



LGMSD 2021/22

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	40%
Education Minimum Conditions	45%
Health Minimum Conditions	45%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	25%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	46%
Educational Performance Measures	44%
Health Performance Measures	58%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	35%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	9%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>There were two DDEG funded infrastructure projects in FY2020/21 of which one was land titling and therefore not a real infrastructure project.</p> <p>-Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000</p> <p>-Titling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000</p> <p>Therefore for this assessment, only Mukyogu HCII was visited and the works carried out were confirmed. The HC was found in a functional state.</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"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	<p>This indicator is inapplicable to this round of assessment.</p>	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>Rukiga DLG implemented two (02) DDEG funded projects in FY2020/21 .</p> <p>Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000</p> <p>Titling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000</p> <p>The LG's 4th Performance Report for FY 2020/21 shows that DDEG was spent 100% by the end of the year. The total amount budgeted was UGX51,277,000 and the same was spent. The completion certificate for the health centre was seen and reviewed.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	Rukiga DLG implemented two (02) DDEG funded projects in FY2020/21. Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000 Tittling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000 The LG's 4th Performance Report for FY 2020/21 shows that DDEG was spent 100% by the end of the year. The total amount budgeted was UGX51,277,000 and the same was spent. The completion certificate for the health centre was seen and reviewed. The two projects were eligible under DDEG guidelines (Code 048104, Table 7, page 8).	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The variations in the contract price for the 1 DDEG project implemented was within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates. Below are the details of the project. Completion of Mukyoogo HC II Contract No: RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004 Contract Price: UGX 34,763,390 Engineer's Estimate UGX 35,031,000 Price Variation: UGX 267,610 Percent Variation: -0.7% Comment: Variation below 20%	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	Out of the 6 Lower Local Governments (LLGs) the Assessor sampled 3 LLGs to establish the accuracy of reported information. The sampled LLGs included the Subcounties of Kashambya, Rwamuchuchu and Mparo Town Council. The Assessor reviewed the "Approved Staff Establishment List" provided by the PHRO and conducted field visits to the sampled LLGs to compare and verify the accuracy of the reported information. On the overall, the Assessor noted that the information about staffing (numbers of staff deployed, names and titles) were consistent with the information indicated on the staff establishment list at the PHRO office. Details of findings at the sampled LLGs were as indicated below:	0
---	--	--	---	---

Kashambya Subcounty: The Assessor established that the numbers of staff deployed by names, titles and file reference numbers indicated at the staff list at the Subcounty were the same as those indicated on the staff list provided by the PHRO. For example; the position of **SAS** was held by **Mr. Agaba Tito**, The **CDO** was **Natukunda Deborah** while the position of Accounts Assistant was held by **Ayinebyona Anthony**.

Extension Workers: The Positions of **Agriculture** and **Veterinary** Officers were substantively filled by; **Arinaitwe Innocent** an Agricultural Officer and **Turyagyenda Robert** an Assistant Veterinary Officer. The positions of Fisheries Officer and Entomology were not provided for at Subcounty level. The above information was accurate and consistent with the information provided by the PHRO. It was however, noted that the position of Fisheries Officer and/or Assistant Fisheries and the Office Typist and Office attendant were vacant.

Rwamuchucu Subcounty: The Assessor established that the information about staffing was consistent with the information indicated on the established staff list; for instance, the position of **SAS** was substantively held by **Tumwesigire Gideon**, while the **CDO** position was substantively held by **Kyakunzire Pheobe** and **Ndyengyejeho** held the position of Senior Accounts Assistant.

Extension Workers:

While the customized staff structure provides for a Positions of Animal Husbandry Officer; the position at **Rwamuchuchu Subcounty** was filled by an **Assistant Veterinary Officer, Agaba Wilfred**, while the position of Agricultural Officer was substantively filled by **Kabahizi Everest**.

The above information was consistent with the information provided by the PHRO (ref. the approved customized staff establishment).

Mparo Town Council: The Assessor reviewed the staff establishment list provided by Town Clerk and established that the information was consistent with the information indicated on the staff establishment list provided by the PHRO. The Positions of **Town Clerk** was substantively held by **Rwamango Hassan**, while the position of Senior CDO position was held by **Clement Arinaitwe**. The position of **Treasurer** was substantively filled by **Nowamani Boaze**.

On the overall, the information provided by the PHRO was consistent with (was accurate) the information verified at the LLGs, at the time of the assessment . **However, owing to the fact that some positions at Kashambya Subcounty were still vacant at the time of the assessment , the LG gets a zero score.**

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>For these two RDLG FY2020/21 projects under DDEG funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000 -Titling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000 <p>Mukyogu HCII was visited. The actual level of completion as verified during site visit was found to be consistent with what was in the reports.</p>	2
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. The Senior Human Resource Officer (SHRO) argued that MoPS advised Rukiga DLG (no documentary evidence was adduced to confirm this assertion) not to go ahead and submit staffing requirements for FY 2022/2023 before recruitment for the staff positions that were approved for FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no sufficient evidence provided to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service). While the PHRO presented to the Assessor a “Staff Attendance Record Book” that was in use and was opened on 31st October, 2019. At the time of the assessment on 15th November 2021, there was no evidence presented to the Assessor to in form of staff attendance analysis reports to confirm that the SHRO prepared staff attendance Analysis reports for review and endorsement by the CAO and for onward submission to MoPS.</p>	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assessor reviewed personal files of all Heads of Department (HoD) at Rukiga District to establish whether they were all appraised during the previous FY as per guidelines issued by MoPS.</p> <p>The review revealed that NOT ALL Heads of Departments were appraised during the previous FY as indicated by the appraisal status for each HoD indicated below:</p> <p>Appraised HoDs:</p> <p>1. Acting Chief Finance Officer: Musiime Justus; File Ref. No. RKI/CR/M/0052; was appraised by the CAO on 28th July, 2021. Both the Performance Agreement and Report were on file and endorsed by</p>	0

the CAO.

2. **Acting District Planner: Muhwezi Henry:** File No.RKI.CR/M0048 was appraised by the CAO on 28th July, 2021. Both the Performance Agreement and Report were on file and endorsed by the CAO.

3. **Acting District Engineer: Kiganda James;** RKI/CR/K/0115: No Performance Appraisal Reports were on file at the time of the assessment.

4. **Acting District Natural Resources Officer: Gumisiriza Nelson;** file no. RKI/CR/A/0009; was appraised by the CAO on 14th September, 2021. Copies of duly signed Performance Agreement and Report were on file.

5. **Acting District Production and Marketing Officer: Kamwesigye Leonard;** RKI/CR/K/0144 was appraised by the CAO on 9th September, 2021. Both the Performance Agreement and Report were on file and duly endorsed by the CAO.

6. **District Community Development Officer: Mbaguta Dorothy,** file no. , RKI/CR/M/0047; was appraised by the CAO on 1st July, 2021.Both the Performance Agreement and Report were on file and duly endorsed by the CAO.

7. **Acting District Commercial Officer: Kajuka Benson;** file No.RKI/CR/N/0036, was appraised by the CAO on 1st July, 2021. Copies of approved Performance Agreement form and Report were on file.

8. **Acting District Education Officer: Bweyendera Justina;** RKI/CR/B/ 0098; was appraised by the CAO on the 1st July, 2021. Both the Performance Agreement and Report were on file and duly endorsed by the CAO.

9. **Acting District Health Officer: Dr. Awumuza Gilbert** was appraised by the CAO on the 2nd Jul, 2021, Both the Performance Agreement and Performance Report were on file and duly endorsed by the CAO.

7

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

No Evidence was provided to confirm that Rukiga District implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines.

0

7	Performance management	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.	There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga District had established a Functional Consultative Committee.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0		
8	Payroll management	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:	The Assessor reviewed the list of "New Staff" that were recruited during FY 2020/2021 and established that 70 staff were Recruited. The Assessor took a random sample of 6 staff and established that they all accessed the Salary Payroll not later than two months after appointment as indicated in the examples below:	1
	Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	Score 1.	1. Nareeba Merabu ; was appointed as an Education Assistant on 21st August, 2020 and accessed the December 2020 Salary Payroll.	
			2. Tumuhimbise Scovia ; was appointed as an Education Assistant on 21st August, 2020 and accessed the Salary payroll of December 2020.	
			3. Oribariho Adad was appointed as an Enrolled Nurse on 21st August, 2020 and accessed the December 2020 Salary Payroll.	
			4. Ephraim Bende , was appointed as a Medical Officer on 14th April, 2021 and accessed the May 2021, Salary Payroll.	
			5. Tumuhimbise Trust , was appointed as an Office Attendant on 14th April, 2021 and accessed the May 2021, Salary Payroll	
			6. Katusime Joan ; Appointed as a Physical Planner on 14 April,2021 and accessed the Salary payroll	

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 Assessor reviewed the list of retired staff (contains details of name of retiree, date of birth, date of retirement, position held at retirement among other details) and requested the PHRO to avail the Pension Pay Slips for each one of the retired staff to ascertain whether they all accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. The Assessor confirmed that **all the retired staff accessed the pension payroll** not later than two months after retirement, as indicated in the examples below:

Nine (9) staff retired during the previous FY. The Assessor took a random sample of 5 files of the retired staff, reviewed them and ascertained that they all accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement, as indicated below:

- **James Mwijuka**; retired as a Headteacher-Primary- on 7th Gusta, 2020 and accessed the pension payroll of September 2020 under IPPS No. 0437066

- **Florence Ndyabatikaro**; retired as a Headteacher-Primary- on 1st January, 2021 and accessed the February 2021 pension payroll under IPPS No, 0437069.

- **Adrine Baryomumaiso**; retired as an Education Assistant on 5th March, 2020 and accessed the pension pay roll of May 2021 under IPPS. No. 0438102

- **Eriakimu Kikuru**; retired as a Headteacher - Secondary; .on 15th January, 2021 and accessed the Pension Payroll of March 2021 under IPPS No.0559746

- **Kyalisiima Kelen**; Retired as an a Headteacher-Primary- on 25th October, 2020 and accessed the December 2020 pension payroll under IPPS No.437040.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

Annual FY 2020/21 DDEG budget for LLGs was 115,376,642. What was transferred to 4 Sub counties and 2 Town Councils during the FY according to the financial report was UGX115,375,642. This means 100% was transferred to LLGs.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):	For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 9th July 2020, the CAO warranted on 22nd July 2020, and the funds were sent to the LLGs on 24th July 2020. For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 6th October 2020, the CAO warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 22th October 2020. For Quarter 3, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th January, the CAO warranted 21st January 2021 and the funds were sent on 27th January 2021. In two of the three quarters, the transfer of DDEG grants was effected after the 5 days deadline, even after adding the 4 days allowance.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	Three LLGs were sampled for the purpose of verifying whether Rukiga DLG 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. Field visits were made to three sampled LLGs. At all the 3 LLGs (<i>Mparo Town Council, Rwamuchucu and Kashambya Subcounties</i>), there was no evidence adduced by the SAS and /or the Senior accounts Assistants in form of DDEG quarterly release letters for FY 2020/2021, to confirm that the communication about DDEG releases was sent within five days from the receipt of the funds on the district accounts. The SAS / TC and /or the Senior Accounts Assistants explained that they normally receive phone calls from the Finance/Accounts office alerting them of the releases/deposits on their Subcounty/TC collection accounts and by displays of the released amounts per Subcounty that are pinned on the Public Notice Boards at the district headquarters..	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 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 supervised and mentored LLGs and projects in the district during the previous FY. They produced mentoring reports as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 2 dated 13/01/2021 to S/Cs and TCs</p> <p>Quarter 3 dated 05/05/2021 to S/Cs and T/Cs</p> <p>Quarter 4 dated 24/07/2021 to S/Cs and T/Cs</p> <p>The reports have information on LLGs and projects visited, facts found on the ground and recommendations made.</p> <p>Evidence for supervision and mentoring visits for quarter one were not availed or seen.</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>No evidence was provided for presentation and/or discussion of any of the activities of support supervision and mentoring in the TPC.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had an IFMIS based assets register, formatted as required in the LG Accounting Manual. The printed copy was availed for verification.</p> <p>The register was also updated and a number of assets sampled including land and buildings, computers, furniture and motor vehicles were found in the register.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</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>A Board of Survey report dated 27th August 2021 with 9 recommendations was availed. The recommendations included sale/boarding off of some LG assets, update of the inventory register, mentorship for some Health In-charges and carrying out improvements in some facilities, especially health centres.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As on the day of assessment on 15th November 2021, The Board of Survey report had been presented to the Council on 29/09/2021. The Council forwarded the report to the DEC to review the recommendations and determine the next course of action.</p>	
			<p>As a result of the previous recommendations from the report of 2019/20 (which were included in the FY2020/21), a 5 stance VIP latrine was constructed at Kashambya HCIII.</p>	
			<p>However, no action has been taken on the recommendations of the previous FY2020/21 report since it is still yet to be approved by DEC.</p>	
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</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>Rukiga DLG has a 12 member Physical Planning Committee, according to the minutes of meetings and the appointment letters on file.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>		<p>Evidence of only one set of minutes for Quarter 1 of FY2020/2021 which met on 23/07/2020 was seen. No evidence was provided for the meetings of the other 3 quarters. Neither was any evidence of any submission of minutes to MoLHUD seen.</p>	

