on certification of works by the Environment Officer on health projects before payments were made to suppliers, thus the LG scored zero.

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

Luuka District Local Government had One Health Infrastructure project i.e. at Construction of placenta pit at Ikubya HCII.

According to the contracts, the following were established construction of placenta pit at Ikubya HCII (Ikubya Sub-county) Reference No. Luuk593/Wrks/19-20/00009

Contract No LUUK/593/HLTH/PHC/19-20/001 with MoWT's estimates was UGX. 18,326,464, while contractors' estimates UGX. 17,996,500 with a variation of UGX. 329,964 equivalent to 1.8%.

Contractor: M/s. Generosity Investments Ltd.

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 Health Infrastructure project (construction of placenta pit at Ikubya HCII (Ikubya Sub-county), for the previous FY, was completed as per work plan/Consolidated procurement plan:

Contract agreement dated 16th January, 2020.

Commencement: 16th January, 2020, expected to end on 17th April 2020, however it was extended to 22nd June 2020.

Interim Certificate No.1, dated 11th March 2020.

LPO: Nil

Payment Issued on date 24th March 2020.

Voucher No: 7131

Substantial Certificate: 22nd June 2020

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Still under DLP.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure

- If above 90% score 2
- If 75% - 90%: score 1
- Below 75 %: score 0

Luuka District LG had approved staffing norm of 341 staff and a wage bill of 2, 242,624,513/=. At the time of assessment there were 205 staff on post. This meant a staffing level 60.1%



Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	We sought to establish whether the LG health infrastructure construction projects were as per the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs and assessed the following:
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0	<p>a) Construction of placenta pit at Ikubya HCII (Ikubya Sub-county)</p> <p>The placenta pit was complete and in use.</p> <p>Considering the works executed on the sub structure of the placenta pit, man-hole cover, wall finishes, were as per scope to the required quality and specifications.</p> <p>However for:</p> <p>b) Upgrade of Bukendi HCII to HC III (Bulongo sub-county)</p> <p>Construction works of Upgrade of Bukendi HCII to HC III (Bulongo sub-county) the project was generally behind schedule. There were other general observations:</p> <p>Floor needed fixing</p> <p>Some windows could effectively close</p> <p>Peeling of paint on the external walls especially on all corners</p> <p>Doors in latrine also required closing well</p> <p>Needed to label the latrines</p> <p>There were no vent on the placenta pit.</p>

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	At the time of assessment the DHO reported 43 filled positions at Kiyunga HC IV, 16 filled positions at Irongo HC III, and 14 filled positions at Bukoova HC III. Site visit and inspection of staff lists and duty rosters confirmed the staffing as provided on the payroll by the DHO. Number of staff on pay roll matched those on staff list and duty rosters found at health facilities
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Luuka district LG had only one (1) health facility upgraded from HC II to HC III during FY 2019/2020. Bukendi HC II was upgraded from H II status to HC III status. Construction works were not completed by the time of assessment</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment all the three sampled facilities; Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo HC III, and Bukoova HC III had no evidence to show that they had submitted their Annual Work Plans and budgets for FY 2019/20 to the DHO</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, the three sampled health facilities Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo HC III and Bukoova III had not submitted their approved Annual Budget Performance reports for FY 2019/20 to the DHO</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The three sampled health facilities; Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo HC III and Bukoova HC III had developed and submitted their Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to the DHO. Kiyunga IV had submitted on 13th October 2019, Irongo HC III and Bukoova HC III had submitted to DHO on 1th October 2020.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled health facilities Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo HC III and Bukoova HC III, had submitted their Monthly HMIS 105 for 12 months and quarterly HMIS 106 (a) 100% and timely 100% as required during FY 2019/2020.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>The sampled health facilities had submitted their RBF Claim invoices for Quarter I Fy 2020/21, ironically the DHO had endorsed the documents with dates that were after submission to Ministry of Health: Kiyunga HC IV 9th November 2020; Irongo HC III 12th November, Bukoova HC III 12th November 2020</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Luuka District LG had submitted the RBF claim invoices to Ministry of Health on 20th October 2020.</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was evidence that the Health Department submitted quarterly performance reports within the first month of the following quarter, as observed from the acknowledgement of receipts of planning documents. The Health Department submitted performance reports as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 was submitted on 11th October 2019</li> <li>• Quarter 2 was submitted on 10th January 2020</li> <li>• Quarter 3 was submitted on 9th April 2020</li> <li>• Quarter 4 was submitted on 3rd July 2020.</li> </ul>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Luuka DHO/DHT developed an approved PIP 2020/2021 for the weakest performing health facilities and had submitted to CAO on 29th September 2020.</p>	1

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Luuka district LG had implemented PIP for the weakest health facilities that had performed poorly in immunization during FY 2019/20. For instance, a report dated 30th September 2020 indicated that the Focal Person in-charge of Medicines and Supplies Management supervised 7 health facilities on issues of management of medicines that had been highlighted in the PIP for FY 2020/21. The facilities supervised included Waibuga HC III, Irongo HC III, Bukoova HC III, Ikumbya Hc III, Bukaya hC III, Ikonja HC III and Kiyunga HC IV.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

## Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Luuka District LG had approved staffing norm of 341 staff and a wage bill of 2, 242,624,513/=. At the time of assessment there were 205 staff on post. This meant a staffing level 60.1%</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</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>At time of assessment, Kiyunga HC IV had 43/49 (87.8%), Irongo HC III had 16/19 (84.2%) and Bukoova HC III had 14/19 (77.7%). All the three sampled health facilities scored above 75% staffing level.</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</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The list and duty rosters of staff found working in the sampled Health Facilities; Kiyunga HC IV, Irongo III, and Bukoova HC III matched with deployment lists and payroll list given by DHO for FY 2020/2021.</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</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>Luuka district LG had publicized health worker's deployed in Kiyunga hC IV, Irongo HC III, and Bukoova HC III during FY 2020/20221 on health facility notice boards.</p>	2

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

The LG provided a list of 20 Facility In-charges and provided annual performance appraisal reports for only 8 in-charges against the sample Minimum of 10 as follows.

1. Mr. Ssegonga Andrew a SCO in-charge Ikumbya HC III was appraised by Mr. Baraza Patrick a SACAO on 25/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and PAS on 26/7/2020 and 2/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.

2. Mr. Mukama Gideon a SMCO in-charge Waibuga HC III was appraised by DHO on 7/7/2020 and endorsed by the PAS on 10/7/2020

3. Mr. Orican Otwikende Immaculate a MCO in-charge Bukova HC III was appraised by the Kimumwe Peter a SMCO on 7/ 7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 8/7/2020 and the PAS on 15/7/2020

4. Ms. Nangobi Justine a MCO in-charge Irongo HC III was appraised by Mr. Bikaba Frank SMCO on 1/7/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH and PAS on 15/7/2020 and 18/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

5. Mr. Bikaba Frank a SMCO in-charge Bukendi HC III was last appraised by Dr. Wabwire Marthius Panyako 30/6/2018

6. Mr. Kimumwe Peter a SMCO in-charge Kiyunga HC IV was appraised by the DHO on 7/7/2020 and endorsed by the PAS on 10/7/2020 with overall performance rating indicated.

7. Mr. Isabirye Jacob a SMCO in-charge Ikonja HC III was last appraised by the DHO on 30/7/2019

8. Ms. Kadeero Ruth SMCO in-charge Bukanga HC III was appraised by the DHO on 24/6/2020 and endorsed by the pas on 16/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	<p>1. Ms. Matama Joyce an enrolled Nurse at Bukanga HC III was appraised by Kadeero Ruth a SMCO on 20/6/2020 and endorsed by ADHO-MCH and PAS on 13/7/2020 and 15/7/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>2. Ms. Ndyesinga Eva an Enrolled Nurse at was appraised by Mukama Gideon a SMCO on 4/7/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH and PAS on 13/7/2020 and 15//2020 with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>3. Ms. Nabwire Agatha an enrolled Nurse at was appraised by Mr. Otim Richard an Enrolled Nurse on 23/6/2020 and endorsed by SMCO and ADHO-MCH on 6/7/2020 and 13/7/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>4. Tapunangoyo Regina a Laboratory Assistant was appraised by Namusobya Carol a Lab Assist. on 4/7/2020 and endorsed by the SMCO and ADHO-MCH on 7/7/2020 and 13/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 3</p> <p>5. Ms. Talimwete Annetan Enrolled Midwife was appraised by 26/6/2020 and endorsed by the SMCO and PAS on 13/7/2020</p> <p>6. Mr. Mutema Enock, a Nursing Officer was appraised by Mr. Bateganya Magala Charles on 30/6/2020 and endorsed by SMCO on 7/7/2020 and ADHO-MCH on 13/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>7. Ms. Namusobya Carol a Laboratory Assistant was appraised by Mr. Mukama Gideon a SMCO on 4/7/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH on 13/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>8. Ms. Mawanda Nabirye Susn an Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Mr. Frnak Bikaba a SMCO on 1/7/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH and PAS on 7/9/2020 and 10/9/2020 with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>9. Ms. Namugugu Lydia an Enrolled Midwife was appraised by a Clinical Officer Dhakwota Stanely on 8/7/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH and PAS on 13/7/2020 and 15/7/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.</p> <p>10. Mr. Bateganya Magala Charles a Clinical Officer at was appraised by Kimumwe Peter a SMCO on 28/6/2020 and endorsed by the ADHO-MCH and PAS 7/6/2020 and 13/7/2020 with overall performance rating 5.</p>
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure		



8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of corrective actions taken based on the appraisal reports</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>Luuka District DHT did not conduct training of health workers- CPD in the AWP and Budget. However, the each of the 3 sampled health facilities had implemented internal CPD/CME during FY 2019/20 at least once fortnightly. For instance Kiyunga HC IV had conducted CME on TB case management on 17th June 2020; and Bukoova HC III had conducted CME for OPD staff on 5th June 2020 about "Filling in OPD register"</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no CPD database at the district.</p>	0

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence to show that the CAO Luuka district had informed the PS Ministry of Health the Health Facilities on PHC NWR grant for FY 2020/21.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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.

