

**LGMSD 2021/22**

Mityana Municipal Council

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (Vote Code: 783)  **Assessment** | **Scores** |
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 53% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 70% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 60% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 61% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 62% |
| Health Performance Measures | 52% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 0% |

**Crosscutting**

**Performance**

**Measures 2020**

**Summary of**

**No. Definition of compliance Compliance justification Score requirements**

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

1

Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

2

Service Delivery

Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

2

Service Delivery

Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

* 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

a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment: o by more than 10%: Score 3

* 5-10% increase: Score 2
* Below 5 % Score 0

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

* If 100% the projects were completed :

Score 3

* If 80-99%: Score 2
* If below 80%: 0

**0**

The toilet constructed under DDEG fund at the Municipal Headquarter at a cost of Ugx 20million was not being used.

**0**

This was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.

**3** There was evidence that the project planned to be implemented in the LG Annual Work Plan for the year 2020/21 page 4, was completed 100% as per the LG annual performance report page 112. This was a toilet at the municipal headquarter constructed at a cost of Ugx20million.

3

Investment

Performance

Maximum 4 poin s o 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.

**2**

re wa ev d nce from h AWP that LG spent all the Ugx305,639,000million DDEG of the previous FY year on eligible projects, page 4 of the Annual workplan. The projects/activities included:

1. Capacity Building Ugx 16,183,000
2. Retooling Ugx 24,428,000
3. Monitoring Ugx 11,571,000
4. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Ugx 20,000,000
5. Physical Development Plan Ugx

75,000,000

1. Landtitles Ugx 14,645,000
2. Transfer to LLG Ugx 143,542,000

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

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance | a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0 |

Measure

**2**

There was evidence that the variations in the contract prices were all within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimate. The sampled contract was for Construction of a 5-Stance

Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Where the Contract price was 21,409,212 and the estimate was Shs. 20,000,000 hence the variation was +7.0%

**0** Three LLGs of Central, Busimbi and Ttaamu divisions were sampled to ascertain the accuracy of filled positions vis-à-vis the staff structure and staff list provided by HRM Division. The information was found NOT accurate:

Central Division: The staff list from HR had 9 filled positions while the staff list from the division had 10, Ttaamu Division: The staff list from HR had 8 filled positions while the staff list from the division had 13, 3. Busimbi Division: The staff list from HR had 10 filled positions while the staff list from the division had 8

4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points o this Performance  Measure | b Evidence tha infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score  0. |

***Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0***

**2** There wa ev d nce that h only DDEG

project of a latrine at the municipal headquarter was 100% complete as reported, page 112 of the Annual Performance report:

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff

Maximum 2 points on this Performance

Measure

7 Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance

Measure

7 Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance

Measure

7 Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance

Measure

a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the

MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.

Score 2 or else score 0

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):

Score 2 or else score 0

i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:

HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0 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

**0** The LG did NOT present information on the consolidation and submission of staffing requirements for the coming FY

1. The municipality conducted the tracking and analysis of staff attendance for only seven months: July, October and November 2020 and January, March, May and June 2021as per the monthly staff attendance reports contained in letters CR/M/154 of the respective months
2. The MC had eight (8) HoD, they were appraised on the following dates as per their appraisal reports reviewed, as follows;

1. Principal Finance - Officer – 12th July

2021, 2. Municipal Engineer – 10th July

2021, 3. Senior Environment Officer 12th July

2021. 4. Principal Community Development

Officer – 10th July 2021, 5. Principal

Commercial Officer – 1st July 2021, 6.

Principal Education Officer – 12th July 2021,

7. Municipal Medical Officer of Health – 10th

July 2021 and 8. Deputy Town Clerk – 12th

July 2021

**1** Administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented as per the minutes of the meetings held on the following date; 24th

September 2020, 19th December 2020 and

10th June 2020

7 erformance management

Maximum 5 poin s o this Performance

Measure

iii Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

Score 1 or else 0

**1**

Con ultat v Commit e for staff grievance redress was established as per the letter MMC/214 dated 20th July 2020,

“Appointment of the Chairperson of the

Grievances and Complaints Committee”.