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukiga DLG had two (02) DDEG funded projects in its FY2020/21 annual workplan.</p> <p>Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000</p> <p>Tittling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000</p> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derived from the LG Development Plan -Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives -Financially feasible -Having costed project profiles. <p>Desk appraisals for the two DDEG projects of FY2021/22 were seen.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rukiga DLG had two (02) DDEG funded projects in its FY2020/21 budget.</p> <p>Phased completion of Mukyogu HCII UGX35,031,000</p> <p>Tittling of Bukinda Seed S. S land UGX16,246,000</p> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technical feasibility -Environmental and social acceptability requirements. <p>No evidence was provided concerning a field appraisal for the two projects of FY2021/22.</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>Rukiga DLG AWP for FY2021/22 had a number of investment projects with profiles, which were costed. The profiles were discussed in a TPC meeting on 16/10/2020 (Min.106/10/DTPC/20). The costed profiles are part of the LG's DDPIII, as appendices (Page 90-123).</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had not yet prepared appraisal reports for environmental and social risks screening of projects to be implemented in the current FY at the time of the assessment.</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>The LG planned to implement 3 infrastructure projects using DDEG funds for the current FY and were all incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of 2-classroom block at Nyarubaare P/S at a budget of 20M under the Education sector in the procurement plan. 2. Construction of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Mukyoogo HC II at a budget of 13M under the Health sector in the procurement plan. 3. Phase II Construction of Rukiga District administration block at a budget of 50.9M under administration sector in the procurement plan. 	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: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>By the time of assessment, the procurement process for the infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG was at the level of award of contracts for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of 2-classroom block at Nyarubaare P/S. Contracts committee minutes dated 1/9/2021 under Minute 166/RDCC/01/09/2021/22(9) approved and awarded to Bona Co, Ltd at contract price of UGX 19,806,300 2. Construction of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Mukyoogo HC II, Contracts committee minutes dated 1/9/2021 under Minute 166/RDCC/01/09/2021/22(10) approved and awarded to Acjude Engineering Ltd at contract price of UGX 11,547,244. 3. Phase II Construction of Rukiga District administration block. Contracts committee minutes dated 1/9/2021 under Minute 166/RDCC/01/09/2021/22(2) approved and awarded to TUR holdings International Ltd at contract price of UGX 50,536,757. 	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	The LG did not establish the project Implementation Team for all the implemented projects as required. For example, during the implementation of all Health and Education sector projects, appointment letters for the contract managers and project managers dated 23/11/2020 for all did not constitute a complete PIT.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG implemented 2 projects using DDEG funds and 1 was a service provision for the processing of a land title for Bukinda Seed Sec. School. The other was completion of Mukyoogo HC II. A field visit was done and it was observed that the contractor did not follow the standard technical designs as provided by the D/Engineer. According to the project file, the Engineer provided for painting of internal walls and the ceiling, lightening protection which were complied with but the floor finishes were not well done with defects on the screed having holes and cracks all around in some of the rooms.	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	Several reports were reviewed for the projects implemented last FY but supervision was being done by only the Engineer as one of the relevant technical staff without the other required 2. i.e., Environment officer and the DCDO. For example, reports dated 10/6/2021, 27/3/2021, 6/1/2021 etc. for completion of Mukyoogo HC II, Construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HC III, Construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Runoni P/S respectively were reviewed and it was established that supervision was only done by the Engineer and no reports were availed for review to ascertain that the other relevant technical staff did supervision anywhere.	0

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the procurement files and payment vouchers, it was established that LG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract. For example;</p> <p>1) Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (MoES/UgIFT WRKS/2018-2019/0119)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor: Geses (U) Ltd • Engineer's certificate No.3 dated 18/2/2020 • Contractor's claim dated 17/2/2020 • Amount: UGX 281,915,1999 • Paid on: 4/3/2020 <p>2) Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor: A Thousand Marbles Ltd • Engineer's certificate No.3 dated 30/3/2021 • Contractor's claim dated 5/3/2021 • Amount: UGX 35,623,748 • Paid on: 3/5/2021 <p>3) Completion of Mukyoogo HC II. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor: Novelty Agencies Ltd • Engineer's certificate No.1 dated 29/1/2021 • Contractor's claim dated 7/1/2021 • Amount: UGX 30,273,351 • Paid on: 3/5/2021
---	---	---

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>All the contracts had complete procurement files in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For example;</p> <p>Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (MoES/UgIFT WRKS/2018-2019/0119)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 29/5/2019 • Evaluation report dated 24/5/2019 • Min. of approval: 43/RDCC/29/05/2018-19 • Contract sum: UGX 2,168,578,450 • Contract agreement signed on: 8/7/2019 • Contractor: Geses (U) Ltd <p>Completion of Mukyoogo HC II. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 22/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 34,763,390 • Contract agreement signed on: 24/11/2020 • Contractor: Novelty Agencies Ltd. <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 265,777,147 • Contract agreement signed on: 3/12/2020 • Contractor: A Thousand Marbles Ltd • Solicitor General's clearance dated 26/11/2020
---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) appointed Dorothy Mbaguta Okello, the District Community Development Office as the focal person on community grievances in a letter dated 25/04/2019.</p> <p>However, the district had not yet established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the Designated Community grievance Focal Person, a log/register of Grievances was reviewed. The grievance log/register had specified the type of grievance, period, affected person, site, investigation, response and remarks. However the Grievance mechanism specifying how issues are recorded, investigated and responded to had not been displayed at the district notice board.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Grievance mechanism had not been published on the noticeboard, nor shared with communities by the time of assessment. There was no evidence to show that the mechanism/procedure through which grievances can be recorded, investigated and responded to, had been shared with communities by the time of assessment.</p> <p>The Focal person informed the assessment that aggrieved persons approach the Chief Administrative Officer to register complaints, rather than reporting issues to him. This indicates there is lack of knowledge regarding how the District receives, records, investigates and responds to complaints from aggrieved parties</p>	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	Rukiga DLG Development Plan III encompasses aspects of environment, social and climate change interventions on Page 27 in its Section 2.6 – Environment and Natural Resources, Section 2.4.4 – Community Development and Social Protection on Page 25. In the LG Workplan for FY2021/22, each department has the aspect of Environment and Climate Change in its plan e.g. Administration on page 3, Finance on page 22, Health on page 44, Education on page 76 etc.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs through a TPC meeting on 11/04/2021, as per Agenda item No.7 and meeting Min.106/04/DTPC/21. The Guidelines were distributed to Sub county chiefs and Town clerks.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	There was 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, (other than health, education, water, and irrigation) The DDEG fund was used on Health projects that is: Phased completion of Muchogo Health Centre II in Kashambya S/c works worth 35031000 and Titling of Bukinda Seed School works worth 16.000000. Therefore no projects that fell into the category under assessment were implemented in previous FY.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	The Environment Officer did not provide records for any project with costing of additional impact from Climate change.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	The District did not present proof of land ownership for any projects implemented with funding from DDEG. Phased completion of Muchogo Health Centre II in Kashambya S/c and Titling of Bukinda Seed School	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	The Environmental officer informed the Assessment that monthly monitoring for projects was not undertaken. ESMPs for the projects were not presented for review during assessment therefore determining whether mitigations were followed-up was not possible. Records from the District Engineer revealed that periodic monitoring was undertaken through joint site visits. Only one report for monitoring of construction of Mukyogo Health Centre II dated 25/05/2020 was availed for review.	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	The Environmental Officer informed the assessment that E& S certifications were not prepared for the projects under review.	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	On the day of assessment on 16th November 2021, the four (04) bank accounts of the DLG were reconciled to date. Here below were their statuses: Treasury single account (TSA) – Reconciled to 31/10/2021. General fund account – Reconciled to 31/10/2021 Revenue account reconciled to 16/11/2021 ACDP account reconciled to 16/11/2021	2
----	---	--	--	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The four quarterly reports of FY 2020/21 were produced by the Internal Audit department. Quarter 1 report is dated 29/10/2020, Quarter 2 dated 29/01/2021, Quarter 3 dated 29/04/2021 and Quarter 4 dated 29/07/2021. There was evidence that the reports were submitted to CAO, LGPAC and RDC/LCV Chair through dated acknowledgement stamps.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The four quarterly internal audit reports for FY2020/21 did contain a section for follow-up on the status of implementation of prior findings/ recommendations.</p> <p>The audit reports were among others submitted to the CAO, the District Speaker and Chairperson, Chairperson LGPAC, as confirmed by the receipt stamps on the reports.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for FY2020/21 were submitted to CAO, LGPAC and RDC/LCV Chair through the Registry on the following dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 29/10/2020 submitted on 30/10/2020</p> <p>Quarter 2 dated 29/01//2021, submitted on 29/01/2021</p> <p>Quarter 3 dated 29/04/2021 submitted on 30/04/2021</p> <p>Quarter 4 dated 29/07/2021 submitted on 30/07/2021.</p> <p>The internal audit reports (1st and 2nd quarter) were discussed by the LGPAC on 07/06/2021 according to the LGPAC report dated 11/08/2021.</p>	1

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>Rukiga DLG OSR budget for FY 2020/21 was UGX285,067,000. What was collected was UGX155,082,884. This was 54.4% of what was budgeted and falls out of the +/-10% range.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>According to the financial reports, Rukiga DLG OSR performance for FY 2019/20 was UGX96,786,639. Performance for FY 2020/21 was UGX155,082,884. The increase was UGX 58,296,245 which was 60.2%.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to Rukiga DLG financial records, for FY 2020/21 the total local revenue collected was UGX155,082,884. During the FY, 2020/21, the amount remitted to LLGs was UGX54,728,450 which was 65% of UGX 84,197,615 the remittable income out of the total income collected. This was compliant with the mandatory 65%.</p>	2

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan for the FY 2021/22 was seen displayed on the District PDU notice board. Among others, there was information archived but had been on display at the notice board i.e., on 4/11/2020 and removed on 17/11/2020, for the award of the Completion of a Mukyoogo HC II at a contract price of UGX 34,763,390 awarded to Novelty Agencies Ltd, Construction of a maternity ward at a contract price of UGX 265,777,147 awarded to A Thousand Marbles Ltd Etc..</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to the effect that the LG's performance assessment results for FY2020/21 were published on the LG noticeboard or website.</p>	0

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided concerning the conducting of Barazas, radio talk shows or other fora to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.</p>	0
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>A circular dated 22/06/202 was made to all sub county chiefs and town councils on the cabinet decision stopping tendering out to private operators the issuance and collection of trade licenses by local governments and urban authorities.</p> <p>Another circular dated 17/07/2020 was made to Town Clerks and sub county chiefs concerning local revenue enhancement, mobilization, verification and assessed business for FY2020/21. It was addressed to the 4 sub counties and 2 town councils.</p> <p>Another circular was made to Town Clerks and sub county chiefs dated 09/12/2020 concerning non-remittance of local revenue advance for Quarter one FY2020/21.</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

No specific single report has been written by the LG to the IGG about the investigation cases during FY2020/21, and the LG leadership informed us that there were no outstanding issues with the office of the IGG.

A check through the LG's IGG file established that the following communications have been made by the CAO to the IGG:

On 01/02/2021 – request to investigate Ms. Jeniffer Muheirwe.

29/03/2021 – on alleged abuse of office and negligence of duty by Jeniffer Muheirwe, the SHRO.

On 08/12/2020 – on submission of project profiles for FY2020/21

07/12/2020 – on response to alleged non-payment of salary and irregular transfer of Mr Nicholas Beyendeza by the CAO Rukiga.

30/04/2021 – on update on alleged non-accountability of funds by Mr James Kiganda the District Engineer.

These communications show that there were issues that called for the report updating the IGG on progress, evidence of which report was not seen.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2019 and 2020 and calculated the percentage change in performance. We noted that the PLE performance increased by 0.3% as evidenced below:</p> <p>1,701 out of 2,020 (84.2%) pupils who sat PLE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (2,039-19)=2,020. We noted that in the previous assessment absentees were not excluded.</p> <p>1,757 out 2,080 (84.5%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (2,120-40)=2,080. Absentees not excluded in the previous assessment</p> <p>Thus a percentage increase of 0.3% which is below 1 % hence the score is zero (no improvement 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"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2019 and 2020 and calculated the percentage improvement in performance for USE schools. We noted that the UCE performance increased by 4.9% as evidenced below:</p> <p>583 out of 1,273(45.8%) students who sat UCE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (18)</p> <p>631 out 1,243 (50.7%) students who sat UCE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (13)</p> <p>Thus, performance improvement of 4.9%</p> <p>We noted that absentees were not excluded and non-USE schools were included during the previous assessment FY 2019/20</p>	2

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>To be scored Zero for all LGs in Y1 & Y2</p>	0
Maximum 2 points				
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant was used on eligible activities as per sector guidelines.</p> <p>The review of the LG quarterly performance report (Q4) FY 2020/21 (page17) revealed that the approved sector development grant of 1,548,324,000Ugx was released in FY 2020/21 and spent on capital investments representing 100% of approved budget of 1,548,324,000Ugx.</p> <p>Specific details outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of Rwamucum Seed SSS at a cost of 1,065,661,000Ugx Construction of (10) latrine stances at a cost of 38,031,000Ugx Etc. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Three (03) RDLG Education projects were sampled to check certification of infrastructure projects under Education.</p> <p>Construction of a VIP latrine Kitanga P/S (UGX1,194,207) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 07/06/2021.</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Runoni P/S (UGX17,616,220) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 07/01/2021.</p> <p>Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (UGX206,014,953) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 15/06/2021.</p> <p>Certification for education projects was done in accordance with the guidelines.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	2

3

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

The variations in the Education sector contract prices were within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates. i.e.

1. Project Name: Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School

Contract No: (MoES/UgIFT WRKS/2018-2019/0119)

Contract Price: UGX 2,168,578,450

Engineer's Estimate: UGX 2,147,416,507

Price Variation: UGX 21,161,943

Percentage Variation: -0.98%

Comment: Variation below 20%

2. Project Name: Construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Runoni P/S.(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

Contract Price: UGX 25,117,480

Engineer's Estimate: UGX 26,400,000

Price Variation: UGX 1,282,520

Percentage Variation: - 4.8%

Comment: Variation below 20%

3. Rehabilitation of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Kitanga P/S(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

Contract Price: UGX 10,940,724

Engineer's Estimate: UGX 11,630,850

Price Variation: UGX 690,126

Percentage Variation: -5.9%

Comment: Variation below 20%

3

0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

According to the LG annual budget performance report, by the end of the previous FY 2020/21, the construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School is reported at 74% budget performance on page 72 which is below 80%.

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The approved structure of primary school teachers in Rukiga DLG stands at 821, of which 721 positions were filled and 100 not filled but already advertised as per the district education department report from DEO's office dated 16th November 2021 and signed with a stamp by DEO (Ms.Vastina Beyendera.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	Therefore the filled positions represent 87.8% i.e. 721/821. The score is 2	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG education department maintained a consolidated schools' asset register for FY 2020/21 covering the (71) UPE schools and (8) USE schools. The asset register for FY 2019/20 was missing hence not possible to calculate the percent of schools that meet prescribed minimum standards as required in the manual.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

The list of primary school teacher deployment obtained from the DEO's office revealed that (721) teachers were deployed in (71) UPE schools in Rukiga DLG.

Verification was done in 03 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.

The number of teachers (17) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (17) in Buzooba primary school, Rwamucucu S/C

The number of teachers (15) on the DEO's deployment list was not consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (10) in Mparo Mixed PS, Mparo TC

The number of teachers(15) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (15) in Kitanga PS, Kashamya S/C

It was verified that the total number of teachers as indicated on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff lists in (2) out of the (3) sampled UPE schools i.e. Buzooba PS and Kitanga PS as indicated above. Therefore the information on deployment list of teachers is not 100% accurate.