There was evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health Services in Line with Health Sector Guidelines.

Page 9 of the Health Facility PHC and guidelines stipulated that a maximum of 15% of the Non-Wage Recurrent Budget (excluding PHC Hospital NWR Grant) was to be used for monitoring and management of District/ Municipality health services.

From the LG approved budget estimates, page 18 the total allocated PHC NWR was Ugx. 255,002,000

Of which Ugx 179,032,000 was sent to Basic Health care services in HC IV, III and II, Ref. page 18 of the Approved budget estimates.

The balance of Ugx. 75,970,000 to the DHOs office

Page 21 of the Approved Annual Budget Estimates was Ugx. 20,000,000 management

Which was =  $(20,000,000/75,970,000) \times 100 = 26.3\%$

However, the LG spent more funds than the required percentage of a maximum of 15% of the PHC NWR on

monitoring service delivery.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence on when the LG warranted direct transfers to healthy facilities for the FY 2019/20.

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 funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence on the LG invoiced and communicated a breakdown of Primary Health Care Conditional Grant to all health facility in charges in lower Health facilities.</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 Luuka HC III had publicized quarterly financial releases to the health facilities during FY 2019/20</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>Luuka DHT had conducted quarterly Performance Review meetings for FY 2019/2020. Minute 5 of the quarterly review meeting held on 22nd January 2020, and Minute 7 of the quarterly review meeting held 19th November 2019 outlined activities/actions to be done as a way forward.</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>Quarterly Review meetings attendance lists included officers and entities such as in-charges of health facilities, DHO, DHI, DCCT, PACAO, SEO, DTLS, HI, Biostat, DHE,DCDO, EPI,-FP, EIM, CHAI, Sec Health, UNICEF representative</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>Support supervision by Luuka district DHT for FY 2019/20 was irregular as documented by reports and in the supervision books found at Kiyunga HC IV, Bukoova HC III and Irongo HC III</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no HSD reports to show that the HSD had conducted support supervision to lower health facilities.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Bukendi HC III had been reported to have poor public relations with the community. The MMS-FP had made a follow-up support supervision visit to Bunkendi HC III on 11th September 2019.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The MMS-focal Person reports dated 11th September 2019 indicated that health facilities had been supervised and advised on medicines. For instance, the medical store at Bukendi HC III was found disorganized, had no shelves and stock cards had been poorly managed. Corrective advice was given by the MMS-FP</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health office Budget to Health Promotion and Budget Prevention Activities.</p> <p>Page 7 of the grant guideline stipulated that a minimum of 30% of the non-wage should be allocated for community-based health promotion, education, and prevention programmes to workplaces, schools, vulnerable urban and rural communities.</p> <p>From the LG approved budget estimates, Ref; page 16 the total allocated of the PHC NWR was Ugx. 75,970,000.</p> <p>On page 22, the total budget spent on promotion and prevention activities (immunization) estimates was Ugx. 25,421,000.</p> <p>Which was <math>(25,421,000/75,970,000) \times 100 = 33.5\%</math></p> <p>This was within the allowable 30% that was spent on promotion and prevention activities.</p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>A report dated 10th July 2019 indicated that the ADHO-EH had conducted support supervision covering health facilities, schools and inspected Luuka Town Council. He had advised on garbage collection, maintenance of buildings and sanitation in households. He had visited EMRA Junior School and advised on sanitation issues, personal hygiene of students especially menstrual hygiene.</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>There was no documented evidence to show follow up actions in personal hygiene.</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>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>Luuka District LG Health Sector had no Assets register apart from Inventory register for medical equipment</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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DDP Plan highlighted broader activities which included health sub-Districts supplied, staff houses constructed, PMTCT sites constructed, PNFP facilities supported, equipment to health centres supplied, health centres constructed, Solar systems established from which the following investment projects were extracted; Ref page 70 of the DDP II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bukendi HC III Building Construction budgeted at 35,377,00 was incorporated into the workplan on pages 45 and 21 of the approved budget estimates page 21</li> <li>• Busiuro Health Center II budgeted at Ugx. 3,748,000 pages 61 of the workplan and 19 of the budget estimates</li> </ul> <p>There was no evidence on desk appraisal by the LG on sector development grants by the time of the assessment.</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>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence indicating that health AWP investments were field appraised for environmental and social acceptability</p>	0

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was 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 checklists however the CDO had not signed on the screening forms, ESIA and ESMP reports yet they are required to endorse on the forms with the Environment Officer. For example;

i. Construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya Health Center III in Ikumbya sub county. Screening forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. . Construction of placenta pit at Ikumbya sub county endorsed by Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. ESIA prepared by Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. Some of the elements from the ESIA were: Destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Clearing the project site.

ESMP: Environment component affected, land degradation. Nature of Environment concern: Destruction of vegetation, fuel wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bear ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees especially kiapples or chogm. Flowers and grass. Leveling ground. Cost of mitigation: UGX 735,000. Work done: Growing trees, flowers and green grass around the completed buildings done. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of the debris done. Person responsible: Environment Officer, District Engineer, DHO, Contractor.

iv. Upgrade of Bukendi Health Center II to Health Center III in Bulobgo sub county. Screening forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. ESIA prepared by Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. Some of the elements from the ESIA were: Destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Clearing the project site.

ESMP: Environment component affected, land degradation. Nature of Environment concern: Destruction of vegetation, fuel wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bear ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees especially kiapples or chogm. Flowers and grass. Leveling ground. Cost of mitigation: UGX 735,000. Work done: Growing trees, flowers and green grass around the completed buildings done. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of the debris done. Person responsible: Environment Officer, District Engineer, DHO, Contractor. Therefore the LG scored zero.

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>Submission letters to the PDU/memos available submitted on 10th April 2020.</p> <p>The AWP was available. Example include:</p> <p>a) Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at Butogonya HCII. S. No. 1 page 2</p> <p>b) Fencing of Kiyunga HC IV. S. No. 4 page 2</p> <p>c) Renovation of Nantamali HCII. S. No. 5 page 2</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Submission letters to the PDU/memos available submitted on 10th April 2020.</p> <p>The AWP was available. Example include:</p> <p>a) Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at Butogonya HCII. S. No. 1 page 2</p> <p>b) Fencing of Kiyunga HC IV. S. No. 4 page 2</p> <p>c) Renovation of Nantamali HCII. S. No. 5 page 2</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 01st Minutes of the District Contracts Committee Meeting held on 2nd 28th October 2019 in the PDU offices.</p> <p>Approval : Min 05/DCC/10/2019</p> <p>There was only health one construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya HCIII (Ikumbya sub-county)</p> <p>Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2019-20/00009.</p> <p>Min 04/DCC/12/2019(t)</p> <p>The Solicitor General letter not required .</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:</p> <p>(i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The PIT was not constituted as there was no evidence.</p>	0



<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>Not all infrastructure health projects followed the standard technical designs provided by the M0H and those designs and BOQs provided by the LG Engineer</p> <p>Sampled project:</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>c) Construction of placenta pit at Ikubya HCII (Ikubya Sub-county)</p> <p>The placenta pit was complete and in use.</p> <p>Considering the works executed on the sub structure of the placenta pit, man-hole cover, wall finishes, were as per scope to the required quality and specifications.</p> <p>d) Upgrade of Bukendi HCII to HC III (Bulongo sub-county)</p> <p>Construction works of Upgrade of Bukendi HCII to HC III (Bulongo sub-county) the project is generally behind schedule. There are other general observations:</p> <p>Floor need fixing</p> <p>Some windows can effectively close</p> <p>Peeling of paint the external walls especially on all corners</p> <p>Doors in latrine also require closing well</p> <p>Need to label the latrines</p> <p>There no vent on the placenta pit</p>
--	---	---