The Committee was functional as per the minutes of the meeting held on 26th October

2020

8

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance

Measure or else score

0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

**0** The MC recruited sixteen (16) new employees. Two were recruited during the month of June, three during September and eleven during November 2020. Six did NOT access the payroll within two months of their appointment as per the municipal list of transfers, recruitments and retirement dated

11th November 2021

9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance  Measure or else score | 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. |

0

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

10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Effective Planning,  Budgeting and  Transfer of Funds for  Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on | 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 |

this Performance

Measure

**0** Six employees retired during the FY 2020/21. Information on their accessing the payroll was NOT availed for review

**2** The LG transferred DDEG funds in full to LLGs. A total of UGX143,581,284 as budgeted for in the year 2020/21, was fully transferred to LLGs as below:

Quarter 1 Ugx 47,860,428 was transferred on

15/7/2020;

Quarter 2 Ugx 47,860,428 was transferred on

20/10/2020; and

Quarter 3 Ugx 47,860,428 was transferred on

26/1/2021.

0

Effect ve Planning,

Budg ting and

Transfer of Funds for

Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance

Measure

b If the LG did imely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):

Score: 2 or else score 0

**0**

The LG did not submit warrants in time for DDEG transfers to LLGs:

Quarter 1 warrant was on 28/7/2020, release date was 9/7/2020; 21 days

Quarter 2 warrant was on 19/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020; 15 days and

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 10 | Effective Planning,  Budgeting and  Transfer of Funds for  Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance  Measure | c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:  Score 2 or else score 0 | The LG did not invoice nor communicate in time to LLGs about DDEG releases:  Quarter 1 invoicing was on 15/7/2020, release date was 9/7/2020, 8 days;  Quarter 2 invoicing was on 20/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020, 14 days; and  Quarter 3 invoicing was on 26/1/2021, release date was 8/1/2021,18 days. | **0** | | 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring  Maximum 4 points on this Performance  Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the LG supervised and mentored all LLGs at least once quarterly:  Q1 was done on 13/8/2020 report dated  19/8/2020 at Central Division, main issues | **2** |   was project formulation skills;  Q2 was done on 4/12/2020 report dated  9/12/2020 at Municipal headquarter for all  LLG CDOs on development planning;  Q3 was done on 10/3/2021 report dated16/3/2020 at Municipal headquarter for all LLG on reporting; and  Q4 was done on 17/5/2021 report dated 20/5/2020 at Central Division on collection of data. |

Quarter 3 warrant was on 22/1/2021 , release date was 8/1/2021;14 days.

11

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance

Measure

**Investment Management**

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

**2** There was evidence that the reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, as seen from the

TPC

Min29/6/2021 Min 08/TPC/29/06/2021 .

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance

Measure

b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:

Score 1 or else 0

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | a Evidence th th District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:  Score 2 or else score 0  ***Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land,*** | maintain d an up-dated assets  register covering details on buildings, vehicle, Land etc. as per format in the accounting manual and was last updated on June 30,2021.  Assets breakdown were as below:  1. Land Ugx ; 253,700,000 |
| 2. Building and structures: ***buildings, vehicles and infrastructure.***  ***If those core assets are missing score***  a) Non Residential buildings Ugx  ***0*** | |

1,031,496,323;

b) Residential buildings Ugx 0

3. Roads and bridges Ugx 536,962,794 4. Motorvehicles Ugx 106,734,794

a) Others Ugx; 145,500,524

5.Office equipment Ugx 4,602,667;

6. Other machinery and equipment Ugx

7,412,544

7.ICT equipment Ugx 8,747,104;

8. Lab equipment Ugx 1,421,000;

9.Furniture and Fittings Ugx 42,068,992;

10. Cultivated assets Ugx 17,944,000

11 Medical equipmebt 943,200,000

Total Assets Ugx 2,157,533,942

**0**

There was no evidence that the LG used the Board of Survey Report of the year 2020/21 dated 24/9/2021 to make Assets Management decisions.