5

0

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The information on the LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2020/21 and school asset registers of the sampled 03 UPE schools was verified in the sampled schools and found not to be consistent in all the 03 sampled UPE schools. Specific details as indicted below:

Kitanga PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (4) latrine stances, (120) desks and teacher accommodation (3) while the school asset register had (13) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (180) desks and teacher accommodation (5). Information not consistent

Mparo Mixed PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (3) latrine stances, (120) desks and teacher accommodation (1) while the school asset register had (9) classrooms, (24) latrine stances, (-) desks and teacher accommodation (4). Information not consistent

Buzooba PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (3) latrine stances, (140) desks and teacher accommodation (1) while the school asset register had (11) classrooms, (21) latrine stances, (221) desks and teacher accommodation (1). Information not consistent

6

0

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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:

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4

- Between 80 – 99% score: 2

- Below 80% score 0

There was noncompliance to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. There was no evidence of submitted annual school reports and budgets highlighting; (i) school performance, (ii) a reconciled cash flow statements, (iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and (iv) an asset register to DEO by January 30th. The LG received copies of the (2) sector guidelines from the MoES but never inducted school head teachers on the budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019). Therefore school head teachers were not using the reporting formats in the sector guidelines.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed inspection reports/departamental minutes and found no evidence that education department supported the UPE schools to prepare and implement school improvement plans (SIPs) in line with inspection recommendations. It was noted that the DEO and DIS were not aware of the SIP format provided in the budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools-page 21.</p> <p>Verification at school level revealed that two (2) out of the (3) UPE schools sampled (Buzooba and Mparo Mixed) had their SIPs in place but not in the required format (page 21) of the budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019)</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The list of government aided primary schools (71) captured in Rukiga district Performance contract FY 2020/21 is consistent with the number of schools (71) in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2020/21</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>Rukiga DLG budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (7) teachers per school or a teacher per class in all the (71) Government aided primary schools.</p> <p>Total of (821) primary teachers were budgeted for as per district education report dated 16th November 2021. The total wage bill provision for general staff salaries was UGX6,546,011,000 while the budget for primary school services was UGX557,069,000 as per the LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/22. We noted that one (1) school (Kabira PS) had a total of (4) teachers on government payroll and (3) community/PTA teachers. The school is a “hard-to-reach and stay” and as a result deployed teachers keep on abandoning the school.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

The education department primary school deployment list for FY 2021/22 obtained from the DEO indicated that a total of (721) teachers were deployed in (71) UPE schools in FY 2021/22 as per sector guidelines. e.g. all the (71) UPE schools had a minimum of (7) teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7

Verification was done in 03 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment/ school staff lists.

The number of teachers (17) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (17) in Buzooba primary school, Rwamucucu S/C

The number of teachers (15) on the DEO's deployment list was not consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (10) in Mparo Mixed PS, Mparo TC

The number of teachers(15) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (15) in Kitanga PS, Kashamya S/C

It was established that deployment of teachers followed the MoES staffing norms including; All the 03 sampled UPE schools had a substantive head teacher and a minimum of (7) teachers while the teacher: pupil ratio was within the recommended ratio of 1:53, i.e. Buzooba PS (1:49), Mparo Mixed PS (1:50) and Kitanga PS had (1:17) respectively.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,

score: 1 else, score: 0

The teacher deployment data had been displayed on school notice board in all the 03 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

Kitanga PS (Kashambya S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (15) teachers including the head teacher i.e. Male (10) and Female (5)

Mparo Mixed PS (Mparo TC) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (10) teachers including the head teacher i.e. Male (7) and Female (3)

Buzooba PS (Rwamucucu S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice-board had (17) teachers including head teacher i.e. Male (9) and Female (8)

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Rukiga district has a total of **71** Government Aided Primary Schools. The Assessor took a random sample of **7** schools to establish whether all primary school Headteachers were appraised for the period under review (calendar year 2020) and Appraisal reports were submitted to HRM with a copy to the DEO.

The review revealed that **all Headteachers for Primary schools were appraised** (though late due to the Covid 19 lock-down in early 2021) for the period under review as indicated by the sample below:

1. **Rwandekyezi Charles**; Headteacher at **Nyeikumana Primary School**, was appraised by the Town Clerk on 27th October, 2021 and the DEO endorsed the report on the same date.

2. **Abarigye Medius**; Headteacher at **Rushoroza Primary School**, was appraised by the Town Clerk on 9th September, 2021 and the DEO signed the report on the same date.

3. **Tusiime Dinavence**; Headteacher; at **Ntaraga Primary School**, was appraised by the Subcounty Chief, Kasanja Subcounty on 3rd October, 2021 and the DEO signed the report on the 9th October, 2021.

4. **Byaruhanga Johnson**. a Headteacher at **Noozi Primary school** was appraised by the Subcounty Chief Rwamuchucu Subcounty on 21st September, 2021. The Subcounty Chief and the DEO both signed the report on the 21st September, 2021.

5. **Tweyojera Onesmus**; Headteacher at **Buzooba Primary School** was appraised by the Subcounty Chief Rwamuchucu Subcounty on 20th September, 2021. The Subcounty Chief and DEO signed the report on the same date.

6. **Ntambirweki Isaiah**; Headteacher at **Kyerero Primary School** was appraised by the Subcounty Chief Bukinda Subcounty on 10th February, 2021. The report was endorsed by the Subcounty Chief and the DEO on the same date.

7. **Muruhura Henry**; Headteacher at **Kitanda Primary School**; was appraised by the Subcounty Chief on 3rd October, 2021 while the DEO endorsed the report on 9th October, 2021.

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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented to the assessor to confirm that all Secondary School Headteachers were appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by DCAO or Chair BoD to HRM</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There were no personal files of Secondary School Head teachers at the District headquarters. The SHRO reported that despite the numerous reminders to the Secondary School Headteachers to submit their personal files to the HRM office, such efforts have been so far futile. In the same vein, the SHRO confirmed that the Headteachers were not appraised for FY 2020/2021</p>	
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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>The Assessor reviewed personal files of all the Education Management Staff and ascertained that out of the 7 staff at the DEO's office; none had been appraised by the time of the assessment. Only two staff (the Senior Education Officer and the Sports Officer) were substantively appointed by the time of the assessment but were not appraised. The rest of the positions were still vacant.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>		
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>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training plan developed during FY 2020/21 to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level. Absence of a training plan was attributed to Covid 19 lockdown.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>		

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>We noted from DEO, that the district was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data. Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment data submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Rukiga district</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The review of the LG quarterly budget performance QTR 4 FY 2020/21 indicated that a total of 55,707,000Ugx (95%) was spent under outputs (078401&078402 for monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education. The money was spent as per sector guidelines i.e. conducted monitoring and inspection for all schools, compiled and submitted reports to MoES/DES, and monitoring the implementation of SOPs, etc.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The timeliness of warranting for schools' capitation grants was tested in the three terms as follows:</p> <p>Term1 (which is quarter 3) cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 8th January. The CAO warranted 21st January 2021 and the funds were sent on 5th February 2021.</p> <p>For Term 2 (which is quarter 4), MoFED circular is dated 31st March 2021 and the CAO warranted on 26th April 2021 and disbursements to LLGs and facilities were made on 1st June 2021</p> <p>For Term 3 (which is quarter 1), the MoFPED circular is dated 9th July 2020, the CAO warranted on 22nd July 2020 and the funds were sent to the LLGs and facilities on 13th October 2020.</p> <p>In all the three cases, the 5 days deadline was not met even after adding the 4 days allowance.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

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

There was no evidence that the DEO communicated capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. For example:

Third quarter cash limits were communicated through the MoFPED circular dated 16th December 2020 and invoiced on 24th January 2021

Release advice for QTR4 FY 2020/21 was communicated through MoFPED circular dated 30th April 2021 and invoiced on 13th May 2021

There was no evidence of display of quarterly capitation grant releases on the district/education department notice-board during FY 2020/21.

However there was evidence of posting of capitation grant releases for QTR 2, 3 and 4 during FY 2020/21 on school notice-boards in (2) out of the (3) sampled UPE schools i.e.

Mparo Mixed PS – Shs.2,450,000 for Term II 2020 dated 4th June 2020, Term III 2020- Shs.80,000 dated 11th February 2021 and Term I 2021-Shs.770,000 dated 25th February 2021

Buzooba PS – Shs.3,705,000 for Term II 2020 and Shs.1,210,000 for Term III 2020.

Kitanga PS: Had no evidence of display of quarterly capitation releases during FY 2020/21. The display on notice-board stopped on capitation releases for Term I 2020 (Shs.2,050,000)

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that the education department had prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections during FY 2020/21 as indicated below:

Inspection plan FY 2020/21: Term III 2020 school inspection schedule dated 23rd December 2020

Preparatory meeting for Term II 2020 for school inspection in Rukiga district. Discussed under Min.4/Term II 2020 inspection schedules/tool dated 29th October 2020

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:

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

Rukiga district education department had two (2) school inspection reports as detailed below:

School inspection report for Term III 2020 (Term III- 2020 Phase I (school re-opening inspection report) dated 26th April 2021. It was conducted from 18th January to 31st March 2021. Seventy six (76) out of 93 primary schools were inspected representing 81.7%. We noted that 64 out of 71 UPE schools were inspected representing 90%

School inspection report (Post lock down phase III 2020 for classes (P4 & 5) dated 7th June 2021. It was indicated that 94 out of 116 schools/institutions were covered representing 81% . We noted that all the 71 UPE schools were inspected representing 100% as indicated below:

Tertiary (1 out of 1)=100%

Government Secondary schools (8 out of 8)=100%

Private secondary schools (13 out of 13)=100%

UPE schools (71 out of 71)=100%

Private primary schools (1 out of 23)=4%

This implies that the average coverage was at 95% for UPE schools and the score is 1

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence of presentation and discussion of school inspection reports during departmental meetings in FY 2020/21 as detailed below:

Inspection of education institutions report on SOPs dated 28th October 2020. Presented and discussed under Min.3/2020

School inspection report dated 7th June 2021. Under Min.25/202, the school inspection report conducted for post lock down phase III for classes P4&5 was presented and discussed on 14th June 2021

We noted that there were no recommendations made for corrective actions during the discussion of inspection reports

Verification was done through the review of inspection files in 3 sampled UPE schools and established that:

Buzooba PS in Rwamucucu S/C had evidence of two (2) inspection/monitoring reports; (i) School inspection feedback report dated 9th November 2020 by Associate Assessor; (ii) monitoring SOPs compliance report dated 2nd June 2021

Kitanga PS in Kashambya S/C had evidence of three inspection/monitoring reports; (i) Monitoring for compliance of education institutions on SOPs dated 6th May 2021 by AA-Atunigire, (ii) School inspection feedback report by DIS dated 10th March 2021, and (iii) school inspection feedback report by DIS dated 17th December 2020

Mparo PS in Mparo TC had evidence of three inspection/monitoring reports during FY 2020/21 including; (i) Monitoring for compliance of education institutions on SOPs dated 21st May 2021 by AA-Bindeeba, (ii) School inspection feedback report by AA-Busibozi Lillian (MoES) dated 17th March 2021, and (iii) School inspection feedback report by DIS dated 12th November 2020

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 of DES acknowledgement letter for submission of school inspection report dated 15th June 2021 submitted by DIS and received by Francis Atima for DES</p> <p>The School inspection report for Term III 2020 (Term III 2020 Phase I-School re-opening inspection report) dated 26th April 2021 was submitted and acknowledged by DES on 14th May 2021</p> <p>Findings from the sampled 03 UPE schools indicated evidence of school inspection reports as indicated below</p> <p>Buzooba PS in Rwamucucu S/C had evidence of school inspection feedback report dated 9th November 2020 and monitoring compliance report on SOPs dated 2nd June 2021</p> <p>KitangaPS in Kashambya S/C had evidence of three reports; i) Monitoring compliance report on SOPs dated 6th May 2021, ii) School inspection feedback report by DIS dated 10th March 2021, and iii) school inspection feedback report by DIS dated 17th December 2020</p> <p>Mparo Mixed PS in Mparo TC had evidence of the following reports on file: i) Monitoring compliance report on SOPs by AA (Bindeeba) dated 21st May 2021; ii) School inspection feedback report by AA (Busobozi Lillian from MoES) dated 17th March 2021; and iii) School inspection feedback report by DIS dated 12th November 2020</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Minutes of the Education, Health and Community Based Services Committee of Council meeting on 10/11/2020 discussed Education service delivery issues (Min.CC/150/2020(1) – Education Progress Report). Also addressed in Min.CC148/2020 of the same meeting.</p> <p>Minutes of the Education, Health and Community Based Services Committee of Council meeting on 20/04/2021 discussed Education service delivery issues (Min.CC/154/2021(3) – Covid-19 and reopening of educational institutions, PLE exams, some school infrastructural issues etc).</p> <p>Minutes of the DEC meeting on 11/08/2020 discussed Education service delivery issues (Min.CC/125/2019).</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of community engagement meetings held in FY 2020/ 2021 as indicated below:</p> <p>Education department October 2020 report Radio talk show on Rukiga FM (Muhanga TC). The radio programme was aimed at mobilizing, sensitizing and informing all the school stakeholders and community about re-opening of education institutions (studio photos on file) and report dated 26th October 2020</p> <p>Report on activities done in the months of February and March 2021 dated 2nd April 2021. Activities included community dialogues about universal primary and secondary education</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The education department had no up to-date consolidated LG asset register during FY 2020/21. We reviewed the consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 and validated the information in the sampled 03 UPE schools as indicated below:</p> <p>Kitanga PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (4) latrine stances, (120) desks and teacher accommodation (3) while the school asset register had (13) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (180) desks and teacher accommodation (5). Information not consistent</p> <p>Mparo Mixed PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (11) classrooms, (3) latrine stances, (120) desks and teacher accommodation (1) while the school asset register had (9) classrooms, (24) latrine stances, (-) desks and teacher accommodation (4). Information not consistent</p> <p>Buzooba PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2020/21 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (3) latrine stances, (140) desks and teacher accommodation(1) while the school asset register had (11) classrooms, (21) latrine stances, (221) desks and teacher accommodation(1). Information not consistent</p> <p>The information on the consolidated LG asset register was not up to date as indicated above.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

For FY 2020/21, the RDLG Education department had the following projects:

Construction of 5 stance latrine at Runoni P/S in Kamwezi S/C (UGX26,400,000)

Rehabilitation of 2 stance latrine at Kitanga P/S in Kashambya S/C (UGX 11,631,000)

Completion of Rwamucucu Seed S.S in Rwamucucu S/C (UGX890,164,000)

Construction of Bukinda Seed S.S in Bukinda S/C (UGX344,284,000)

Supply and delivery of ICT equipment, science kits and chemical reagents to Rwamucucu Seed S.S (UGX210,522,000)

Payment for departmental vehicle i.e. DEO (UGX65,324,000)

A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.