<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>Progress report for the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 30th August 2019; 2nd April 2020;</p> <p>Minutes of site meeting the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 18th June 2019; 17th April 2019. Members present included PAS, Ag DE, Contractor, Senior Procurement officer, LC5 Councilor, Ag DCDO, DHO.</p> <p>Minutes of site meeting the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 17th April 2019. Members present DE, DHO, DNRO, Contractor, DCDO, RDC, Secretary for social service- Baker Luwana, CAO, etc.</p>
--	---	--

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Minutes of site meeting the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 18th June 2019; 17th April 2019. Members present included PAS, Ag DE, Contractor, Senior Procurement officer, LC5 Councillor, Ag DCDO, DHO.</p> <p>Minutes of site meeting the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 17th April 2019. Members present DE, DHO, DNRO, Contractor, DCDO, RDC, Secretary for social service- Baker Luwana, CAO, etc.</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>Minutes of site meeting the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III held on site dated 17th April 2019. Members present DE, DHO, DNRO, Contractor, DCDO, RDC, Secretary for social service- Baker Luwana, CAO, etc.</p> <p>Progress report for the construction of Upgrade of Bukendi Health Centre II to III by the DE to the CAO dated 30th August 2019, 17th December 2019; 2nd April 2020</p>	1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

From sampled vouchers, there was evidence that the DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors as highlighted below;

Mpakibi Investments Ltd contracted to renovate Irongo HCII in Irongo S/C. Requisition dated 27/07/2019 raised by the contractor. Certificate No. 2 worth 4,909,724 dated 27/07/2019 was prepared by the District Engineer, verified by the Internal Auditor, and approved by the CAO on 28/07/2019. Requisition for payment was prepared and forwarded by the DHO on 28/07/2019. Payment worth Ugx. 4,909,722, Vr. No. 01834 was effected on 28/7/2019.

Mwayi Investments Ltd contracted to renovate Kiwalazi HCII in Irongo S/C. Requisition dated 28/07/2019 raised by the contractor. Certificate No. 2 worth 4,909,724 dated 28/07/2019 was prepared by the District Engineer, verified by the Internal Auditor, and approved by the CAO on 28/07/2019. Requisition for payment was prepared and forwarded by the DHO on 28/07/2019. Payment worth Ugx. 8,642,746, Vr. No. 03825 was effected on 28/07/2019.

The DHO initiated the payments within one working day, hence the LG was compliant in this area.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Procurement file for health infrastructure projects for the previous FY was complete. For instance:

construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya HCIII (Ikumbya sub-county)

Procurement Ref No Luuk593/wrks/2019-20/00009.

Min 04/DCC/12/2019(t)

Advert: 29th October 2019

Type of bid: ODB dated 29th October 2019

Closing on 18th November 2019.

Date for Opening: 18th November 2019.

Display: 3rd December 2019

Removal of Display: 16th December 2019

Requisition forms PPF1: 10th September 2019

The Evaluation report: 25th November 2019

BEB Notice: 3rd December 2019

Letter of Bid Acceptance: 17th December 2019

Bidder's acceptance: 17th December 2019

The contractor: Generosity Investments Ltd

Contract agreement: 9th March 2020

Contract sum: 17,996,500.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework because there was no grievance redress committee. Therefore the LG scored zero.

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had Disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities in FY 2019-2020 Out</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider). Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. That is to say construction of placenta pit at Ikumbya Health Center III Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability. The assessment team was informed that land surveying was on going but there was no documentation to prove so. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for FY 2019-2020 projects under Health department for example;</p> <p>i. Renovation of OPD at Kiwalazi Health Center II in Irongo sub county. ii. Renovation of OPD at Irongo Health Center II in Irongo sub county.</p> <p>iii. Construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya Health Center III in Ikumbya sub county.</p> <p>iv. Upgrade of Bukendi Health Center II to Health Center III in Bulobgo sub county. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence of environment and social mitigation certification forms completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer Musenero Bernard prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects. However the CDO had not signed yet it was a requirement for both Environment Officer and CDO therefore the LG scored zero for example;

i. Compliance certification forms completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard for renovation of OPD at Kiwalazi Health Center III by M/s Mwayi Investments. Certificate dated 8th May 2020. Project activities: Opening the ground, construction. Negative Environment and social impacts: Soil erosion, destruction of vegetation, trees and grass leading to loss of habitat for animals. Mitigation measures: Leveling the project site, clearing of site. Project implementation progress: The project site was cleared. Environment Officer Musenero Bernard recommended for payments.

ii. Compliance certification forms completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard for renovation of OPD at Irongo Health Center III by M/s Mpakiza. Certificate dated 8th May 2020. Project activities: Opening the ground, construction. Negative Environment and social impacts: Soil erosion, destruction of vegetation, trees and grass leading to loss of habitat for animals. Mitigation measures: Leveling the project site, clearing of site. Project implementation progress: The project site was cleared. Environment Officer Musenero Bernard recommended for payments.

iii. Compliance certification forms completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard for construction of OPD at Bukendi Health Center III by M/s Green Heat Investments. Certificate dated 25th June 2020. Officer Musenero Bernard recommended for payments.

iv. Compliance certification forms completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard for construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya Health Center III by M/s. Generosity Investments. Certificate dated 14th May 2020. Officer Musenero Bernard recommended for payments.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS sector data report, it was observed that Luuka DLG had rural water source functionality percentage of 96% ( Water summary 2019/2020	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	From Water and Sanitation committee FY 2019/20 from the Ministry of Water and Environment , it was observed that Luuka DLG had established 610 Water and Sanitation committees out of which only 493 WSCs were functional translating to $(942/1004)*100=80.82\%$	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.  If LG average scores is  a. Above 80% score 2  b. 60 -80%: 1  c. Below 60: 0  (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Not applicable	0



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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

o If 100 % of water projects are  
implemented in the targeted S/Cs:  
Score 2

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

There was evidence that Luuka DLG planned and budgeted for water projects during FY 2019/20 in sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average- In the AWP and budget FY 2019/2020 dated 29th July, 2019 reference CR/209/1, the LG planned to drill 07 number Boreholes at estimated budget of Ugx.180,730,191 issue 2.4 and construction of piped water supply system (water reservoir tank) at Ugx.200,659,756 issue 2.8 in the following sub counties;

Ikumbya sub county 66 %

Irongo sub county 88 %

Nawampiti sub county 95%

Bukooma sub county 57%

Bukanga sub county 80%

Waibuga sub county 92

The district average safe water access by the end of the FY 2018/19 was at 77%

In the fourth quarter progress report FY 2019/20 dated 4th August, 2020 in the budget expenditure indicated Ugx.325,090,079 of the development budget spent and it was observed that all the four projects planned in sub counties below the district average access had been implemented leading to,

$$(4/4)*100= 100\%$$

Therefore, LG had 100% implementation rate to the above water sources projects.

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

For the sampled projects the following  
observations were recorded concerning;

The engineers' estimate and the contract price'

- Construction of 4- stance lined VIP latrine with a bathroom Waibuga RGC); Engineers' estimate was Ugx.17,731,539. the contract price was UGX.17,700,000. variation was Ugx. -31,539 equivalent to  $(-31,539/17,731,539)*100$

$$= 0.18\%$$

- Siting, drilling, pump testing, and water quality analysis of 07 boreholes, Engineers' estimate was Ugx.136,470,356 the contract

price was UGX.136,072,880 variation was  
Ugx.-397,476 equivalent to  
 $397,476/136,470,356 \times 100$

= 0.3%

- Construction of 43 cubic meters water reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC in Bukooma sub county.

the engineers' estimate was Ugx.190,659,756,  
the contract price was Ugx.190,459,469 with a  
variation of

Ugx.-200,287 equivalent to  
 $200,287/190,659,756 \times 100 = 0.11\%$ .

- Casting of borehole platforms and installation of 11 boreholes.

the engineers' estimate was Ugx.13,418,266,  
the contract price was Ugx.13,404,800 with a  
variation of

Ugx.13,466 equivalent to  
 $(13,466/13,418,266) \times 100 = 0.1\%$ .

- Procurement and supply of borehole parts and spares

the engineers' estimate was Ugx.44,961,670,  
the contract price was Ugx.44,953,700 with a  
variation of

Ugx.7,970 equivalent to (-  
 $7,970/44,961,670 \times 100 = 0.02\%$ .

Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since all  
the variations in the contracts were within +/-  
20%

The negative meant that the Engineers'  
estimate was higher than the cost quoted by  
the contractors.