**2** Physical Planning Committee was in

place and functioning, at least 4 sets of minutes were prepared but not submitted to MoLHUD as required:

1. Meeting held on 25/3/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021;

Measure

1. Meeting held on 22/4/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021;
2. Meeting held on 22/5/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021;
3. Meeting held on 1/6/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021.

The committee did not have an approved Physical development plan, it was fully constituted with 7 members and submission of new investments were considered within

30 days of submission.

c Evidence th 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.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance

Measure

d.For DDEG financed projects;

Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the

LGDP:

Score 2 or else score 0

**2** The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan ( Pages 153-154) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 19/3/2020 for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21.

The projects appraised included:

1. Construction of 2- class room block at

Maswa PS, Ugx 64,000,000

1. Construction of 2- class room block at

Kalamba PS Ugx 64,000,000

1. Completion of a 2-classroom block at

Nakibanga PS Ugx 12,334,000

1. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala HCIII Ugx 26,093,000

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Measure | For DDEG fin nc d projects:  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:  Score 2 or else score 0 | conduct d field appraisals, the  investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports 10/6/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21. The projects appraised included:  1. Construction of 2- class room block at |   Maswa PS, Ugx 64,000,000 |

1. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Ugx 20,000,000 12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance

Measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0.

1. Construction of 2- class room block at

Kalamba PS Ugx 64,000,000

1. Completion of a 2-classroom block at

Nakibanga PS Ugx 12,334,000

1. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala HCIII Ugx 26,093,000
2. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Ugx 20,000,000

**1**

There was evidence that the project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY. These projects were discussed under minute 4 of 12/7/2021.

1. Construction of the Administration Block

Ugx 200,000,000

1. Rehabilitation of Naama HCIII Staff house Ugx 20,000,000
2. Rehabilitation of Kabule HCIII Staff house

Ugx 22,975,128

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance

Measure

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

**2**

There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before projects funded by the DDEG are approved for construction .

There was only one DDEG project. It was construction of a 5-Stance pit latrine at the Municipal Headquarters. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 30 November 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on

30 November 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer.

3

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | a Evidence th all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0 | re was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. This included : Rehabilitation of Naama HCIII Staff house;  Maternity Ward Rehabilitation at Naama HCIII; and Construction of the LG administration block |  |
| 13 | Procurement, contract | b. Evidence that all infrastructure | There was evidence that all infrastructure | **1** |
| management/execution projects to be implemented in the current projects to be implemented in the current FY | | |
| FY using DDEG were approved by the  Maximum 8 points on  Contracts Committee before  this Performance commencement of construction: Score 1  Measure or else score 0 | | using DDEG were approved by the Contracts  Committee. This w as under Minute  06/TPC/05/03/2021 of the joint meeting of the Technical planning committee and the procurement committee that took place on  March 3, 2021 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract c. Evidence that the LG has properly management/execution established the Project Implementation  team as specified in the sector  Maximum 8 points on guidelines:  this Performance  Measure Score 1 or else 0 | | There is evidence of letters dated July 20, 2020 sugned by the Town clerk appointing members of the Preoject Implementation teams for the various projects. | **1** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract d. Evidence that all infrastructure management/execution projects implemented using DDEG  followed the standard technical designs  Maximum 8 points on provided by the LG Engineer:  this Performance  Measure Score 1 or else score 0 | | There was evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer. The sampled project was the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at the LG head quarters. The sampled stance dimensions were 0.9 x1.4m agains the design dimension of 0.9 x 1.35. This was deened acceptable. | **1** |

3

e th LG has prov ded

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

e a environmental

officer a d CDO participated in the project supervi ion. The sampled payments were for:

.A Contract for the construction of a 2 classroom block by Lint Engineering Ltd at