-Derived from the LG Development Plan

-Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives

-Financially feasible

-Having costed project profiles.

Desk appraisals for RDLG Education Department projects of FY2020/21 were seen.

12	Planning and budgeting for investments	c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0	<p>For FY 2020/21, the Education department had the following projects:</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance latrine at Runoni P/S in Kamwezi S/C (UGX26,400,000)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 2 stance latrine at Kitanga P/S in Kashambya S/C (UGX 11,631,000)</p> <p>Completion of Rwamucucu Seed S.S in Rwamucucu S/C (UGX890,164,000)</p> <p>Construction of Bukinda Seed S.S in Bukinda S/C (UGX344,284,000)</p> <p>Supply and delivery of ICT equipment,science kits and chemical reagents to Rwamucucu Seed S.S (UGX210,522,000)</p> <p>Payment for departmental vehicle i.e. DEO (UGX65,324,000)</p> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <p>-Technical feasibility</p> <p>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements</p> <p>No evidence was provided concerning field appraisals for RDLG Education projects of FY2020/21.</p>	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG Education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects were approved and incorporated into the procurement plan for the FY 2021/22. i.e.; Seed Sec. School in Kandago is reflected in the approved procurement plan extracted from the Education sector plan (item No.3) that was submitted to PDU on 2/7/2020.	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The school infrastructural projects were approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction.

See details below;

1. Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (MoES/UgIFT WRKS/2018-2019/0119)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 29/5/2019

- Evaluation report dated 24/5/2019

- Min. of approval: 43/RDCC/29/05/2018-19

- Contract sum: UGX 2,168,578,450

- Contract agreement signed on: 8/7/2019

- Solicitor General's clearance dated 2/7/2019

- Contractor: Geses (U) Ltd

2. Project Name Construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Runoni P/S. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020

- Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020

- Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21

- Contract sum: UGX 25,117,480

- Contract agreement signed on: 18/11/2020

- Contractor: Henhopex Enterprises Ltd

3. Rehabilitation of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Kitanga P/S(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020

- Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020

- Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21

- Contract sum: UGX 10,940,724

- Contract agreement signed on: 19/11/2020

- Contractor: K-Maró General Contractors Ltd

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not establish the project Implementation Team for the sector implemented projects as required. For example, the appointment letters for the contract managers and project managers dated 23/11/2020 for all sector projects were availed for review but do not constitute a complete PIT.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	<p>Site visit was done to a fully complete construction of Rwamucucu seed Sec. school.</p> <p>On site were completed and furnished structures of three 2-classroom blocks, ICT & Library, Multi-purpose hall, science lab, administration block, a leveled play ground with grass and 3 twin staff houses with kitchen & 2-stance latrines. Both boys and girls 5-stance plus one 2-stance for staff VIP latrines.</p> <p>Spot measurements for multipurpose hall were taken and not all were standard as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traces are metallic with pre-painted 26-gauge Iron sheets. • Front door: 1.2m/2.4m standard • Front windows: 1.2m/1.5M standard • Splash apron: 1.58M • Ramp 1.2m/2.3M <p>but did not provide for burglar proofing on some of the windows on the staff houses as per standard designs.</p>	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	From the District Engineer, the project file for the Rwamucucu Seed Sec. school was obtained and it was established that site meetings duly took place according to the minutes dated; 6/11/2020,16/4/2021,18/12/2019, etc..	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The evidence availed for supervision activities indicated participation of the D/Engineer and DCDO but missing out on the Environment officer during critical stages of construction according to the joint monitoring reports and site meeting minutes that dated 23/3/2021,1/11/2020,30/10/2020, etc. and 16/4/2021,6/11/2020 respectively etc. for Rwamucucu Seed sec. School	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Three (03) RDLG Education projects were sampled to check certification and timeliness of payment of infrastructure projects under Education.</p> <p>Construction of a VIP latrine Kitanga P/S (UGX1,194,207) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 07/06/2021. Requisition dated 07/06/2021 and payment dated 30/06/2021 (23 days).</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Runoni P/S (UGX17,616,220) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 07/01/2021. Requisition date 07/01/2021 and payment 29/01/2021 (22 days).</p> <p>Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (UGX206,014,953) – certified by DEO, CDO and environmental officers on 15/06/2021. Requisition was dated 15/06/2021 and payment dated 30/06/2021 (15 days).</p> <p>In all the 3 sampled education projects payment was done beyond the 14 days' time limit.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The sector procurement plan for last FY was timely submitted to pdu on 28/4/2020 and received on the same date as required by PPDA.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had a complete procurement files for the school infrastructure contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For example;

1. Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School (MoES/UgIFT WRKS/2018-2019/0119)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 29/5/2019

- Evaluation report dated 24/5/2019

- Min. of approval: 43/RDCC/29/05/2018-19

- Contract sum: UGX 2,168,578,450

- Contract agreement signed on: 8/7/2019

- Solicitor General's clearance dated 2/7/2019

- Contractor: Geses (U) Ltd

2. Project Name Construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Runoni P/S. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020

- Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020

- Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21

- Contract sum: UGX 25,117,480

- Contract agreement signed on: 18/11/2020

- Contractor: Henhopex Enterprises Ltd

3. Rehabilitation of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Kitanga P/S(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

- Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020

- Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020

- Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21

- Contract sum: UGX 10,940,724

- Contract agreement signed on: 19/11/2020

- Contractor: K-Maró General Contractors Ltd

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>From the Community Grievance Focal person, there were no complaints raised at some project sites under education department.</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 of education guidelines incorporating E&S developed during FY 2020/21 by the Environment Officer.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>Costed ESMPs that should have guided planning for implementation of environmental and social safeguards was not developed.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>The Project files for education were reviewed. A certificate of Freehold Register Volume KAB14 FOLIO 3 was presented dated 10/11/2020 covering 1.3210 hectares and known as Plot , Block 213 at Buzooba, where where Bukinda Seed School is located under the ownership of Rukiga District Local Government.</p> <p>Another certificate of Freehold Register Volume 1579 Folio 3 dated 12/6/2019 covering 0.870 hectares and known as Rukiga Block 138 Plot 21 at Katooma, where Ramucucu Seed School was constructed under the ownership of Rukiga District Local Government.</p> <p>Land agreements or titles for areas where education department had projects (in Karorwa, Runoni and at Kitanga Primary Schools were not presented for review during assessment.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	The Environmental Officer did not present consistent monitoring records for projects implemented under the Education Department as required. However, a report on follow-up to check for environmental compliance at Rwamucucu Seed School dated 17/6/2021 was on file.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	<p>There was evidence that the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments:</p> <p>Construction of a VIP latrine Kitanga Primary School at UGX1,194,207 Certified by the Environmental officer, District Community Development Officer and the District Education Officer on 07/06/2021.</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Runoni Primary School at UGX17,616,220 Certified by the Environment Officer, the Community Development Officer and the District Education Officer on 07/01/2021.</p> <p>Construction of Rwamucucu Seed Sec. School UGX206,014,953 Certified by DEO, CDO and Environmental officer on 15/06/2021.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was no evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG registered increased utilization of Health Care Services (Focus on total deliveries). As guided by the final updated data Collection Checklists dated 26.10.2021, the computations were based on all the HCIIIs and HCIVs. Rukiga DLG has Six HC IIIs (4 Government and 2 PNFP) and two HC IVs. The assessment team reviewed health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for all HC IIIs and HC IVs for FY 2019/2020 and compared them with FY 2020/2021. The findings were as described below;</p> <p>The total deliveries were; FY 2019/2020=1979 and FY2020/2021= 1979 which represents an overall increase of 20.0%. Therefore, Rukiga DLG did not register any increase in the utilization of Health Care Services (0%) as per the requirements of the performance measure.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Rukiga DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2020/21 shows that UGX341,490,000 was budgeted for the health development. The total amount spent was UGX341,490,000.</p> <p>The projects where the Health Development grant was spent included:</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HCIV UGX300,000,000.</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII UGX24,000,000.</p> <p>Renovation of cold chain at DHO office, DLG HQs UGX15,000,000.</p> <p>These activities are eligible under the grant guidelines. They didn't involve purchase of land, procurement of vehicles etc.</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Five (05) certifiable payments out of FY2020/21 infrastructure projects of Rukiga DLG Health were sampled.

Phased construction of maternity ward at Mparo HCIV (UGX41,026,106) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 30/03/2021.

Completion of Mukyogo HCII (UGX34,763,390) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 01/02/2021.

Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII (UGX12,571,000) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 09/04/2021.

Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII (UGX16,206,746) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021.

Renovation of cold chain building 2nd phase at DHO office (UGX15,882,092) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 25/02/2021.

Certification for health projects was effected in accordance with the guidelines.

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

The contract prices of sampled health infrastructure investments were within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineer's estimates. For example;

1. Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV

(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)

- Contract Price: UGX 265,777,147
- Engineer's Estimate 300,000,000
- Price Variation: UGX 34,222,853
- Percent Variation: -11.4%
- Comment: Variation below 20%

2. Renovation of a cold chain building at the district health office (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00011)

- Contract sum: UGX 15,882,092
- Engineer's Estimate UGX 16,000,000
- Price Variation: UGX 117,908
- Percent Variation: -0.7%
- Comment: Variation below 20%

3. Completion of Mukyoogo HC II. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004)

- Contract No: RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004
- Contract Price: UGX 34,763,390
- Engineer's Estimate UGX 35,031,000
- Price Variation: UGX 267,610
- Percent Variation: -0.7%
- Comment: Variation below 20%

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	LG did not upgrade any HC II to HC III as of last FY.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	There was evidence to confirm whether Rukiga DLG recruited staff for all three (3) government HCIIIs the two (2) HCIVs as per staffing structure. The staff structure obtained from DHO indicated that HC IVs required to have 48 staff while HC IIIs required to have 19 health workers.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>According to the FY 2021/2022 approved budget, Generated on 27/06/2021 11:08 (Page 21), the allocated conditional Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) was 2,679,466,000/= part of which caters for the 176 deployed staff out of the 248 staffing norm for the available HC IV and HC IIIs. This implies that only 96.1% of positions of health workers for the available HC IV and HC IIIs were filled. The details of the percentage of health workers positions filled for facilities was as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bukinda HC III; 26 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 136.8% of filled positions. 2. Kamwezi HC IV; 38 staff were deployed out of 48 required staffing norms. This represents 79.2 % of filled positions. 3. Kashambya HC III; 18 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 94.7% of filled positions. 4. Kyogo HC III; 16 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 84.2% of filled positions. 5. Mparo HC IV; 49 staff were deployed out of 48 required staffing norms. This represents 102.1% of filled positions. 	

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG did not upgrade any HC II to HC III as of last FY.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that the information given by Rukiga DLG on the position of health workers filled was accurate as evidenced by the findings from three (3) sampled facilities. The assessment team reviewed the staff list for FY 2021/2022 and compared it with the staff lists found at the sampled facilities. The details of the findings were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bukinda HC III; 26 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility. 2. Kyogo HC III; 16 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility. 3. Mparo HC IV; 49 health workers deployed as per the staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility. 	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that information on health facilities constructed and functional was accurate. The list obtained from the DHO included the following items; 1) Construction of Maternity Ward at Mparo HC III, 2) Construction of 5 stance Latrine at Kashambya HC III and 3) Phased completion of OPD Block at Mukyogo HC II.</p> <p>The assessment team reviewed the annual PBS report (Quarter 4) submitted on 09/09/2021 (Page 64) and established that information on the above-mentioned projects was accurate.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:

- Score 2 or else 0

There was no evidence to confirm whether health facilities in Rukiga DLG prepared and submitted Annual Work plans & budgets to the DHO by March 31st of the FY 2020/2021 as per the LG Planning Guidelines for the Health Sector. The assessment team sampled Annual Work plans & budgets for three health facilities and established the following.

1. **Bukinda HC III:** Submitted its Annual Workplans & budgets for FY 2021/2022 to the DHO on 21st August 2021
2. **Kamwezi HC IV:** Submitted its Annual Workplans & budgets for FY 2021/2022 to the DHO on 21st August 2021
3. **Mparo HC IV:** Submitted its Annual Workplans & budgets for FY 2021/2022 to the DHO 16th October 2021

All the Annual Work plans & budgets for the sampled Health facilities were submitted beyond the recommended date of 31st March of FY 2020/2021. The assessment team also observed that annual work plans & budgets for sampled health facilities did not conform to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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 :

- Score 2 or else 0

There **was no evidence** to confirm whether health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2020/2021 by July 15th of the as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. By end of day two (2) of the assessment in Rukiga DLG, no evidence had been shared with the assessment team to this effect.