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>There was evidence that all of WSS infrastructure projects were completed as per the annual work plan by the end of the FY as observed from;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fourth quarter progress report of FY2019/2020 dated 4th August 2020 page 3 of 3, issue 2.4 indicated that the DWO planned 07 boreholes at a cost ugx. 180,730,191 and achieved 07 boreholes at a cost of ugx. 137,365,365, making 100% achievement. The fourth quarter progress report FY 2019/20 dated 4th August, 2020 page 3 of 3, issue 1.1 indicated 100% construction of public latrine at an expenditure of Ugx.18,731,539.</li> <li>Completion report on construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine with urinal at Waibuga RGC dated 26th May, 2020 by Makinabu Yahaya, DWO</li> <li>Certificate of completion dated 19th December, 2019 by DWO for the procurement and supply of borehole hand pump parts and spares.</li> <li>Completion report on siting, drilling, pump testing, and water quality analysis of 07 boreholes dated 22nd April, 2020 by DWO</li> </ul>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>From the MWE MIS data on functionality of water sources, it was observed that during FY 2018/19, Luuka DLG registered water source functionality of 96% and in FY 2019/20, the functionality was 87% leading to;</p> <p><math>(87-96)\%/96\%*100 = -9.4\%</math> decrease in the water source functionality.</p>	0
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>From the MWE MIS data on functionality of water sources, it was observed that during FY 2018/19, Luuka DLG registered water source functionality of 96% and in FY 2019/20, the functionality was 87% leading to;</p> <p><math>(87-96)\%/96\%*100 = -9.4\%</math> decrease in the water source functionality.</p>	1

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>3</p> <p>There was evidence that DWO had accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities was as reported according to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On field visits for the sampled completed projects for FY 2019/20 revealed the following;</li> </ul> <p>Item (s/no.2.1) the reservoir 43m3 nominal capacity on 15m steel tower of the measurement sheet was seen</p> <p>Item (s/no.4.1) a chain-link fence line of 50 by 50 mm galvanized all-round the tank was seen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress report on construction of four (4) stance lined pit latrine with urinal at Waibuga RGC dated 21st April, 2020 by DWO</li> <li>Progress report on construction of reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC dated 22nd May, 2020 by DWO</li> <li>Second progress report on construction of reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC by M/s Virmar technical investments Ltd in the FY 2019/2020 dated 11th June, 2020 by DWO</li> </ul>
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>2</p> <p>There was evidence that Luuka LG DWO collects and compiles quarterly information on sanitation facilities;</p> <p>The following were quarterly reports availed for verification;</p> <p>Quarter one (1) report dated 31st October,2019</p> <p>Quarter two (2) report dated 23rd January,2020</p> <p>Quarter three (3) report dated 4th August,2020</p> <p>Quarter four (4) report dated 4th August,2020</p> <p>On 13th June,2020 a report of Namadope source in Waibuga sub county was seen</p> <p>On 29th May, 2020, a report of Kyanvuma source in Irongo sub county was seen</p> <p>On 9th March, 2020 a report of Buyemba source in Irongo sub county was seen</p> <p>On 30th June, 2020 a report of Nairika-Bwalilizo source in Bukooma sub county was seen</p>

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>MIS data report on new Boreholes on form 1 and 4 was submitted on 17th August, 2020 to PS MWE and a copy of receipt was seen. Some of the sources submitted included;</p> <p>On 13th June,2020 a report of Namadope source in Waibuga sub county was seen</p> <p>On 29th May, 2020, a report of Kyanvuma source in Irongo sub county was seen</p> <p>On 9th March, 2020 a report of Buyemba source in Irongo sub county was seen</p> <p>On 30th June, 2020 a report of Nairika-Bwalilizo source in Bukooma sub county was seen</p> <p>The LG could not be scored because only one report for one quarter was availed.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the Assessment team to verify that Luuka DLG held LLG assessment during the FY 2019/20</p>	0

## Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO had budgeted for its departmental staff.</p> <p>In the Annual work plan and approved budget for FY 2019/20 page 17 PBS dated 29th July, 2019 under Water supply development budget, amount equivalent to Ugx.21,077,000 for the water staff wages.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>No information was availed for verification</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was some evidence that the district water office staff were appraised as only one appraisal was seen as below.</p> <p>Kayeyera Benard, Position BMT appraised for the period 1st July, 2019 to 30th June, 2020 by Eng. Makinabu Yahaya position; District water officer on 24th October, 2020</p> <p>Out of four water staff members, only one staff was appraised at the time of the assessment hence the score of zero</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>No information was availed to the assessment team for verification</p>	0

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

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

According to the MWE Luuka DLG had average safe water coverage during FY 2019/20 at 78% and in the AWP FY 2020/2021 dated 22nd October, 2020 page 3 of 3, the following sub counties were planned and budgeted with a total annual development budget of Ugx.749,819,369,

Irongo sub county at 88% with Ugx.51,637,198,

Ikumbya sub county at 66% with Ugx. 51,637,198,

Waibunga sub county at 92% with Ugx.25,818,599,

Nawampiti sub county at 95% with Ugx. 51,637,198,

Bukanga sub county at 80% with Ugx.77,455,797

Bulongo sub county at 95% with Ugx. 51,637,198,

Bukooma sub county at 57% with

Ugx. 51,637,198, plus Ugx.276,026,657 for completion of piped water scheme at Bukoova RGC giving a total development allocation of Ugx.637,487,039 out of which Ugx.379,301,053 was allocated to sub counties below the district average access coverage

Leading to  $(379,301,053/637,487,039) \times 100 = 59.5\%$  budget allocation.

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO carried out launch of boreholes for FY 2019/2020 for all the sub counties that were intended to guide the planning process especially in allocation of WATSAN facilities to the different sub counties. This was captured in a report dated 30th October, 2019

Minutes of site meeting for construction of 43m<sup>3</sup> water reservoir for Bukoova piped water system held on 12th March, 2020 at the site (Bukoova RGC) where brief by the project manager and contractor were given under Minute 5/12/3/2020. It evolved the community, project manager, CAO, RDC, Contractor and the other associates.

No information was displayed on the main notice board and the LLGs notice board

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the district Water Office had monitored the WSS facilities at least quarterly .</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted One (1) quarterly DWSCC meeting and was verified in the following reports;</p> <p>Under minute 6/30/1/20 on page 2, the DWSCC meeting was held on 30th January, 2020 and the following issues were raised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of reports by partners and departments on water and sanitation activities from third quarter report dated 4th August, 2020.</li> </ul>	2
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer had publicized budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties.</p>	0



10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO allocated budget to the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities as follows;</p> <p>In approved Annual work plan and budget FY 2019/20 page 2 of 3, the following was observed,</p> <p>NWR was equivalent to Ugx.30,886,066,</p> <p>Issue 6, Software activities allocated Ugx.8,780,600 ,</p> <p>Issue 4, Monitoring and supervision allocated Ugx.4,451,400 page 1 of 3,</p> <p>Issue 1, Stakeholder coordination was allocated ugx.5,030,836</p> <p>Therefore, the total budget allocated Ugx.18,262,836 was equivalent to Ugx. 30,886,066 giving <math>(18,262,836/30,886,066)*100</math></p> <p>=59.13%.</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team to verify that the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer had trained WSCs on their roles on OEM of WSS facilities during FY2019/20. However, a report on training of new water user committees for FY 2019/2020 dated 17th November, 2019 by Kigenyi Asifu, ADWO-Mobilization was seen</p>	0

## Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team to verify the existence of an up-to date assets register.</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>b. Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all water projects were derived from the LGDP and were eligible for expenditure because Luuka district had no Development Plan (DDP) by the time of assessment.</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>There was evidence that all budgeted investments for current FY had completed applications from beneficiary communities as observed below;</p> <p>Application dated 10th September, 2019 for Nawaka A source in Ikumbya sub county requesting for Boreholes,</p> <p>Application dated 14th November, 2019 for Kazigo source in Irongo sub county,</p> <p>Application dated 11th September, 2018 for Kirimwa A source in Bukooma sub county.</p> <p>Application dated 11th September, 2018 for Budoma B source in Bukanga sub county.</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>There was no evidential to prove 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.</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>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY 2020-2020 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 because some of the environmental activity processes were still ongoing. For FY projects included drilling of fourteen (14) boreholes for example drilling of boreholes at Kirabagulu in Bukanga sub county, Lwanika in Wainuga sub county, Ikonja-Busige in Nawanpiti sub county, construction of two public latrines in rural growth centers. Therefore the LG scored zero.</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 infrastructure</p> <p>Investments for FY 2019/20 were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan prepared on 23rd October, 2019, reference CR/105/1 approved by PPDA on, 25th October, 2019 page 1</p> <p>Siting, drilling and water quality testing of 07 deep Boreholes.</p> <p>Construction of reservoir tank for supply of water to serve Bukooma RGC</p> <p>Construction of four stance lined pit latrine at Waibuga RGC</p> <p>Casting and installation of 11 borehole platforms</p> <p>Procurement and supply of hand pump parts and spares for 11 boreholes.</p>	2

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

b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction  
Score 2:

There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for FY2019/20 were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as verified from the following Contract Committee minutes;

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

- Contract committee meeting held on 2nd December, 2019, minute number; min04/DCC/12/2019(h), approving the evaluation report for construction of 43m3 water reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC in Bukooma sub county.
- Contract committee meeting held on 2nd December, 2019, minute number; min04/DCC/12/2019(q), approving the evaluation report for construction of a four stance lined pit latrine at Waibuga RGC in Waibuga sub county.
- Contract committee meeting held on 2nd December, 2019, minute number; min04/DCC/12/2019(a), approving the evaluation report for siting, drilling, pump testing and water quality analysis of 07 Boreholes.
- Contract committee meeting, held on 2nd December, 2019, minute number; min04/DCC/12/2019(0), approving the evaluation report for casting and installation, of borehole platforms (11 Boreholes).
- Contract committee meeting held on 2nd December, 2019, minute number; min04/DCC/12/2019(l) approving the evaluation report for procurement and supply of borehole hand pump parts and spares.