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance

Measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

Nakibanga p/s in central division Ugx21,770,528 submitted on 7/6/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 15/6/2021 and payment was made

on 29/6/2021 inline with the contract;

2.A Contract for the construction of a VIP latrine by Muluwa Enterprises ltd at Naama

Junior school Ugx21,865,577 submitted on

6/5/2021was certified by the MEO,

Environment Officer and CDO on

19/5/2021and payment was made on

29/6/2021 inline with the contract; and

3.A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block by Sebalamu ltd at Maswa primary school Ugx63,613,210 submitted on

8/3/2021was certified by the MEO,

Environment Officer and CDO on

10/3/2021and payment was made on 6/4/2021 inline with the contract.

**1** There was evidence that the LG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract. The sampled projects were:

1. The Construction of a 5 stance VIP toilet at Magala HC III where: the contractors invoice was received om April 4, 2021; the

Supervisor of Works certified the invoice on March 3, 2021, the Distr. Engineer verified ion May 5, 2021, the CAO cleared it on May

19, 2021, the CAO approved it on May 19, 2021; and payment was effected under Vr.

No 36829544.

1. The Construction of a 2 classroom block at Maswa P.S where: the contractors invoice was received om March 8, 2021; the

Supervisor of Works certified the invoice on March 10, 2021, the Distr. Engineer verified ion March 15,2021, the CAO cleared it on March 19, 2021, the CAO approved it on March 19 2021; and payment was effected under Vr. No 35438294

g The LG has complete procurement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0 | There w s vidence that the LG had complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required: The |

sampled projects were:

* 1. Mitymc783/Wrks/20-21/00071 Construction of a 5-stnce VIP latrine at Magala HC III where: the procurement requisition was received on April 8, 2020; the approval of procurement was on September 1, 2020; the Invitation for bids was on September 17,

2020; evaluation was concluded on October

7, 2020; the award was made on December

12, 2020

* 1. Mitymc783/Wrks/20-21/00005 Completion of a 2-classroom block with office at Nakibanga P.S phase 1 where: the procurement requisition was received on July 15, 2021; the approval of procurement was on September 1, 2020; the Invitation for bids was on September 17, 2020; evaluation was concluded on October 7, 2020; the award was made on December 22, 2020;
  2. Mitymc783/Wrks/20-21/00003 Construction of a 5-stnce VIP latrine at Naama DAS P.S, where: the procurement requisition was received on July 16, 2021; the approval of procurement was on September 1, 2020; the Invitation for bids was on September 17,

2020; evaluation was concluded on October

7, 2020; the award was made on December

22, 2020

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

G i vanc red e s mechanism

operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

a th District/Mun cipality

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

Score: 2 or else score 0

Municipality had

i) desig t d a person to coordinate respon e to feed-back (grievance

/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. This was done as follows:

i) A letter dated July 20th, 2021, written by

14

Grievance redress mechanism

operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.

If so: Score 2 or else 0

Nakawuka Juliet, Deputy Town Clerk

Mityana Municipal Council, appointed The

Physical Planner as Chairperson of the Grievance and Complaints Committee.

ii) The same letter that appointed the chairperson also appointed six members to the GRC. They were:

Mr. Dan Musisi as Secretary

Ms. Nakuya Grace,

Mr. Wadroboh Isaiah,

Mr. Kironde James Muwanga,

Mr. Bukenya Steven, and

Ms. Naluggya Catherine as Members.

**2**

There was evidence that Mityana Municipal Council had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log. A Blue hard cover Counter Book was available as a Complaints log. But it registered ALL kinds of complaints, mixed for all departments. It did not separate departmental complaints, and there were no

Logs for the various departments.
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Grievance redress mechanism

operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.

If so: Score 1 or else 0

**0**

There was NO evidence that Mityana Municipal Council Municipality had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties knew where to report and get redress. The municipality only advertised at the main Noticeboard at the Municipal Main Building and nowhere else.