6

0

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

a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

- Score 2 or else 0

There **was no evidence** to confirm whether health facilities had developed and reported on the implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports. The assessment team sampled three (3) health facilities and called for their improvement plans for FY 2021/2022. However, these were not found on file in the DHO's Office. By end of day two (2) of the assessment in Rukiga DLG, no evidence had been shared with the assessment team with regards to this.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

2

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

d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,

- score 2 or else score 0

There **was evidence** to confirm if health facilities in Rukiga DLG submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). The assessment team randomly sampled three (3) facilities and established that the monthly (and quarterly reports were submitted timely. The sampled health facilities were Bukinda HC III, Mparo HC IV and Kamwezi HC IV.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no evidence to confirm whether health facilities submitted their RBF invoices timely (By the 15th of the month following the end of the previous Quarter. The assessment established that Health facilities in Rukiga DLG were enrolled into the RBF programme in FY 2019/2020. At the time of assessment, there were no Health facilities RBF invoices on file to make reference to. The Ag. DHO said that the hard copies had been taken by the RBF regional focal point person but did not provide evidence to confirm the allegation. By end of day two (2) of the assessment in Rukiga DLG, no evidence had been shared with the assessment team with regards to this.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no sufficient evidence to confirm whether Rukiga DLG submitted timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following the end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities. The assessment team established that RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities were submitted to MOH as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter 1; Submission was made late on 18 November 2020. 2. Quarter 2; Invoices were submitted on 1st February 2021 3. Quarter 3; Submission was made on 19th April 2021 and; 4. Quarter 4; Submission was made on 27th July 2021. 	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided as to the submission dates of Health department quarterly reports to the Planning unit.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team established that Rukiga DHMT had developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the weakest performing health facilities. The Performance Improvement Plan was endorsed by the Ag. DHO (Ahumuza Gilbert) and Grace Angabiire on 23rd July 2020. The weakest facility was noted to be Kyogo HC III.</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 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>There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG had Implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities as follows; The RBF varication feedback meetings minutes dated 14th September 2020 indicated that the department had put up measures to ensure availability of blood at Mparo HC IV. This aspect was reflected on the page (6) of the DHMT Performance improvement plan.</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 (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that the Rukiga DLG health department Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines or in accordance with the staffing norms. The approved staff structure obtained from DHO's office indicates an approved structure of 315 health care workers. The review of the approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/2022 Generated on 27/06/2021 11:08 (Page 22) revealed that Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) allocation for Rukiga DLG health department was 2,679,466,000/= to cater for the 250 health care workers in post. The assessment team established there the Rukiga DLG did not have additional wage limits approved by MoFPED to recruit and fill the available gap.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga DLG health department did not deploy health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms. The assessment team reviewed deployment lists for FY 2021/2022 and noted that some health facilities did not have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms. For instance; Ibugwe, Karorwa and Bucundura HC IIs had 6 staff in post out of the 9 required as per staffing norms (66.7%); Nyakashebeya HC II had 3 staff in post out of the 9 required as per staffing norms (33.3%).</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was evidence to confirm that health workers in Rukiga DLG were working in health facilities where they are deployed. The assessment team reviewed the deployment list for FY 2021/2022 and compared it with the logs in the attendance book at the randomly sampled health facilities and established that the two were in agreement. The assessment team sampled three health facilities (Bukinda HC III, Mparo HC IV and Kyogo HC III) and established that was no variance between the deployment list obtained from DHO's and logs in the staff attendance books found at the health facilities as described below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bukinda HC III: 26 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO. 2. Kyogo HC III: 16 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO. 3. Mparo HC IV: 49 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO. 	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Rukiga DLG publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards. The assessment team visited three 3 sampled health facilities and found staff lists for FY 2021/2022 available on the Notice Boards at Bukinda HC III, Kyogo HC III and Mparo HC IV.</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 Assessor reviewed personal files of Health Facility In-charges at **Rukiga DLG** including HC IV, III, and some files for HC II to establish whether the DHO conducted Performance Appraisals for Health Facility In-charges. The review revealed that **NOT all** Incharges were appraised as indicated below:

Appraisal of HC IV In-charges:

1. **Kamwezi HC IV: Bende Ephraim** a Medical Officer and Incharge at Kamwezi HC IV was appraised by the DHO on 9th June, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.
2. **Mparo HC IV: Godfrey Muchunguzi** a Senior Medical Officer and Incharge at Mparo HC IV **was not appraised** during the previous FY. There were no appraisal documents for FY 2020/2021, at the time of the assessment.

Appraisal of HC III In-charges (sample of 3 facilities out of 8):

1. **.Nkwasiwe Micheal**; a Senior Clinical Officer and Incharge at **Kyogo HC III**, was **not appraised**. There were no appraisal documents on file for FY 2020/2021 at the time of the assessment.
2. **Atambirwe Evidence**; a Senior Clinical Officer and Incharge at **Bukinda HC III** was appraised by the DHO on 2nd September, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on 9th September, 2021.
3. **Asiimwe Eric**, a Senior Clinical Officer and Incharge at **Kashambya HC III**, was appraised by the DHO on 13th August, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.

Appraisal of HC II facility In charges (sampled 3 facilities):

1. **Mbabazi Golden**; an Enrolled Nurse and Incharge at **Ibubwe HC II** was appraised by the DHO on 4th October, 2021 and the CAO signed the form on the same date.
2. **Kyalisima Prudence**, an Enrolled Midwife and Incharge at **Rwanjura HC II**, was appraised by the DHO on 2nd September, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the form on the same date.
3. **Ayebare Phillip** an Enrolled Nurse and Incharge at **Vandago HC II** was appraised by the DHO on 9th September, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Appraisal of Health Workers by Health facility Incharges:

The Assessor took a sample of three (3) Health workers at the levels of HC IV, III and II reviewed their personal files to determine whether they were appraised by their respective Incharge. The Assessor confirmed that Incharges appraised Health workers under their supervision. Details the of status of appraisal were as indicated below:

Appraisal of HC IV Health Workers:

- **Angabire Grace**, a Nursing Officer and Incharge at **Mparo HC IV** was appraised by the DHO, on 19th July, 2021 and the CAO signed the report on the same date.
- **Mutamba Maziba Mudogo Edgar**; a Medical Officer at **Mparo HC IV** was appraised by the DHO on 16th July, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.
- **Aryampa Isaac**, a Psychiatric Nurse at **Kamwezi HC IV** was appraised by the DHO on 16th July, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.

Appraisal of HC III Health Workers:

- **Kyokusiima Allen**, an Enrolled Nurse at **Bukinda HC III**, was appraised by the DHO on 23rd August, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on 24th August, 2021.
- **Tukahirwe Diana**; an Enrolled Nurse at **Bukunda HC III**, was appraised by the DHO on 28th August, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on 23rd August 2021.
- **Tumugumeho Mathias**, an Enrolled Nurse at **Kashambya HC III**, was appraised by the DHO on 9th September, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.

Appraisal of HC II Health Workers:

- **Olibaho Adat**; an Enrolled Nurse at **Muchogo HC II**. Was appraised by the DHO on 14th September, 2021 and the CAO signed the report on the same date.
- **Katsigazi Alexander**, an Enrolled Nurse at **Rwanjura HC II**, was appraised by the DHO on 14th September, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.
- **Nakito Stella a** Health Assistant at **Rwanjura HC II**, was appraised by the DHO on 23rd August, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm whether corrective actions were taken based on appraisal reports.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was evidence accessed by the assessment team to confirm that Rukiga DLG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance with the training plans dated 30th July 2020. For instance; The department trained 10 health workers on COVID antigen RDT testing as evidenced by the report submitted to the DHO's office on 4th June 2021. The department also undertook the training of health workers in cervical cancer between 8th -12th March 2021.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence to confirm whether Rukiga DLG had Documented training activities in the training/CPD database. By the end of day 2 of the assessment exercise in the district, no evidence had been provided to the assessment team in this regard.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum 9 points on this performance measure	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	There was evidence that the CAO 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 FY 2021/2021. Rukiga DLG has a total of 29 health facilities receiving PHC NWR grant. The assessment team reviewed the Rukiga DLG approved budget for FY 2021/2022 Generated on 27/06/2021 11:08 (Pages 22 to 23) and Grants guidelines on pages 163 to 164 under Vote 620. The assessment team also reviewed the copy of a letter addressed to the MoH endorsed by CAO and the Ag. DHO. This was submitted to Apio Brenda by email (apiobrenda20@gmail.com) on 11th September 2021. The review of the letter indicated that, supplier numbers for Nyakarambi HC II, Kakatunda HC III, Bukinda HC III had been correctly highlighted.	2
---	---	--	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Rukiga DLG budget for PHC for FY 2020/21 was UGX170,655,000. Total allocation for management and monitoring of activities in the same year was UGX25,600,000 which 12% of the total. This was less than the 15% maximum.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The disbursements of all funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine. For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular was dated 9th July 2020, the CAO warranted on 22nd July 2020 and the funds were sent to the LLGs and facilities on 26th July 2020. For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 6th October 2020, the CAO warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 16th October 2020. For Quarter 3, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th January, the CAO warranted 21st January 2021 and the funds were sent on 25th January 2021. For Quarter 4, MoFED circular is dated 31st March 2021 and the CAO warranted on 26th April 2021 and disbursements to LLGs and facilities were made on 29th April 2021. In three of the four quarters, the transfer of PHC NWR grants was effected after the 5 days deadline, even after adding the 4 days allowance.</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>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The disbursement of all funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine.</p> <p>For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular was dated 9th July 2020, the CAO warranted on 22nd July 2020 and the funds were sent to the LLGs and facilities on 26th July 2020.</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 6th October 2020, the CAO warranted on 13th October and the funds were sent on 16th October 2020.</p> <p>For Quarter 3, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th January, the CAO warranted 21st January 2021 and the funds were sent on 25th January 2021.</p> <p>For Quarter 4, MoFED circular is dated 31st March 2021 and the CAO warranted on 26th April 2021 and disbursements to LLGs and facilities were made on 29th April 2021.</p> <p>In three of the four quarters, the transfer of PHC NWR grants was effected after the 5 days deadline, even after adding the 4 days allowance.</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 evidence that the Rukiga DLG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities. The assessment team established that Rukiga DLG had 29 health facilities. The assessment team observed that a list of the quarterly financial releases (PHC non-wage recurrent releases) was found displayed at the health department notice board. The displayed quarterly financial releases were dated; 10th August 2020, 21st October 2020, 20th January 2021 and 14th April 2021. However, the assessment team did not find evidence to confirm whether financial releases for the available and displayed quarter was made within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <u>was evidence</u> to confirm that Rukiga DLG had health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meetings held during the FY 2020/21. The assessment team reviewed four (4) sets) of DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting held on the following days; 11th September 2020, 7th December 2020, 4th March 2021 and 28th May 2021. The assessment team established that actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review had been implemented as follows;</p> <p>Review of Quarter 4 DHMT performance meeting minutes (Min. 7) noted that there was a need to supply GBV registers to Kihanga HC III and Kashekye HC II. The assessment team established that the requisition of these registers was made on 12th July 2021. In addition, the review of Quarter 3 DHMT performance meeting minutes (Min. 6) held on 4th March 2021 noted that the meeting had recommended conducting data quality assessment to establish validity errors and corrections. Evidence accessed by the assessment team noted that this was undertaken at Bukinda HC III, Kashambya HC III and Kamwezi HC IV as evidenced by the report submitted by the Biostatistician on 8th April 2021.</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>There <u>was evidence</u> to confirm that Rukiga DLG Health department quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g., WASH, Community Development, Education department. Review of the quarterly performance review meetings held on 11th September 2020, 7th December 2020, 4th March 2021 and 28th May 2021 indicated that they involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>Rukiga DLG had two HC IVs and no district general hospital. Evidence availed to the assessment team confirmed that Mparo and and Kamwezi HC IVs were supervised atleast once every quarter in the FY 2020/2021 as evidenced by the assessment reports submitted to the DHO on 8th September 2020, 15th December 2020, 24th March 2021 and 15th July 2021.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>There <u>was no evidence</u> to confirm that the Rukiga DLG DHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower-level health facilities within the FY 2020/2021. Rukiga DLG has two Health sub-districts (Rukiga East and Rukiga North). The assessment team reviewed the Support supervision reports for Rukiga North and established the following;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter 1: Supervision report submitted on 30th July 2020; All the 12 lower-level health facilities were supervised. 2. Quarter 2: Supervision report submitted on 4th January 2021; Only 6out of 12 lower-level health facilities were supervised. 3. Quarter 3: Supervision report submitted on 5th April 2021; All the 12 lower-level health facilities were supervised. 4. Quarter 4: Supervision report submitted on 28th June 2021; Only 6out of 12 lower-level health facilities were supervised. 	
			<p>Therefore, since not all lower-level health facilities were supervised in Quarters 2 and 4, Rukiga DLG DHT did not ensure that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower-level health facilities within the FY 2020/2021.</p>	

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG used results/reports from the 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 FY 2020/2021. For evidence from the sampled health facilities noted the following findings; At Kyogo HC III CMEs schedules had been put in place as recommended by DHT during Quarter 4 support supervision while EPI monitoring charts had been displayed at Mparo HC IV following recommendations made during the DHT integrated supervision in Quarter 2.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the FY 2020/2021 as evidenced by the essential medicines and ART SPARS implementation reports submitted on the following dates; 12th December 2020, 30th January 2021, 22nd April 2021, 14th June and 30th June 2021. The review of the report submitted on 14th June 2021 indicated that the following had been established at Kitanga HC III (PNFP); the facility was found clean; Stock cards were updated and the essential medicines were available.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO health office budget for FY 2020/21 was UGX25,600,000. Out of this a total of UGX5,160,000 was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities. This was a proportion of 20.2%. This was below the 30% minimum.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Rukiga DLG DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities; For instance, the report submitted to DHO on 8th April 2021 indicated that the department had conducted activities as a district of COVID 19 IEC materials to the VHTs, distributed condoms in the major trading centres in the district and that they had held radio talks on the status of health service delivery in the district.</p> <p>The 4th Quarter health promotion report (report submitted to DHO on 6th July 2021 indicated that Rukiga DLG had conducted community sensitization activities on COVID 19 in the church such as Buzooba COU, Kihanga COU and Katungu COU. The report also shows that the department held training of VHTs on the management of COVID 19 cases in the community.</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 evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports. For instance, on 7th April 2021, the department requested additional Malaria RDT test kits from Kabale regional referral hospital to support the response to the Malaria outbreak in the catchment area of Kibanda HC II in Kamwezi Sub county.</p>	1
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to confirm whether Rukiga DLG health department had an updated Asset register that set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.</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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);</p>	<p>For FY 2020/21, the prioritised investments under Health department included the following projects:</p> <p>The projects where the Health Development grants were spent included:</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HCIV UGX300,000,000.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p>	<p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII UGX24,000,000.</p>	<p>Renovation of cold chain at DHO office, DLG HQs UGX15,000,000.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p>	<p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p>	<p>-Derived from the LG Development Plan</p>	
<p></p>	<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>-Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives</p>	<p>-Financially feasible</p>	
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p>-Having costed project profiles</p>	<p>Evidence of desk appraisals for RDLG Health projects was provided and reviewed.</p>	
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For FY 2020/21, the prioritised investments under KDLG Health department included the following projects:</p> <p>The projects where the Health Development grants were spent included:</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HCIV UGX300,000,000.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p></p>	<p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII UGX24,000,000.</p>	<p>Renovation of cold chain at DHO office, DLG HQs UGX15,000,000.</p>	
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p>	<p>-Technical feasibility</p>	
<p></p>	<p></p>	<p>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements</p>	<p>No evidence was provided concerning performing field appraisals during planning.</p>	

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not done for all the health projects:</p> <p>The Environment officer availed screening forms for three projects: Construction of a five stance VIP Latrine at Kashambya H/C II dated 13/12/2020, Phased Completion of Mukyogo Health Centre II dated 11/12/2020, Renovation of Cold Chain Room at the DHOs Office dated 6/12/2020. However, the screening form for the construction of a maternity ward at Mparo Health Centre IV in Mparo T/C, was not presented for review during the assessment.</p> <p>Costed ESMPs should have been developed for the projects, covering environmental and social safeguard recommendations, Occupational health and safety, stakeholder engagements, waste management etc but this was not done.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The LG health department timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans on 29/4/2021 and received in PDU on 29/4/2021 which is before the 30th of April as 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>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The procurement request forms (Form PP1) for sector project i.e., completion of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV was submitted to PDU on 30/6/2021 which is within the 1st quarter of the FY as required.</p>	1