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

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

There was no evidence that the District Water Officer established the Project Implementation team as required.

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled at

- Waibuga RGC in Waibuga Sub county had Gauge 28 roof cover as specified in the measurement sheet (Sn.3 Element C).
- The Bore hole water sources were to be constructed with a drainage channel that is about three (3) metres long as required in the B.O.Q
- On field visits for the water tank reservoir at Bukoova RGC in Bukooma sub county, the Item (s/no.2.1) the reservoir 43m3 nominal capacity on 15m steel tower of the measurement sheet and Item (s/no.4.1) a chain-link fence line of 50 by 50 mm galvanized all-round the tank were seen

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the relevant technical officers in Luuka DLG carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as observed from the following site reports;

- Progress report on construction of reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC by DWO dated 22nd May, 2020.
- Second progress report on construction of reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC by m/s Virmar technical investments Ltd in the FY 2019/2020 dated 11th June, 2020 by DWO
- Progress report on construction of one 4-stance pit latrine with urinal at Waibuga RGC dated 21st April, 2020 by DWO.
- Fourth quarter annual report dated 4th August, 2020

<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated 100% payments of contractors as follows ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For construction of 43m3 water reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC in Bukooma sub county by Virmar technical investments Ltd, requisition was raised on 18th May, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 22nd May, 2020, taking two days, IPC raised on 22nd May, 2020, Voucher number 03/5/2020 and receipt number 0015 dated 28th May, 2020 was seen.</li> <li>For construction of a four stance lined pit latrine at Waibuga RGC in Waibuga sub county by Mukumuta Enterprises (U) Ltd, a requisition was raised on 29th April, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 26th May, 2020, taking only (1) day IPC raised on 26th May, 2020 voucher number 01/5/2020 and receipt number 11059 dated 29th May, 2020 was seen.</li> <li>For siting, drilling, pump testing and water quality analysis of 07 boreholes by Sharda drilling (U) Ltd, a requisition was raised on 27th March, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 22nd April, 2020, taking only (1) day IPC raised on 22nd April, 2020 voucher number 09/4/2020 and receipt number 053 dated 24th April, 2020 was seen</li> <li>For casting and installation of boreholes platforms (11 boreholes) by Bato NK technical consult (U) Ltd, a requisition was raised on 7th April, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 8th April, 2020, taking only (1) day IPC raised on 8th April, 2020 voucher number 01/4/2020 and receipt number 121 dated 15th April, 2020 was seen</li> </ul> <p>All payment were executed within the required timeframe of thirty (30) days.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The assessment team was able to see the complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law as given below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For construction of 43m3 water reservoir tank at Bukoova RGC in Bukooma sub county, procurement reference number; Luuka/wrks/19-20/00015, date of advert was 29th October, 2019 in the daily monitor newspaper, bid issue on 18th November, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th November, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th November, 2019</li> </ul>
---	---	--

Evaluation report on the bid was 25th November, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd December, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 2nd December, 2019.

- For construction of a four stance lined pit latrine at Waibuga RGC in Waibuga sub county, procurement reference number; Luuk593/wrks/19-20/00012, date of advert was 29th October, 2019 in the daily monitor newspaper, bid issue on 18th November, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th November, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th November, 2019

Evaluation report on the bid was 25th November, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd December, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 2nd December, 2019.

- For siting, drilling, pump testing and water quality analysis of 07 boreholes, procurement reference number; Luuka/wrks/19-20/00001, date of advert was 29th October, 2019 in the daily monitor newspaper, bid issue on 18th November, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th November, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th November, 2019

Evaluation report on the bid was 25th November, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd December, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 2nd December, 2019.

- For casting and installation of boreholes platforms (11 boreholes), procurement reference number; Luuk.593/wrks/2019-20/00014, date of advert was 29th October, 2019 in the daily monitor newspaper, bid issue on 18th November, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th November, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th November, 2019

Evaluation report on the bid was 25th November, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd December, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 3rd December, 2019.

- For procurement and supply of borehole hand pump parts and spares, procurement reference number; Luuk593/supp/19-20/00001, date of advert was 29th October, 2019 in the daily monitor newspaper, bid issue on 18th November, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th November, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th November, 2019

Evaluation report on the bid was 25th November, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd December, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 3rd

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported a water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework, therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented as were presented in the Social Management Plans for example; Planting of trees at least two, East and West of the water sources was done during the first rains of April 2019 and affected grounds were leveled.</p>	3



Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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 of a letters of agreement for safe water source construction and access by community users for example;

i. Letter dated 14th February 2020 between Mr. Ngobi Badiru and Luuka District for which the land owner willingly and at no cost provided a piece of land of size 20ft by 30ft square feet located on Namadope in Waibuga sub county. The agreement stated that the owner shall allow the community after construction to access and fetch water without consequent demand for payment. The letter was signed by the land owner and the Chairperson water user committee Bakowe Dilimusanga endorsed by the CAO Moses Wangalya on behalf of Luuka District on 15th March 2020.

ii. Letter dated 13th February 2020 between Mr. Mudhiga James and Luuka District for which the land owner willingly and at no cost provided a piece of land of size 20ft by 30ft square feet located on Kyanvuma in Irongo sub county. The agreement stated that the owner shall allow the community after construction to access and fetch water without consequent demand for payment. The letter was signed by the land owner and the Chairperson water user committee Mukwana Azedi endorsed by the CAO Moses Wangalya on behalf of Luuka District on 15th March 2020.

iii. Letter dated 24th January 2020 between Ms. Kyakuwaile Elizabeth and Luuka District for which the land owner willingly and at no cost provided a piece of land of size 20ft by 30ft square feet located on Nawanyago in Ikumbya sub county. The agreement stated that the owner shall allow the community after construction to access and fetch water without consequent demand for payment. The letter was signed by the land owner and the Chairperson water user committee Batambule Pea endorsed by the CAO Moses Wangalya on behalf of Luuka District on 15th March 2020.

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Environment and Social certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer Musenero Bernard prior to payments of contractor invoices/ certificates at interim and final stages of projects however the certificates were not endorsed by the CDO yet the indicator required both Environment Officer and CDO to endorse for example;</p> <p>i.Environment and Social certificate dated 31st March 2020 issued to M/s Maa Technologies Limited for drilling boreholes at Bukubembe zone, Kyanvuma, Buyoola-Nakyere, Namadope site locations. Some of the mitigation measures identified were: Leveling of the borrow pits, Planting of trees, Making land agreements with the land owners. Implementation progress: Leveling of the project area, trees were planted, land agreements with Land owners were obtained. The Environment Officer Musenero Bernard recommended that Environment and social issues were complied with so final payments be made. Since the CDO did not endorse on the form, the LG scored zero.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the CDO and environment Officers</p> <p>Undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance With ESMPs; and provide monthly reports. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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 no evidence of available data on irrigated land for the last two FYs since the grant was started this FYI	0
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	There was no evidence of increased acreage on newly irrigated land, Since LG was just starting the irrigation programme there was no record for previous year	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:  • Above 70%; score 4  • 60 – 69%; score 2  • Below 60%; score 0  Maximum score 4	There was no evidence of any score in micro scale irrigation for LLG, the grant was rolled out this financial year and activities were just kicking off	0
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	na	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	na	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the variation in contract price and Engineer's estimate was within +/-20% since the procurement process had not started	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 no evidence that contracts were signed for MSI equipments during the previous FY since the procurement had not started	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	The LG had recruited 16 extension workers at LLGs against the 48 workers as per the staffing structure thus 33%	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence of installed micro scale irrigation systems during last FY since there was no grant for this activity	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of equipment installed during the FY 2019/20 .</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information on position of extension workers filled was accurate. This is because when the assessor visited the 3 sampled LLGs of Waibuga, Bukanga and Bulongo the following findings were made.</p> <p>1. At Waibuga S/C, the assessor found only Hajji Kayongo Salim the chairperson LC3 in office and he could not provide the staffing information</p> <p>2. At Bukanga S/C only the porter Mr. Galubale John was in office and he could not provide the necessary information for assessment.</p> <p>3. At Bulongo S/C, Mr. Kasango Ivan was available but he stated that the attendance records, quarterly reports and staff lists were all locked up in the SAS' office.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the information on micro scale irrigation system installed and functionality was accurate, there was no inventory of the equipment</p>	0

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land since there was no any irrigation activities running</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG entered upto date LLG information into MIS and hit the target Of 395 according to MIS report generated on 12th/07/2020</p>	1
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG prepared quarterly report using information compiled from LLG in the MIS; 1st Quarter report FY 2020/2021 dated 27th/11/2020 compiled by Isabirye Ali the DAE</p>	1
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of developed approved performance improvement plan and therefore no implementation was done</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of developed approved performance improvement plan and therefore no implementation was done	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 evidence that the LG budgeted for extension workers as per the Departmental work plan 2020/2021 and production staff list of 31st/08/2020 prepared by the DPO Musenero Richard	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	The LG did not deploy extension workers as per guidelines. The LG had only filled up to 22 out of 54 workers thus 41% of positions	0
	Maximum score 6			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not provide information to find evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed. When the assessor visited the 3 sampled LLGs of Waibuga, Bukanga and Bulongo the following findings were made.</p> <p>1. At Waibuga S/C, the assessor found only Hajji Kayongo Salim the chairperson LC3 in office and he could not provide the staffing information</p> <p>2. At Bukanga S/C only the porter Mr. Galubale John was in office and he could not provide the necessary information for assessment.</p> <p>3. At Bulongo S/C, Mr. Kasango Ivan was available but he stated that the attendance records, quarterly reports and staff lists were all locked up in the SAS' office</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The extension workers deployment had not been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board.</p>	0
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>The LG appraised Extension workers as follows.</p> <p>1. Mr. Irera Bosco a Fisheries officer at at Bukanga S/C was last appraised by Tezikya Ruth Aquaculture by the SAS on 30/6/2019</p> <p>2. Dr. Batyani James a Principal Vet. Officer at Luuka District Water Officer was last appraised by Dr. Musena Aggrey a Principal Agriculture Officer on 30/6/2019</p> <p>3. Mr. Mukama Geoffrey at Bulongo S/C was last</p>	0



appraised by the SAS on  
16/1/2018

4. Mr. Muyanja Wilberforce an  
Assistant Vet. Officer at  
Waibuga S/C was last  
appraised by Dr. Batyani James  
a Senior Vet. Officer on  
30/6/2017

5. Mr. Nsubuga Patrick an  
Animal Husbandry Officer at  
Luuka Town Council was last  
appraised by Mr. Maganda  
Siragi, the Town Clerk on  
30/6/2020

6. Mr. Kubeketerya Isaac and  
Animal Husbandry officer at  
Nawampiti S/C was last  
appraised by SAS on 20/8/2018

7. Mr. Misiri Stephen a Vet.  
Officer at Bukanga S/C was last  
appraised by Mr. Tezikya Ruth  
a SAS on 30/6/2020

8. Mr. Nsubuga Patrick a an  
Animal Husbandry Officer at  
Luuka T/C was last appraised  
by Mr. Maganda Siragi the  
T/Clerk on 30/6/2019

9. Mr. Tamukedde Richard a  
Senior Fisheries Officer at  
Luuka District Head Quarters  
was last appraised by the Ag.  
DPMO on 3/7/2019

10. Mr. Tigawalana Stephen a  
an Animal Husbandry Officer at  
the District Headquarters was  
last appraised by Dr. Batyani  
James aPVO on 30/6/2018.

8

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

Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator  
has;

Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence of  
action taken from the appraisal  
reports.

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 the training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level as indicated in the training report of 5th/10/2020 compiled by DAE Isabirye Ali, and the attendance register of 25th/08/2020</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that training activities were documented in the training data base</p>	0

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the performance contract the LG had allocated Ugx. 94,267,000 to production and marketing department, Ref: page 13 of the APR.</p> <p>The LG allocated funds worth Ugx. 51,096,000 to awareness creation, training and expression of interest, Ref: pages 44 to 48 of the AWP.</p> <p>From above information, the Micro Scale Grant were all allocated to complementary services.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had budgeted for Ugx. 94,267,000 to production and marketing department, Ref: page 13 of the APR.</p> <p>Out of which Ugx. 51,096,000 was allocated to awareness creation, training and expression of interest, Ref: pages 44 to 48 of the AWP.</p> <p>Which was  <math>(51,096,000/94,267,000) * 100 = 54\%</math></p> <p>The 54% which was allocated was complementary services and was in line with the guidelines.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that co—funding was reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the DPO monitored on monthly basis the installed micro scale irrigation equipment. There were no equipment installed since the grant was just starting</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG oversaw technical training and support to the approved farmers since the grant was just starting and no farmers had been approved</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG provided hands on support to the LLG extension workers</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG established and ran farmer field schools</p>	0
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per the radio talk show receipt N0 6987 hosted on Kamuli Broad casting services on 30/09/2020 , attendance lists of 16th/07/2020, 23th/07/2020, 4th/08/2020 for parish frmers sensitization meetings conducted by extension workers</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District trained staff and sensitised political leaders at LG and LLG levels, this is captured from training report of 14th /10/2020 compiled by Isabirye Ali the DAE. Further evidence was captured from the attendance lists of 13st/10/2020, 23rd/09/2020, 25th/09/2020</p>	2

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG keeps an upto data database of applications which was found on the UgIFT MICRO-SCALE IRRIGATION PROGRAM</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District carried out farm visit to farmers that submitted complete EOI</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG District agricultural engineer publicized the eligible farmers that were approved on the notice board</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>	na	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>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>	na	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	na	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	na	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	na	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	There was no evidence to show that the micro scale irrigation equipment installed was in line with the design output sheet	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that LG conducted regular technical supervision of micro scale irrigation projects	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	there was no evidence to show that the LG oversaw the equipment supplier during the testing of the functionality of the installed equipment	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	There was no evidence to show that the LG oversaw the handover of equipment to the approved farmer	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	na	0
----	---	---	----	---

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	na	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	There was no evidence of nature and avenues to address grievance displayed on the production department notice boards	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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 no evidence that the LG disseminated micro scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper sitting, land access and there were no copies of MOUs between LGs and farmers	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	N/A	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 agrochemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Kisadha Alex was appointed Senior Agriculture Engineer on 10/4/2017 with a wave of Probationary period under Min. 23/LK/DSC/03/17 (viii)</p>	70
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	N/A	0
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	N/A	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG appointed Mr. Makinabu Yahaya Lukkwitira Water Officer on transfer of service from Busembatia Town Council (Borehole Maintenance Technician) under Min. KLR/DSC/026/2012 (iii)	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Kigenyi Asifu a CDO at Waibuga S/C was assigned duties of Water officer for Mobilization by the CAO on 21/6/2018 in a letter Ref: CR/D/1566	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Kayeyera Benard was appointed Borehole Maintenance Technician on probation on 24/5/2019 under Min. 14/LK/DSC/5/2019 (1) and confirmed on 30/6/2020 under Min. 06/LK/DSC/5/6/2020 (i)	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	This position was not filled at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had not filled this position at the time of assessment as stated by Mr. Mutagobwa Fred the PHRO- Luuka DLG	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had not filled this position at the time of assessment as stated by Mr. Mutagobwa Fred the PHRO- Luuka DLG	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

If the LG:

a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment forms for drilling of boreholes. Forms were filled and endorsed by the Environment Officer Senior Musenero Bernard. However the CDO had not endorsed on the screening form yet it was requirement therefore the LG scored zero. Some of the sampled screening forms were for;

i. Borehole drilling at Namadope in Waibuga sub-county, forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 8th July 2019.

ii. Borehole drilling at Kyanvuma in Irongo sub-county, forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 8th July 2019.

iii. Borehole drilling at Bukubembe in Ikumbya sub-county, forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 8th July 2019.

iv. Borehole drilling at Buyoola-Nakyere in Nawanpiti sub-county, forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 9th July 2019.