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 health infrastructure investments for the FY 2020/2021 were approved by the Contracts Committee as detailed below;</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 265,777,147 • Contract agreement signed on: 3/12/2020 • Contractor: A Thousand Marbles Ltd • Solicitor General's clearance dated 26/11/2020 <p>Renovation of a cold chain building at the district health office (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated:19/1/2021 • Evaluation report dated 18/1/2021 • Min. of approval: 125/RDCC/19/01/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 15,882,092 • Contract agreement signed on: 8/2/2021 • Contractor: David and Beatress Construction Co., Ltd <p>Completion of Mukyoogo HC II.(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 22/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 34,763,390 • Contract agreement signed on: 24/11/2020 • Contractor: Novelty Agencies Ltd.
--	--	--

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not establish the project Implementation Team for the health sector implemented projects as required. For example, the appointment letters for the contract managers and project managers dated 23/11/2020 for all health sector projects were availed for review but do not constitute a complete PIT.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>The sector did not implement any project regarding upgrade during the FY 2020/21.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>For the health sector implemented projects, there was no clerk of works appointed and therefore no daily site reports were availed for review to ascertain that the weekly reports are consolidated from the daily site reports.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</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>LG did not upgrade any HC II to HC III as of last FY.</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>According to the supervision reports on projects' files dated 10/6/2021,(27/3/2021 and 25/5/2021), 30/3/2021 for completion of Mukyoogo HC II, Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HC III and Construction of a maternity ward at Mparo HC IV respectively, technical supervision of works for all the projects implemented last FY indicated that supervision was only done by the D/Engineer and missing the other equally relevant officers including the Environment officer and CDO at critical stages of construction.</p>	0

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

Five (05) certifiable payments out of FY2020/21 infrastructure projects of Rukiga DLG Health were sampled to test certification and the timeliness of payment for works executed. Phased construction of maternity ward at Mparo HCIV (UGX41,026,106) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 30/03/2021. Requisition dated 05/03/21 and payment dated 03/05/2021 (58 days). Completion of Mukyogo HCII (UGX34,763,390) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 01/02/2021. Requisition dated 27/01/2021 and payment dated 03/05/21 (96 days). Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII (UGX12,571,000) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 09/04/2021. Requisition dated 27/03/2021 and payment dated 17/05/2021 (50 days). Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya HCIII (UGX16,206,746) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021. Requisition dated 10/05/2021 and payment dated 14/06/2021 (34 days). Renovation of cold chain building 2nd phase at DHO office (UGX15,882,092) – certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 25/02/2021. Requisition dated 20/02/2021 and payment dated 30/03/2021 (40 days) In all the 5 sampled projects, payments were effected beyond the 14 days time limit.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had complete procurement files for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law14 as detailed below;</p> <p>Construction of maternity ward at Mparo HC IV (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 265,777,147 • Contract agreement signed on: 3/12/2020 • Contractor: A Thousand Marbles Ltd • Solicitor General's clearance dated 26/11/2020 <p>Renovation of a cold chain building at the district health office (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated:19/1/2021 • Evaluation report dated 18/1/2021 • Min. of approval: 125/RDCC/19/01/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 15,882,092 • Contract agreement signed on: 8/2/2021 • Contractor: David and Beatress Construction Co., Ltd <p>Completion of Mukyoogo HC II.(RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 22/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 34,763,390 • Contract agreement signed on: 24/11/2020 • Contractor: Novelty Agencies Ltd.
--	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0	From the Community Grievance Focal person, no complaints raised at some project sites under health sector department. were recorded in the log book.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG Health Department had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management to health facilities. For instance; there were charts on medical waste segregation displayed the three sampled health facilities of Bukinda HC III, Mparo HC IV and Kyogo HC III.	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	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	There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG had a functional system/central infrastructure with equipment for medical waste management and had a dedicated/operational budget. The assessment established that the district was supported by USAID through Green label Company Ltd to manage medical waste. Waste collection forms dated 10th March 2021 for green label company limited was also found on file.	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to confirm that Rukiga DLG had conducted training and created awareness in health care waste management. The department undertook infection Prevention Committees mentorship activities on 14th -19th September 2020.	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Costed ESMPs should have been developed for the projects, covering environmental and social safeguard recommendations, Occupational health and safety, stakeholder engagements, waste management etc but this was not done.</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 proof of land ownership for all health projects implemented.</p> <p>The Project files for health were reviewed. A certificate of Freehold Register, Volume HQT1745 FOLIO 5 A was presented dated 11/4/2019 covering 7.7940 Hectares in Rukiga County Kabale District. At block (road) 103 plot 41 at Kabumbiro/Kashaki where a maternity ward at Mparo Health Centre IV was constructed including the project for the renovation of Cold Chain Room at the DHOs Office under the Ownership of Rukiga District Local Government</p> <p>Land agreements or titles for Muchogo Health Centre II in Kashambya S/c and for the construction of a five stance VIP Latrine at Kashambya Health Centre III were not presented for review during assessment.</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>The Environmental officer informed the Assessment that monthly monitoring for projects was not undertaken. ESMPs for the projects were not presented for review during assessment therefore determining whether mitigations were followed-up was not possible.</p> <p>Site maintenance at the Cold Chain Room in the DHOs Office which was completed at the time of the visit was poor. There was no provision for onsite management of waste, Kaveras and plastics were observed thrown all around the site. At Mparo H/C III, Overall site maintenance was good and all the health workers had PPE.</p> <p>The CDO and Environment Officer however did not participate in screening or monitoring of this sites therefore no record of Environmental and social aspects were presented for review during field visit.</p>	0

<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The contractor certificates for projects implemented under Health Department were signed off/certified by the Environment and Community Development Officer as indicated for the following projects:</p> <p>Phased construction of maternity ward at Mparo H/C IV amount worth UGX41,026,106 Certified by the District Health Officer, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 30/03/2021. Completion of Mukyogo H/C II amount worth UGX34,763,390 Certified by the District Health Officer, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 01/02/2021. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kashambya H/C III amount worth UGX16,206,746 Certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021.</p> <p>Renovation of cold chain building 2nd phase at DHO office amount worth UGX15,882,092 Certified by the DHO, District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 25/02/2021.</p>
--	---	--

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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	As per the MWE-MIS for the current FY (2020/21), the rural water functionality for Rukiga District is 67% which falls below 80%, thereby justifying a score of zero (0).	0
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 the MWE -MIS for the current FY (2020/21), the % of WSS facilities with functional WSCs in Rukiga DLG, as seen under the Management Column, is 88%. This value lies between 80% and 89%, thereby justifying a score of 1 to be entered.	1
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Not Applicable - LLGs' performance assessments have not yet started.	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

Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for
Rukiga District for the previous FY
(2020/2021), as obtained from the
DWO, was 95%. There were no Sub-
Counties (S/Cs) with SWC below the
district average to be targeted.

The budgeted water projects in the
previous FY 2020/21 that were
implemented included the following:

- Construction of Public Latrines in
RGCs (1): One 2-stance VIP Latrine at
Karorwa RGC in Bukinda S/C;
- Design and documentation of Ibumba
GFS in Rwamucucu S/C;
- Rehabilitation works on Shooko GFS
in Rwamucucu S/C;

Of the 3 WSS projects that were
implemented in the previous
FY2020/21, all S/Cs were therefore the
targeted S/Cs, representing 100% of
the water projects implemented thereby
justifying the entering of a score of 2.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

A review of the Annual budget for the
previous FY 2020/2021 and a sample
of 3 WSS contracts revealed the
following variations:

(i) Contract RUK620/WRKS/2020-
2021/00001: Awarded to DACOSI LTD
to do rehabilitation works on Shooko
GFS Rwamucucu S/C; had contracted
amount of UGX 174,813,583 compared
to Engineer's estimate amount of UGX
179,080,000 that represents a variation
of -2.38%.

(IVA wrongly calculated the % variation
of the contracted amount
(=Difference/Contracted amount = -
2.44%) and not the % variation of
Engineer's estimate calculated by the
Assessor (=Difference/Engineer's
Estimate =-2.382%)

(ii) Contract RUK620/WRKS/2020-
2021/00006: Awarded to Bonnar
Company Ltd for construction of 2-
stanceVIP lined Latrine at Karorwa
RGC; had contracted amount of UGX
12,399,440 compared to Engineer's
estimate amount of UGX 13,000,000
that represents a variation of -4.62%.

(iii) Contract RUK620/SRVCS/2020-
2021/00001: Awarded to ARK
Associates to carry out design and
documentation of Ibumba GFS; had
contracted amount of UGX21,476,000
compared to Engineer's estimate
amount of UGX22,150,000 that
represents a variation of -3.04% (Not
0.3% calculated by the IVA).

Therefore, given that the contracted
prices of the sampled 3 WSS
infrastructure investments for the
previous FY are within +/-20% of the
engineer's estimates, a score of 2 is
entered.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

- o If 100% projects completed: score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1
- o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

The Annual performance report (4th
Quarter) for the DWSCG for FY
2020/21 Signed and submitted by
Rukiga CAO on 4th/8/2020 to the
Permanent Secretary MWE and
received by MWE Central Registry on
6th/8/2020 and approved by the MWE
Rural Water Supply and Sanitation
Department (RWSSD) on the same
date, indicated the following as the
planned WSS infrastructure projects:

(i) Contract RUK620/WRKS/2020-
2021/00001: Awarded to DACOSI LTD
to do rehabilitation works on Shooko
GFS Rwamucucu S/C; had contracted
amount of UGX 174,813,583: 100%
Level of completion as per annual
workplan;

(ii) Contract RUK620/WRKS/2020-
2021/00006: Awarded to Bonnar
Company Ltd to construction of 2-
stanceVIP lined Latrine at Karorwa
RGC; had contracted amount of UGX
12,399,440: 100% Level of completion
as per annual workplan; and

(iii) Contract RUK620/SRVCS/2020-
2021/00001: Awarded to ARK
Associates to carry out design and
documentation of Ibumba GFS; had
contracted amount of UGX22,150,000:
100% Level of completion as per
annual workplan;

Therefore, a score of 2 is entered for
100% projects completed.

New_Achievement of
Standards:

The LG has met WSS
infrastructure facility
standards

*Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure*

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

- o If there is an increase: score 2
- o If no increase: score 0.

From MWE-MIS for the current FY
(2020/21), the rural water functionality
for Rukiga District is 67% while the
Functionality was 82% for the previous
FY 2019/20. This indicates a decrease
of 15% in the water supply facilities that
are functional, and therefore, there was
no increase and a score of zero (0) is
entered.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>From MWE-MIS for the current FY (2020/21), the rural water Management for Rukiga District is 88% while the Management was 93% for the previous FY 2019/20. This indicates a decrease of 5% in the water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees, which is a no increase and therefore a score of zero (0) is entered.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The list of constructed WSS facilities in the previous FY 2020/21 attached to 4th Quarter DWSCG for Rukiga DLG that were the only ones implemented and were therefore sampled included:</p> <p>(i) Rehabilitation works on Shooko GFS Rwamucucu S/C; and</p> <p>(ii) Construction of 2-stanceVIP lined Latrine at Karorwa RGC;</p> <p>All the facilities are functioning well, as observed during the field visits and the DWO accurately reported on them in the Annual Performance Report of 4th Quarter in the FY 2020/21.</p>	3
---	---	--	--	---

5

0

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

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

There was no evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles information on sub-county water supply and sanitation as should be reported in the minutes of the coordination committee meetings expected to be held each quarter and incorporated in the following Quarterly reports:

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

(i) 1st Quarter Report for FY 2020/21 was not seen

(ii) 2nd Quarter Report for FY 2020/21 was not seen

(iii) 3rd Quarter Report for FY 2020/21 submitted by Rukiga DLG CAO on 14th/04/2021 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 16th/04/2021

(iv) 4th Quarter Report for FY 2020/21 submitted by Rukiga DLG CAO on 4th/7/2021 to the MWE PS and received by the RWSSD on 6th/8/2021

Since the 1st and 2nd quarter reports were not available, it can be concluded that there was no evidence that the DWO collected and compiled information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, the functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water coverage, hygiene, and community involvement during those quarters. Therefore, a score of zero (0) is entered.

5

0

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

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

There was no evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) as there is no DWO MIS though, two Quarterly Reports seen indicated the only newly constructed facility. The details of the newly constructed facilities that are supposed to be filled in Form 1 as a data collection form for point water sources , detailing the location of the new facilities, population served, the functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) were not seen.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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 is no previous assessment of the LLGs' performance, the assessment is to start next FY.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO budgeted for the critical staff in the district water office. While at the time of the assessment there was only one substantive staff (the District Water Officer),a budget provision was duly made for the District Water officer (other positions were not provided for in the structure) as reflected on Page 40 of the approved Estimated Budgets for FY 2021/2022 generated on 27th June 2021 at 11.08 am.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment & Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff in the Natural Resources department . The Assessor reviewed the approved budget estimates for FY 2021/2022 and established that a budget provision was made for key staff that were provided for in the established and customized staff structure. A budget provision was cited on page 43, of the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/2022 generated on 27th June, 2021 at 11.08 am.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>No staff had been recruited in the Water Office during FY 2020/2021 , except the District Water Officer. Accordingly, there were no staff that could be appraised by the District Water Officer.</p>	0

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no Capacity needs assessment report provided by the DWO; no Training plans; and Training reports were availed. Therefore, the DWO never submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO for consolidation into the District Training database and no staff was trained. The District Training database was also not in place.

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

Rukiga District Access-Functionality-Population Report as per 30th/06/2021 obtained from the DWO indicated Rukiga District average Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for the previous FY (2020/2021) as 95%. There is no S/Cs with SWC below this district average and therefore there any S/C becomes the target for budget allocations in the current FY 2021/22.

The Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget for the current FY 2021/22 for Rukiga DLG submitted by CAO on 4th/08/2021 to the MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by the RWSSD on 6th/08/2021 indicated the following budget allocations under the District Rural Water Supply-Development Fund part of the DWSCG:

- Construction of a Public Latrine in a RGC at UGX13,000,000;
- Payment for construction of piped water supply system (Shooko GFS) in Rwamucucu S/C and Karorwa in Bukinda S/C at UGX8,500,000;
- Construction of Ibumba GFS: Extending moreservice points in Ibumba and Nyakagabagaba in Rwamucucu S/C at a cost of UGX75,000,000; and
- Construction of Nyakagabagaba GFS at a cost of UGX25,000,000.