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs), score 10 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG carried out social impact assessments for drilling boreholes. Forms were prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard, however the CDO had not signed on the ESIA yet it was a requirement therefore the LG scored zero. For example;

i. ESIA for Borehole drilling at Namadope in Waibuga sub-county. Some of the Environment and Social impact elements were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or projected areas, sloping or flat. Yes. Environmental Social impacts: Soil erosion. Mitigation measures: Compaction of soil within the project area. ESIA prepared on 8th July 2019. ESMP for Namadope borehole site: environment components affected like land degradation, human beings. Nature of environmental concern: Contamination of water from animals. Land disputes between the contractor and owners of the land on which the boreholes were constructed, increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation and construction traffic. Mitigation measures: Planting of trees at least two in the east and west sides of water sources. Train water source user committees in environment management and presentation. Mitigation cost: UGX 400,000. Work done: Tree planting during the first rains in April 2019. Responsible persons Environment Officer, DWO, Contractor.

ii. ESIA for Borehole drilling at Kyanvuma in Irongo sub-county. Some of the Environment and Social impact elements were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or projected areas, sloping or flat. Yes. Environmental Social impacts: Soil erosion. Mitigation measures:

Compaction of soil within the project area. ESIA prepared on 8th July 2019. ESMP for Kyanvuma borehole site: environment components affected like land degradation, human beings. Nature of environmental concern: Contamination of water from animals. Land disputes between the contractor and owners of the land on which the boreholes were constructed, increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation and construction traffic. Mitigation measures: Planting of trees at least two in the east and west sides of water sources. Train water source user committees in environment management and presentation. Mitigation cost: UGX 400,000. Work done: Tree planting during the first rains in April 2019. Responsible persons Environment Officer, DWO, Contractor.

iii. ESIA for Borehole drilling at Bukubembe in Ikumbya sub-county. Some of the Environment and Social impact elements were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or projected areas, sloping or flat. Yes. Environmental Social impacts: Soil erosion. Mitigation measures: Compaction of soil within the project area. ESIA prepared on 8th July 2019. ESMP for Bukubembe borehole site: environment components affected like land degradation, human beings. Nature of environmental concern: Contamination of water from animals. Land disputes between the contractor and owners of the land on which the boreholes were constructed, increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation and construction traffic. Mitigation measures: Planting of trees at least two in the east and west sides of water sources. Train water source user committees in environment management and presentation. Mitigation cost: UGX 400,000. Work done: Tree planting during the first rains in April 2019. Responsible persons Environment Officer, DWO, Contractor.

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM. Therefore the LG scored zero.

0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence of appointment letter of the DHO availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Ms, Babiye Josephine Kyobe a Senior Nursing Officer was assigned the duties of ADHO – MCH on 11/11/2020 by the CAO in a letter ref: CR/161/1</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Ms. Nangobi Hidaya was appointed ADHO- (EnviromentalEnvironmental Health ) on promotion from Senior Health Inspector on 9/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/3/7/2020</p>	10

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not fill this position</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not fill this position</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Kaweesa Henry was appointed on transfer of service on 21/5/2015 under Min. 4/LK/DSC/6/2015-(ii) (2)</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The file for this staff was not available at the time of assessment having been taken by the IGG.</p>	0



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

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

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

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

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

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

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

## Environment and Social Requirements

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

*Maximum score is 30*

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG had Environmental, Social and Climate Change screenings done however the screening forms were endorsed by the Environment Officer without the CDO yet it was required that both CDO and Environment Officer endorsed, for example;

i. Construction of a placenta pit at Ikumbya Health Center III in Ikumbya sub county. Screening forms filled and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. The assessment team noted that projects like; Renovation of OPD at Kiwalazi Health Center II, Renovation of OPD at Irongo Health Center III and Upgrade of Bukedi Health Center II ti Health Center III in Bulongo sub county were rolled over projects from FY2018-2019 whose screening was done then.

There the LG scored zero because the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms.

0

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)

Maximum score is 30

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

There was evidence of ESIA prepared and endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer Musenero Bernard however the CDO had not endorsed on the EISAs therefore the LG scored zero for example;

i. Construction of placenta pit at Ikumbya sub county endorsed by Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. ESIA prepared by Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019. Some of the elements from the ESIA were: Destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Clearing the project site.

An ESMP was prepared with and some of the extracts were: Environment component affected, land degradation. Nature of Environment concern: Destruction of vegetation, fuel wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bear ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees especially kiapples or chogm. Flowers and grass. Leveling ground. Cost of mitigation: UGX 735,000. Work done: Growing trees, flowers and green grass around the completed buildings done. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of the debris done. Person responsible: Environment Officer, District Engineer, DHO, Contractor.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Kamyuka Francis was appointed DEO on promotion from Senior Education Officer on 30/6/2020 under Min. 06/LK/DSC/5/6/2020</p>	30
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had two Inspectors of Education.</p> <p>1. Ms. Nabwire Jane was appointed Senior Inspector of Schools on accelerated promotion from Inspector of Schools on 30/6/2020 under Min. 06/LK/DSC/5/6/2020</p> <p>2. Mr. Wambuzi Moses Galandi was appointed Inspector of Schools by RE-designation from Head Teacher under on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020 (1)</p>	40

## Environment and Social Requirements

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 the LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, forms filled and endorsed by the Environment officer on some projects. However, the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms for example;

i. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Bukoova primary school in Bukooma sub county. The project was screened, forms filled and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019.

ii. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Busiro primary school in Waibugo sub county. The project was screened, forms filled and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 10th July 2019.

iii. Renovation of a classroom at Busala primary school in Bulongo sub county. The project was screened, forms filled and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 10th July 2019.

iv. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Kiwalazi primary school in Irongo sub county. The project was screened, forms filled and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019.

The Maximum score is 30

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

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

There was evidence of ESIA report forms prepared by the Environment officer. However the CDO had not endorsed yet it was required that both Environment Officer and CDO endorse for example;

i. Construction of a two (2) classroom at Bukoona primary school in Bukoova sub county. Some of the elements in the report were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or projected areas, sloping or flat? Yes Environment or social impact was: soil erosion, destruction of green cover. Mitigation measures: planting trees. Any resources used in construction and operation (Water, energy, other materials, marrum) Environment or social impacts: marrum (opening) of pits. Mitigation measures: Restore the pits. ESIA was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019.

ESMP for the same was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard dated 18th July 2020. From the ESMP some of the environmental components affected were: Land degradation. Nature of environmental concern: destruction of vegetation, wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bear ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees, flowers and grass around the completed buildings. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of debris done. Responsible person: Environment Officer, District Engineer, District education officer, Contractor.

ii. ESIA for construction of a two (2) classroom at Busiro primary school in waibugo sub county. Some of the elements in the report were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or projected areas, sloping or flat? Yes Environment or social impact was: soil erosion, destruction of green cover. Mitigation measures: planting trees. Any

The Maximum score is 30

waste generated and means of dumping. Environment or social impacts: Generation of debris. Mitigation measures: Proper disposal of the debris into pits. ESIA was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 10th July 2019.

ESMP for the same was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard in a general report for all approved projects for FY 2019-2020 dated 18th July 2020. From the ESMP some of the environmental components affected were: Land degradation. Nature of environmental concern: destruction of vegetation, wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bare ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees, flowers and grass around the completed buildings. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of debris done. Responsible person: Environment Officer, District Engineer, District education officer, Contractor.

iii. ESIA for renovation of a classroom at Busala primary school in Bulongo sub county.

Some of the project elements in the report were: Was the nature of site wetland, forest or protected areas, sloping or flat? Yes Environment or social impact was: soil erosion, destruction of green cover. Mitigation measures: planting trees. Any waste generated and means of dumping. Environment or social impacts: production of debris. Mitigation measures: Proper disposal of the debris into pits. Form was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard on 13th July 2019.

ESMP for the same was prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer Musenero Bernard in a general report for all approved projects for FY 2019-2020 dated 18th July 2020. From the ESMP some of the environmental components affected were: Land degradation. Nature of environmental concern: destruction of vegetation, wood scarcity, timber scarcity, bare ground. Mitigation measures: Growing trees, flowers and grass around the completed buildings. Leveling off the ground, proper disposal of debris done. Responsible person: Environment Officer, District Engineer, District education officer, Contractor. Therefore, the LG scored zero.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG appointed Mr. Kipaalu Bogere George the CFO on promotion from the Principal Finance Officer on 30/6/2020 under Min. 06/LK/DSC/5/2020	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Wandira Yosia was appointed District Planner on Promotion from the Principal Planner on 3/7/2020 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/7/2020	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Musisi Rajab was appointed Ag. District Engineer on 9/7/2020 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/7/2020 (2)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	No substantive evidence was given about the staff in this position. The PHRO verbally said it's occupied by the Senior Environment Officer who had no letter of appointment or assignment to this position.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Musenerao Benard was appointed District Production Officer on promotion from Principal Agriculture Officer on 30/6/2020	3

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	Mr. Bikhadho Hamis was appointed DCDO on promotion from SCDO on 30/6/2020 under Min. 06/LK/DSC/5/6/2020	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer,  score 3 or else 0	The PHRO said this position wasnot filled	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	The appointment letter of the Senior Procurement Officer was not availed to the AT	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	Ms. Bakirya Mercy was appointed Procurement Officer on probation on 30/5/2018 under Min. 18/LK/DSC/05/18 (Vii)	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The file of the PHRO was not found at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	Mr. Musenerao Benard was appointed Senior Enviroment Officer on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020(2)	2

1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Ms. Kisakye Dorothy was appointed SLMO on promotion from Land Management Officer on 27/3/2018 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/02/18 (a) (i)</p>	2
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Ms. Naigembe Lydia appointed a Senior Accountant on Promotion from accountant on 27/2/2018 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/02/18(b)(ii)</p>	2
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Kakungulu David Kigenyi a Senior Internal Auditor was appointed Ag. Principal Internal Auditor on 9/7/2020 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/7/2020 (1)</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of the PHRO (Sec. DSC) was not filled at the time of assessment</p>	0



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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

The LG had 8 LLGs and appointed SAS as follows.

1. Ms. Mirembe Catherine was appointed SAS on promotion from CDO on 10/4/2017 under Min. 23/LK/DSC/03/17/(xi) and deployed at Irongo S/C

2. Ms. Tezikya Ruth was appointed SAS on promotion from CDO on 30/5/2018 under Min. 18/LK/DSC/05/18 (vi) and deployed at Bukanga S/C

3. Mr. Byakika Jowadu was appointed SAS on promotion from Parish chief on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020 and deployed T Nawampiti S/C

4. Mr. Ngobi Robert was appointed SAS on transfer of service from Detective Corporal on 30/10/2006 under Min. 210/2006 and deployed

5. Ms. Mutesi Mariam was appointed SAS on probation on 22/5/2009 under Min. 128/2009 (a) and confirmed on 18/3/2015 under Min 17/LK/DSC/02/2010 (22) and deployed

6. Mr. Barasa Patrick Musisi was appointed on probation on 16/10/2006 under Min. 194/2006 and confirmed on 2/3/2009 under Min. 19/2009 and deployed at Ikumbya S/C

7. Mr. Gangira Emmanuel was appointed SAS on probation on 11/6/2003 under Min. 69/2003 and confirmed on 15/2/2006 under Min. 157/2005 (a) (i) and deployed at Bulongo S/C

8. Mr. Maganda SIRAGI was appointed Principal Township Officer on promotion from SAS on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020 and deployed at Luuka Town Council.

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

score 5 or else 0.

The LG appointed CDOs in 5 of the 8 LLGs as follows.

1. Mr Wabodha Isaac was appointed CDO on promotion from ACDO on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020 (2) and deployed at Nawampiti S/C
2. Mr. Museene Michael was appointed on probation on 19/3/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/036/2012 (ii) and confirmed on 9/7/2020 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/2/7/2020 (1) and deployed at Bukoma S/C
3. Mr. Chakasi Fred Kiberu was appointed CDO on promotion from ACDO on 21/5/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/044/2012 (v) and deployed at Waibuga S/C.
4. Ms. Kisakye Juliet Racheal was appointed CDO on probation on 19/3/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/036/2012 and confirmed on 18/3/2015 under Min. 17/LK/DSC/02/2015 (18) and deployed at Bulongo S/C
5. Ms.Naisukwe Dorothy was appointed CDO on promotion from Parish Chief on 14/7/2020 under Min. 04/LK/DSC/6/7/2020 (3)

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

score 5 or else 0.

Seven out of 8 LLGs had Senior Accounts Assistants filled as follows:

1. Mr. Bogere Mpaata Joshua was appointed SAA by re-designation from Accounts Assistant on 28/4/2017 under Min. 28/LK/DSC/04/17 (II) (f) and deployed at Waibuga S/C

2. Mr. Katumba Kenedy was appointed on re-designation from Accounts Assistant on 28/4/2017 under Min. 28/LK/DSC/04/17 (II) (g) and deployed at Bulongo S/C

3. Mr. Senfuka Joseph was appointed SAA on promotion from Accounts Assistant ON 9/7/2019 Min. 05/LK/DSC/3/7/2020 (3) and deployed at

4. Mr. Nairemba W. Moses appointed SAA on promotion from Assistant Accountant on 9/7/2020 under Min. 05/LK/DSC/3/7/2020 (1) and deployed at Ikumbya S/C

5. Ms. Baibrye Rebecca was appointed SAA on promotion from Assistant Accountant on 16/3/2018 under Min. 08/lk/dsc/03/18 (a) (1) and deployed at Bulongo S/C

6. Ms. Tibiri Frances Konso was appointed SAA on promotion from Assistant Accounts on 8/7/2020 under Min. 05/LK/DSC/3/7/2020 (2) and deployed Nawampiti S/C

7. Mr. Kaweire Chris was appointed SAA on promotion from Assistant Accountant on 18/4/2018 under Min. 03/LK/DSC/03/18 (e) and deployed at Bukoma S/C

## Environment and Social Requirements

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

From the Final Accounts for FY 2019/20, Statement of Appropriation of Accounts as of 30th June 2020 page 19, the budgeted funds for Natural Resources were Ugx.50,579,640.

The LG allocated funds to Natural Resources Department worth Ugx. 50,573,320, ref page 19 of the Final Accounts FY 19/20

Which was  $(50,573,320 / 50,579,640) \times 100$

= 99.9%

Thus, the LG complied with the performance measure as it allocated 99.9% of the budget for Natural Resources. The balance of shs. 6,320 lacked materiality, hence the score of 2

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

Maximum score is 4

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

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

From the Final Accounts for FY 2019/20, Statement of Appropriation Account as of 30th June 2020 page 19, the budgeted funds for Community Based Services Department were Ugx.779,664,267.

The LG allocated funds to Community Based Services Department worth Ugx. 462,472,818, ref page 19 of the final account's FY 19/20.

Which was  $(462,472,818 / 779,664,267) \times 100$

= 59.3%

59.3% allocated to Community Based Services Department was less than the funds that were budgeted for, thus the LG was non-compliant

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

Maximum score is 12

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

There was no evidence that the LG had carried out Environment and Social climate change screening prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) in FY 2019-2020 for example;

i. Emptying of pit latrines at schools by M/s Kenwood General Enterprises and construction company limited.

ii. Procurement and supplies of Desks. However, this was a supplies and did not require screening.

iii. Designing of the LG Physical development plans of Bulanga and Kyanvuma. (Project and not reached the implementation phase were screening would come in) Based on these, the LG scored zero because emptying of pit latrines would require screening and social impact assessments but there was no evidence that it was done.

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

There was no evidence that the LG had 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) in FY 2019-2020 because some of the projects did not necessitate ESIA for example;

i. Emptying of pit latrines at schools by M/s Kenwood General Enterprises and construction company limited.

ii. Procurement and supplies of Desks. However, this was a supplies and did not require ESIA.

iii. Designing of the LG Physical development plans of Bulanga and Kyanvuma. (Project and not reached the implementation phase were screening would come in) Based on these, the LG scored zero because emptying of pit latrines would require social impact assessments but there was no evidence that it was done.

4

0

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

There was no evidence of Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). Therefore, the LG scored zero.

### Financial management and reporting

5

0

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

Maximum score is 10

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

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

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

Awaiting Audit Opinion that will be assessed in January.

Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).

maximum score is 10

If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),

score 10 or else 0.

Luuka District submitted the responses on the Internal Auditor General's report for the FY2018/19 on 17th December 2019. The responses were received on 17th December 2019 by MOFPED, Accountant General, IGG, MOLG and Auditor General.

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

1. Unrecovered YLP Funds.
2. Vanished youth groups.
3. Unmaintained accounts records.
4. Lack of technical supervision of works.
5. Unequitable distribution of LST.
6. Poor management in schools.
7. Relaxed records keeping and accounting system.

The LG submitted responses on the Auditor General report for 2018/19 on 27th March 2020 which was received on 27th March 2020 by MOFPED, Auditor General and Parliamentary LGAC. The number of queries raised were seven and they were cleared, as detailed below:

1. Partially implemented outputs.
2. Accumulated payables.
3. Vacant approved staff as per the structure.
4. Incomplete execution of works under UGiFT
5. Deteriorated works under UGiFT
6. Failure to recover YLP funds.
7. Slow recovery of UWEP funds.

The submission of the status of implementation of the Auditor General report was outside the required deadline, hence the LG was non-compliant.

7

4

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

Maximum Score 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG had submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of FY 2020/21.

The LG had submitted the Annual performance contract for the FY2020/2021 on 29/06/2020, which was acknowledged by Permanent Secretary/Secretary to the Treasury, Permanent Secretary; Ref: PBS submission form dated 29/06/2020 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer, Luuka District.

This was within the acceptable time frame of 31st August 2020 hence the LG was compliant.

8

0

Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year

maximum score 4 or else 0

If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

The annual performance report for FY 2019/20 was submitted on 15/10/2020 and received on 15th October 2020. Ref: PBS Annual Report FY 2019/20 dated 15/10/2020 signed by the CAO, Luuka in copy was the LCV Chairperson (District).

This was after the required submission deadline of 31st August 2020; hence LG was non-compliant.



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

Maximum score is 4

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,

score 4 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG had submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2019/2020. Quarterly budget performance reports were submitted as follows.

- Quarter 1 was submitted on 16/01/2020
- Quarter 2 was submitted on 25/02/2020
- Quarter 3 was submitted on 12/05/2020
- Quarter 4 was submitted on 15/10/2020

Ref: PBS Local Government Quarterly Performance Report, Luuka District FY 2019/20.

All reports were submitted via PBS.

From the above, Q4 performance report was submitted after the required deadline of 31st August 2020, hence the LG was non-compliant.