Therefore, there is 100% of the budget allocation for the current FY 2021/22 to target S/Cs.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There is evidence that the DWO conducted S/C advocacy meetings and informed LLGs about allocations per source.

(i) Rukiga DLG District Advocacy and planning meeting held on 6th/05/2021 in District Lukiiko Hall, attended by 35 participants: agenda item 6 on "Presentation by the DWO, and agenda item 7 on "Discussion and way forward".

(ii) Report following Planning and advocacy meeting held at Rukiga District, dated 14th/01/2021.

(iii) Report following Planning and advocacy meeting held at Rukiga District, dated 30th/05/2021.

(iv) Rukiga DLG Extension staff meeting conducted at the district on 7th/01/2021, attended by 21 participants: agenda item 6 on "Presentation by the DWO" in which he informed of the FY 2021/22 Plans that included protection of 15 springs, Construction of 2-stance Latrine in Rwamatunguru RGC in Kamwezi S/C, and rehabilitation of Ibumba GFS; and agenda item 7 on "Discussions and way forward".

(v) Minutes taken during Town Extension Workers meeting held on 28th/06/2021, attended by 25 participants: Agenda item 5 on "Presentation by the DWO" and agenda item 6 on "Presentation and submission of quarterly reports by HIs/HAs and CDO", attended by 25 participants.

(vi) There was also displayed on the District Notice Board regarding "Rukiga DLG Consolidated Procurement Plan for FY 2021/22" that included the water projects with their allocations.

Therefore, the DLG should be scored and a score of 3 is entered.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance

a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)

• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities

There was no evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly.

(a) The WSS facilities in Rukiga DLG as seen from the Annual Situation Analysis as of 30th/06/2021 (attached to the DWSCG Progress Report for 4th

measure

monitored quarterly: score 4

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

Quarter included the following:

- 218 protected springs of which 204 are functional,
- 4 Shallow wells with hand pump and depth less than 30m, of which only one is functional,
- 62 Deep boreholes with pump and depth greater than 30m, of which only 8 are functional,
- 26 GFSs with 365 Tap Stands of which 347 are functional, and
- 52 Rain Water Tanks (with a volume less than 10m³), of which 35 are functional.

There were no reports seen for monitoring and supervision of these existing WSS facilities.

(b) The List of WSS facilities implemented for Rural Water Supply for Rukiga district in previous FY 2020/21 included:

- Construction Of A 2-Stance VIP Latrine at Karorwa RGC in Bukinda S/C;
- Construction works for rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Nyarurambi Parish in Rwamucucu S/C
- Design and documentation of Ibumba GFS piped Water Supply System in Rwamucucu S/C

There were no monitoring plans seen at the Water LG Office, although the following reports were found at the LG Water Department:

- Report following orientation meeting done with communities near Shooko GFS, date 1st/02/2021 to the CAO through District Engineer by Focal Person for Mobilization;
- Report following meeting conducted at Kanzamugyerere concerning Kabisha GFS issues, dated 27th/02/2021 to CAO through DWO by the Focal person for Mobilization;
- Two supervision reports for construction of Shooko GFS in Rwamucucu S/C from the DWO to the CAO, dated 15th/02/2021 and 31st/05/2021.

(c) In the AWP for FY 2020/21,

indicated planned 5 monitoring and supervision visits, and 2 Inspection visits of water points after construction, implying a total of 7 visits and therefore, 7 reports of Monitoring, Inspection and Supervision. From the listed reports, there were only 4 reports accessed during the Assessment, representing only about 57.1% that is far below 80% of the facilities being monitored.

(d) Even considering the 2 WSS facilities implemented in FY 2020/21, if each facility is to be monitored at least quarterly, then the expected minimum reports will be 8 reports. The percentage of 4 reports accessed at the LG Water Office out of 8, gives a percentage of about 50% that is again far less than 80% of WSS facilities monitored.

Therefore, a score of zero (0) was entered.

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There is no evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed. The following documents were not seen at the Water LG Office:

- DWSCC Minutes;
- 1st Quarter and 2nd Quarter Progress Reports were not seen;
- Although 3rd and 4th Quarter Progress Reports were seen, they did not contain the Minutes for DWSCC Meetings.

0

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There is no evidence that the DWO publicized budget allocations for the current FY 2021/22 to all S/Cs.

0

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The Total Non-Wage Recurrent budget for the previous FY 2020/21 was UGX 46,466,474 while the amount spend on Mobilization was UGX 8,878,474, which is 19% of the NWR. This Percentage is far less than the Minimum of 40% as per sector guidelines. Therefore, a score of zero (0) is entered.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that for the previous FY 2020/21, the District Water Officer in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities.</p> <p>From the sampled WSS projects implemented in FY 2020/21 listed below, there was no evidence that WSCs were established and trained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Of A 2-Stance VIP Latrine at Karorwa RGC in Bukinda S/C; and • Construction works for rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Nyarurambi Parish Parish in Rwamucucu S/C. 	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 is no up-to-date LG asset register at the Water LG Office.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p>	<p>For FY 2020/21, RDLG Water and Environment department had the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Karorwa Rural Growth Centre in Bukida S/C UGX13,000,000 Rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Rwamucucu S/C UGX192,150,000 Re-design of Ibumba GFS in Rwamucucu S/C UGX22,150,000 <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derived from the LG Development Plan -Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives -Financially feasible -Having costed project profiles. <p>Evidence of desk appraisals for RDLG Water projects was provided and reviewed.</p>	4
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>		
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the budgeted investments for the current FY 2021/22 have completed applications from beneficiary communities. No Community application files were seen at the Water LG Office.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>For FY 2020/21, RDLG Water and Environment department had the following projects:</p> <p>Construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Karorwa Rural Growth Centre in Bukida S/C UGX13,000,000</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Rwamucucu S/C UGX192,150,000</p> <p>Re-design of Ibumba GFS in Rwamucucu S/C UGX22,150,000</p> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technical feasibility -Environmental and social acceptability requirements <p>No evidence was provided with regard to field appraisals for these projects.</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. Score 2</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not carried out for all the previous FY projects.</p> <p>The screening form for the Redesign of Ikumba GFS in Rwamucucu was on file dated 8/12/2020. However, there was no evidence of screening provided for the Rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Rwamucucu</p> <p>Costed ESMPs, and its incorporation on BoQs were not observed at time of assessment</p>	0

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

The water infrastructure investments implemented during the FY 2020/21 were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan extracted from the water sector plan submitted and received in PDU on 13/04/2020 as detailed below;

1) Construction of Shooko GFS phase II in Rwamucucu S/C is reflected in the procurement plan under water sector.

2) Construction of 2-stance water borne toilet Karorwa RGC Bukinda S/C is reflected in the procurement plan under water sector.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the FY 2020/21 was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Shooko GFS phase II in Rwamucucu S/C. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 174,813,583 • Contract agreement signed on: 25/11/2020 • Contractor: DACOSI Ltd 2. Construction of 2-stance water borne toilet Karorwa RGC Bukinda S/C. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 12,399,440 • Contract agreement signed on: 25/11/2020 • Contractor: Bona Co., Ltd 	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The water sector did not establish the project Implementation Team for the sector implemented projects as required. For example, the appointment letters for the contract supervisor and project manager dated 23/11/2020 for all water sector projects availed did not make up to a complete PIT.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There is evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO. The Water and Public Sanitation infrastructure sampled were:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>(i) Construction Of A 2-Stance VIP Latrine at Karorwa RGC in Bukinda S/C for FY 2020/21: The Super Structure, Walling, Roofing and Doors were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO. In addition, Gutters were put to collect rain water to drain it away. The ventilation of the facility was properly done, Finishes and painting were properly done.</p> <p>(ii) Construction works for rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Nyarurambi Parish Parish in Rwamucucu S/C: The source protection, Sedimentation Tank, Brake Pressure tank, 60m3 new Reservoir was constructed and and rehabilitation of an existing 40m3 Reservoir was done, tap stands and pipe network were all properly constructed/installed according to the technical designs provided by the DWO.</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>According to the supervision reports dated 31/5/2021, 15/2/2021 and 11/5/2021 etc., that were availed and reviewed, it was established that not all the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects i.e., apart from the Water officer and Community Development officer, the Environment officer did not participate.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></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>.</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>Three (3) certifiable projects were sampled in Rukiga DLG Water and Environment to check for certification and timeliness of payments:</p> <p>Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Karorwa Rural Growth Centre (UGX12,399,440) – certified by the District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021, Requisition dated 11/05/2021 and payment made on 14/06/2021 (33 days).</p> <p>Construction of Shooko GFS water scheme (UGX174,813,583) – certified by the District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021, Requisition dated 24/05/2021 and payment made on 30/06/2021 (36 days).</p> <p>Design of Ibumba GFS (UGX21,476,000) – certified by the District Engineer, the CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/05/2021, Requisition dated 24/05/2021 and payment made on 14/06/2021 (20 days).</p> <p>Even though all the 3 sampled projects were certified, none of them met the 14 days payment time limit criterion.</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>.</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 procurement files for the water infrastructure investments implemented FY2020/21 for each contract were complete and had all records as required by the PPDA Law. See details below;</p> <p>1. Construction of Shooko GFS phase II in Rwamucucu S/C. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00001)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 174,813,583 • Contract agreement signed on: 25/11/2020 • Contractor: DACOSI Ltd <p>2. Construction of 2-stance water borne toilet Karorwa RGC Bukinda S/C. (RUKI620/WKS/2020-21/00006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Contracts Committee meeting dated: 3/11/2020 • Evaluation report dated 21/10/2020 • Min. of approval: 103/RDCC/03/11/2020-21 • Contract sum: UGX 12,399,440 • Contract agreement signed on: 25/11/2020 • Contractor: Bona Co., Ltd
--	---	--

Environment and Social Requirements

<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>From the Community Grievance Focal person, there were no complaints raised at some project sites under the water department.</p>
---	--	---

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 & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source and catchment protection and natural resource management guidelines had not been disseminated at the time of assessment.</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 & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water Source Protection plans and natural resource management plans for water infrastructure were not prepared, therefore not presented during assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent.</p> <p>There was a Memorandum of understanding between Rukiga district local government and Nyana Temple, Jackson Barugahare, Sadress Tarutaru, and Rutankundira James for land for Construction of Shooko Gravity Flow scheme signed by the CAO, Tumwesigye Gideon and Nywana Temple, Bamwine Margaret, Ainebyona Nelson dated 15/02/2021. This project was completed in the previous FY 2020/21.</p> <p>The other project of the Construction of a 2-Stance latrine at Karogwa HC II, Bukinda was placed on government land at the HC.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&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>Five (5) certifiable projects were sampled in Rukiga DLG Water and Environment to check for E&S certification.</p> <p>Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Karorwa Rural Growth Centre (UGX12,399,440)</p> <p>Construction of Shooko GFS water scheme (UGX174,813,583)</p> <p>Design of Ibumba GFS (UGX21,476,000)</p> <p>No evidence was provided to confirm E&S certification for any of the sampled projects.</p>	0

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

One monitoring record was provided
for Rwamucucu Seed School dated
17/06/2020. However monthly reports
were not developed for Water
infrastructure implemented by the
District as required.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
Maximum score 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	<p>The staffing structure for LLG extension workers provides for a total of 24 extension workers (Agriculture, Veterinary, Fisheries, Entomology) at the 6 LLGs at Rubanda District. By the time of the assessment, a total of 17 extension workers had been recruited, constituting a percentage of 71 percent. The breakdown for the recruitment of the different cadres of extension workers at the time of the assessment was as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agricultural Officers: Planned: 4 and 2 Senior Agricultural Officers. Total recruited 6. 2. Agricultural Assistants: Planned: 4. Total Recruited : 0. 3. Veterinary Officers: Planned: 4. Total recruited: 1. 4. Veterinary Assistants: Planned 6: Total recruited: 6 5. Fisheries Officers: Planned 4: Total recruited 3. <p>Overall total number Planned 24. Overall total number recruited 17. Therefore $17/24 * 100 = 71\%$.</p>	0
Maximum score 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 		

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 6			

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	<p>The Assessor sampled three LLGs out of 6 LLGs namely: Kashambya Subcounty, Rwamuchucu Subcounty and Mparwo Town Council to verify the accuracy of the positions of extension workers filled. The Assessor established that the information reported about the positions of extension workers filled at LLGs was accurate. Examples of extension staff recruited are indicated below:</p> <p>At Kashambya Subcounty; the position of Agricultural Officer was held by Arinaitwe Innocent while Turyagyenda held the position Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer. At Rwamuchucu Subcounty, Kabahizi Everest was the Agricultural Officer while Agaba Wilfred held the position of Animal Husbandry Officer. At Mparo Town Council; Kukundakwe Benjamin was the Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, while Agaba Louise held the position of Agricultural Officer.</p> <p>The above information was accurate and consistence with the information contained on the staff list provided by the acting District Production and Marketing Officer.</p>	2
	Maximum score 4			

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 4			

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The Assessor reviewed the approved Performance Contract and Budget estimates for FY 2021/2022 and confirmed that the District Production department budgeted for extension woovers as per guidelines. A budget provision was made in the approved budget estimates as indicated on page 17 of the approved budget estimates generated on the 27th June, 2021 at 11.08 am.	1
	Maximum score 6			
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	While extension workers of the calibers of Agriculture, Veterinary and Fisheries were deployed at all the LLGs, after a critical analysis of the deployment list from the Production Department, the assessor ascertained that extension workers were not deployed in accordance with the guidelines (i.e. an Agricultural and Veterinary Officer deplyed at every LLG). On the overall, no LLG at Rukiga district, had substantively filled the position of veterinary Officer. For example at Bukinda Subcounty , an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Turinawe Dismus - was deployed instead of a Veterinary Officer. At Muhanga Subcounty , Niwakora Precious , an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was deployed instead of a Veterinary Officer.	0
	Maximum score 6			
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	The Assessor confirmed that at all the LLGs sampled and visited, it was established that the extension wokers were working where they were deployed. At all the LLGs, staff lists were displayed at the public notice boards and at the SAS and Town Clerk's Office. Staff attendance record books were available at all stations (although were suspended due to Covid 19 but resumed use of them in August 2021). The Assessor, however, did nor see copies of SAS/TC supervision monitoring reports.	2
	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>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>At all the three sampled LLGs, copies of staff lists were displayed at public notice boards as a way of publicizing and disseminating information about extension workers deployed at the respective LLGs.</p>	2
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 Assessor took a sample of seven (7) files of extension workers and reviewed them to establish whether the District Production Coordinator appraised all extension workers during the previous Financial Year. The Assessor confirmed that all extension workers were appraised as revealed by the details of the sample below:</p> <p>-- Kukundakwe Benjamin a Veterinary Officer was appraised by the District Production Coordinator on 30th June, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>-- Agaba Loyce; an Agricultural Officer was appraised by the District Production Coordinator on 30th June, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>-- Kabahizi Everest, an Agricultural Officer was appraised by the Production coordinator on the 30th June, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>-- Agaba Wilfred; a Veterinary Officer, was appraised by the District Production Coordinator on 30th June, 2021 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>-- Asiimwe Amelia; a Fisheries Officer; was appraised by the District Production Coordinator and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p>	1

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 presented to the Assessor to confirm that corrective actions were taken based on appraisal reports.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at district level.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Rukiga district had not yet developed a training data base at the time of the assessment.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – Not in DLG	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>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>	Not applicable – Not in DLG	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable – Not in DLG	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>	Not applicable – Not in DLG	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>	Not applicable – Not in DLG	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>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>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 4			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>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>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</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>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</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>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</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>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable – not in the DLG.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	0
----	--	---	----------------------------------	---

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable – not in the DLG.	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	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	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	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
----	--	--	---	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p>	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0</p>	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0</p>	Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Senior Agricultural Engineer: The Position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>There was no evidence to confirm that Rukiga District had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government to substantively fill the position of Senior Agricultural Engineer.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>Rukiga District is not part of the National Pilot for Micro-Scale Irrigation Project.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The Approved and Customized staffing structure for Rukiga District provided for only one key staff; the District Water Officer . All other key positions of ; Assistant water Officer – Mobilization, Borehole Maintenance Technician, Natural Resources Officer, Environment Officer and Forestry Officer were not provided for in the structure. Accordingly, by the time of the assessment it was the position of District Water Officer that was substantively filled. Ms Mutabazi Deogratius , File No. RKI/CR/M/1271, was substantively appointed as District Water Officer as directed by DSC. Min. NO.5/2019 and by letter dated 17th March, 2020. There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to determine whether Rukiga DLG formally requested the Central Government to substantively appoint staff on secondment to fill the vacant positions.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant as it was not provided for in the Customized staff structure.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant as it was not provided for in the Customized staff structure	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The position was vacant as it was not provided for in the Customized staff structure	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Although the position of Environment Officer was provided for in the Customized staffing structure, it was still vacant at the time of conducting the assessment exercise.	0
---	--	---	---	---

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant as it was not provided for in the Customized staff structure	0
---	--	--	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not carried out for all the previous FY projects. The screening form for the Redesign of Ikumba GFS in Rwamucucu was on file dated 8/12/2020. However, there was no evidence of screening provided for the Rehabilitation of Shooko GFS in Rwamucucu	0
---	---	--	--	---

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	The projects implemented with the DDEG did not require ESIA in accordance with the National Environment Act, 2019, therefore none were developed.	10
---	---	--	---	----

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The DWO informed the assessment that no Abstraction permit had been obtained for the Gravity flow scheme as required.	0
---	---	--	---	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Established/Customized Staff Structure for Rukiga district provides for 7 positions in the Health Department including: DHO, Assistant DHO Maternal and Child Health, Assistant DHO Environmental Health, Senior Environmental Health Officer, Senior Health Educator, Biostatistician and Assistant Inventory Management Officer. The Assessor reviewed the personal files of staff and established that Only three (3) staff out of seven (7) were substantively filled at the time of the assessment exercise. For all the positions that were still vacant; there was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government to fill the vacant positions. Details of staff recruitment and status were as indicated below.</p> <p>1. Acting District Health Officer: Awumuza Gilbert, a Senior Environment Health Officer, file ref. no. RKI/CR/A/017 was appointed on Assignment of duty as Acting District Health Officer by letter dated 8th April, 2021.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>2. Assistant District Health Officer:-Maternal Child Health and Nursing: The position was still vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Ms. Angabire Grace, a Nursing Officer Midwifery, was assigned the responsibilities of Acting Assistant DOH- Maternal and Child Health and Nursing by letter dated 27th September, 2018.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>3. Assistant District Health Officer- Environmental Health. The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>4. Senior Environmental Health Officer: Ms. Ahumuza Gilbert was substantively appointed as Senior Environmental Health Officer, as directed by DSC. Min. No 34/2019 (b) and by letter dated 2nd March, 2020.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>5. Senior Health Educator: The position was still vacant at the time of the assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>6. Biostatistician: Ahimbisibwe Patrick; File No.RKI/CR/A/1335, was substantively appointed as a Biostatistician as directed by DSC. Min. No. 0052021 and by appointment letter dated 14th April, 2021.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>7. Cold Chain Technician: Nasasira Eriad; file no. RKI/CR/N/0285 was substantively appointed as a Cold Chain Technician as directed by DSC. Min. no. 11/2018 and by letter dated 14th May, 2018.</p>	10

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

h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

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

i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

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

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not done for all the health projects:

The Environment officer availed screening forms for three projects: Construction of a five stance VIP Latrine at Kashambya H/C II dated 13/12/2020, Phased Completion of Mukyogo Health Centre II dated 11/12/2020, Renovation of Cold Chain Room at the DHOs Office dated 6/12/2020

However, the screening form for the construction of a maternity ward at Mparo Health Centre IV in Mparo T/C, was not presented for review during the assessment.

Maximum score is 30

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)

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

The projects implemented with the Previous FY did not require ESIA in accordance with the National Environment Act, 2019, therefore none were developed.

Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The approved staff structure of Rukiga District provides for 7 staff, including: The District Education Officer, Senior Education Officer, Principal Inspector of schools, Senior Education Officer (special Needs and Administration, Sports Officer, Education Officer-Guidance and Counseling and Inspector of Schools. The recruitment details and status of appointment for the District Education Officer and District Inspector of schools are detailed below: District Education Officer: Mr. Bweyendera Vastina ; file no. RTI/CR/B/0096, was substantively appointed as a District Education Officer as directed by DSC Min. No.19/2019 and by appointment letter dated 10th July, 2019. 2020.	30
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	District Inspector of Schools: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment. The roles of District Inspector of schools were assigned to the Senior Inspector of Schools; Mr. Ndyabegyera Christopher , who was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools by DSC Min. no. 23/2020 and by appointment letter dated 24th March 2021. There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government for substantively fill the position of District Inspector of Schools.	0

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not carried out for all education projects for the previous FY

The screened projects were: Construction of Bukinda seed secondary school in Bukinda subcounty dated 1/10/2020 construction of a two VIP Latrine at Karorwa in Bukinda Subcounty 20/10/2020, Construction of a five stance VIP latrine at Runoni Primary School dated 09/12/2020, Rehabilitation of VIP latrine for learners with disability at Kitanga Primary School dated 10/12/202 and Construction of a five stance VIP Latrine at Kashambya Health Centre III dated 13/12/202.

The Environment Officer and CDO during the assessment did not avail the screening forms for the completion of Rwamucucu Seed.

0

2

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

The projects implemented with the Previous FY did not require ESIA in accordance with the National Environment Act, 2019, therefore none were developed.

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The Approved and Costed staff Structure for Rukiga District dated 3rd October, 2017 Ref. No. ARC 135/306/01 provides for Nine (9) Heads of Departments (HoD). At the time of the Assessment Exercise; Rukiga District had substantively filled only 2 out of 9 Heads of Department. The positions of the District Education Officer and the Community Development Officer were the only two positions that were substantively filled. The Assessor reviewed personal files of all HoDs and established their appointment status as indicated below: Acting Chief Finance Officer: Musiime Justus , a Senior Treasurer; file no. RKI/CR/M/0052 was appointed as Acting Chief Finance by letter of assignment dated 28th July, 2021.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Acting District Planner: Mr Muhwezi Henry , file no. RKI/CR/M/10048, a substantive Economist, was appointed as acting District Planner by letter dated 28th July, 2021.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Acting District Engineer: Kiganda James File No. RKI/CR/K/0115 was appointed as acting District Engineer by letter dated 12th October, 2020.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Acting District Natural Resources Officer: Gumisiriza Nelson ; a Senior Lands Management Officer, was appointed as Acting Natural Resources by letter dated 15th September, 2021.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Acting District Production and Marketing Officer: <i>Katwesigye Leonard</i> , a substantive Agricultural Officer, file no.RKI/CR/K/0144, was appointed as acting District Production Officer, by letter dated 18th June, 2019.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	District Community Development Officer: <i>Mbaguta Dorothy</i> ; File ref. no. RKI/CR/M/0047 was substantively appointed as a District Community Development Officer as directed by DSC. Min. No.19/2018 and by letter dated 18th June, 2018	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	Acting District Commercial Officer: <i>Kaijuka Benson</i> ; File Ref.no. RKI/CR/K/0036 was appointed as Acting District Commercial Officer by assignment of duty letter dated 1st July, 2021.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Senior Procurement Officer: The Position was vacant at the time of the assessment: There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested the Central Government for staff secondment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Procurement Officer: <i>Musimenta Milta</i> ; was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer as directed by DSC. Min. No. 19/2018 and by letter dated 28th May 2018.	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested the Central Government to second staff to Rukiga DLG to substantively fill the position of Principal Human Resource Officer.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Environment Officer: <i>Byaruhanga John</i>; File no.RKI/CR/B/003, was substantively appointed as directed by DSC No. 19/2018 and by letter dated 18th June, 20</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Land Management Officer: <i>Gumisiriza Nelson</i>; file no.RKI/CR/A/009, was substantively appointed as a Senior Lands Management Officer, by DSC Min. No. 19/2018 and by letter dated 28th May 2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Accountant: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The roles of Senior Accountant were assigned to Ms.Tusasirwe Brita, file no.RKI/CR/T/0072, as an Acting Senior Accountant by letter dated 28th May, 2018, Ref.no.DSC.19/2018.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government to substantively fill the position of Senior Accountant.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Internal Auditor: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Ms. Byarugaba Geoffrey, file no. RKI/CR/B/0110 was appointed as Acting Principal Internal Auditor by letter dated 1st November, 2021.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government to substantively fill the position of Principal Internal Auditor.</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC): The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Ms. Ainembabazi Medred was appointed as acting PHRO-Secretary DSC, by letter dated 1st November, 2021.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Rukiga DLG had formally requested for staff secondment from the Central Government to substantively fill the position of PHRO-Secretary to DSC.</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGs, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Rukiga District is constituted of 6 Lower Local Governments (LLGs) that include 4 Sub counties and 2 functional Town Councils.</p> <p>The Assessor reviewed the Approved and Customized Staff Establishment for Rukiga DLG by Ministry of Public Service; ref ARC135/306/01, dated 3rd October, 2017 and established that Rukiga District substantively filled all the essential positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries, Community Development Officers and Senior Accounts Assistants at all the LLGs as per minimum staffing standards.</p> <p>Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS): All four (4) positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries (including two positions of Town Clerks), were substantively filled at the time of the assessment. For example at Kashambya Subcounty the SAS was Agaba Tito; File No. RKI/CR/N/0062, appointed as directed by DSC. Min. No 91/2006, on 17th January, 2007, while the SAS at Rwamuchucu Subcounty was Tumwesigire Gideon, appointed by DSC Min. No. 77/2011 G(x) and by letter dated 19th July, 2018. The Town Clerk at Mparo Town Council was Rwamango Hassan.</p>	5

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Community Development Officers: All positions of Community Development Officers at the 4 Subcounties were substantively filled while one position of senior Community Development at Muhanga Town Council was vacant at the time of the assessment. At Kashambya Subcounty, the CDO position was held by Ms. Natukunda Deborah; substantively appointed by DSC Min. No. 19/2018 and by appointment letter dated 28th May, 2018. At Rwamuchucu Subcounty, the CDO position was held by Kyakunzire Pheobe, file No.RKI/CR/K/0042,appointed by DSC. Min.No. 19/2018, appointed on 18th June, 2018 while the Senior CDO at Mparo Town Council was Clement Arinaitwe. The district gets a zero score because of the vacant position of Senior CDO at Muhanga Town council.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Senior Accounts Assistants: Two LLGs (Bukuna and Kamwezi Subcounties) had the positions of Senior Accounts Assistant substantively filled while 4 LLGs (including two Town Councils) had the positions of Senior Accounts Assistants substantively filled by Accounts Assistants. For example at Kashambya Subcounty; Mr. Ayinebyona Anthony; appointed by DSC. Min. No. 59/2011 (5) and by letter dated 21st June, 2021, held the position of Accounts Assistant, while at Rwamuchucu Subcounty, Mr. Ndyengyejeho held the position of Accounts Assistant. At Mparo Town Council; the position of Treasurer was held by Nowamani Boaze, appointed by DSC. Min. No. 19/2018 and by appointment letter dated 28th May, 2018.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>For RDLG Natural Resources what was budgeted for FY2020/21 was UGX 139,886,000. What was released according to the warrants was 136,011,479. This was a ratio of 97.2%, which was less than 100%.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>For RDLG CBS what was budgeted for FY2020/21 was 129,902,037. What was released according to the warrants was 123,749,149. The main reason for the variance was some UWEP funds which were not fully remitted. The ratio of what was budgeted to what was utilised was 95.2%, which was less than 100%.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the Previous Financial year Projects implemented with the DDEG included: Screening report for the construction of Bukinda seed secondary school in Bukinda subcounty dated 1/10/2020. Report signed by the environment Officer. The DDEG fund was also used on completion of Muchogo Health Centre II in Kashambya S/c.	4
Maximum score is 12				
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0	The projects implemented with the DDEG did not require ESIA in accordance with the National Environment Act, 2019, therefore none were developed.	4
Maximum score is 12				
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0	Costed ESMPs were not developed to guide planning for implementation of environmental and social safeguards.	0
Maximum score is 12				

Financial management and reporting

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p>	<p>As per the submissions to the Internal Auditor General's office and records at Rukiga DLG, a report on the implementation status of IAG recommendations for FY 2019/20 was submitted to the office of MoFPED on 01/12/2020. The report contained actions taken on 5 recommendations.</p> <p>The submission was made before the February end deadline.</p>	10
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Rukiga DLG Performance Contract for FY 2021/22, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) was submitted on 27/06/2021. This was before the deadline of 31st August.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Rukiga DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2020/21, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) was submitted on 09/09/2021. This was after the deadline of 31st August.</p>	0
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Rukiga DLG Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2020/21, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) were submitted as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1 report on 13/11/2020</p> <p>Quarter 2 report on 05/02/2021</p> <p>Quarter 3 report on 02/06/2021</p> <p>Quarter 4 report on 09/09/2021</p> <p>All the reports were beyond the one month allowance and the fourth quarter report submitted beyond the mandatory August 31 deadline.</p>	0
		<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>		
		<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
		<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
		<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		