Saf guards f ervice

delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

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 Environment, Social

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management  score 1 or else 0 | There was evidence that DDEG guidelines were given to LLGs in the TPC meeting of 12/3/2021 and were duly acknowledged for by LLG staff. | **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 | 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.  A copy of the costed ESMP was only attached to the BoQs but NOT incorporated into the actual Frame of BoQs | **0** | | 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on | d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0 | There was no any additional costing done to address climate change adaptation. | **0** |   this performance measure |

and Clim t change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets ,Ugx 2,200,000 was budgeted for it on page 24 of the 2020/21 LG approved budget.

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

**0** There was NO evidence that all projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability.

The Land Title for Mityana Municipal

Headquarters was kept at the Ministry of

Agriculture under the District Farmer’s

Institute (DFI), Mityana, and not at the

Municipal Council offices.

Saf guards f ervice

delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

f environmental off cer

and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly

reports:

Score 1 or else score 0

**1**

environmental

officer a d CDO conducted support supervi ion and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports.

Four reports were presented on monitoring and supervision activities as follows:

1. Monitoring of Roads on 11th June 2021. The report was prepared by Ssekajugo

Stuart, Senior Engineer on behalf of the Senior Management Team that included that included all Heads of Departments;

1. Monitoring report about construction works dated 16/04/2021 prepared and signed by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer and

Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer; and

1. Monitoring report about construction works dated 25th Jan 2021 prepared and signed by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer and Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community

Development Officer.
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Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

**Financial management**

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

**1** There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors’ invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.

Certification Form No. 209 dated 31/05/2021 was availed for certification of the construction of a 5-Stance lined pit latrine at the Municipal headquarters.

mak s m nthly

Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on this Performance

Measure

th LG makes monthly

bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:

Score 2 or else score 0

**0** All th 3 bank accoun s sampled did no have monthly reconciliations done up to October, 2021 as required. These were:

1. Youth Livelihood Project was reconciled up to June 30, 2021 (More than a month late);
2. Property tax was reconciled up to October

31, 2021; and

1. General Fund was reconciled up to

October 31, 2021.

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the

LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.

Score 2 or else score 0

**2** The LG produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports in the FY 2020/21 as below:

Quarter 1 report was prepared on 30/11/2020;

Quarter 2 report was prepared on 22/2/2021 ;

Quarter 3 report was prepared 24/6/2021; and Quarter 4 report was prepared on 30/8/2021.

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the

LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.

Score 1 or else score 0

**1**

The LG had provided status of implementation of internal audit findings to the LG PAC for all the 4 quarters:

Quarter 1 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on

30/11/2020;

Quarter 2 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on

22/2/2021;

Quarter 3 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on

24/6/2021; and

Quarter 4 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on

17/11/2021.

**1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the  LGA Section 90  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure  **Local Revenues** | | c int rnal audit reports for  the previous FY were submitted to LG  Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followedup:  Score 1 or else score 0 | e e a all the 4 quar erly  audit reports were discussed. Only quarter 1 was discussed in the LGPAC meeting of 9/3/2021 and quarters 2, 3 and 4 were discussed in the LGPAC meetings of  29/9/2021. |  |
| 18 | LG has collected local revenues as per | a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected | The actual/budget local revenue collection ratio for the FY 2020/21 was 50.4%  (UGX501,287,079 / 995,000,000). This was a budget variance of 49.6% which is higher than 10%. Therefore scoring 0.  (Source: LG draft Final accounts for FY  2020/21 page 10 and the LG Approved Work  Plan and Budget for 2020/21 page 4.) | **0** |
| budget (collection ratio) against planned for the previous FY | |
| Maximum 2 points on this performance measure | (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %:  then score 2 or else score 0. |
| 19 | 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)  Maximum 2 points on this Performance  Measure. | 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   * If more than 10 %: score 2. * If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. * If the increase is less than 5 %: score   0. | The LG OSR increased by 16 % from  UGX431,553,249 in the FY 2019/20 to UGX 501,287,079 in the FY 2020/21. (Source: LG audited accounts for Financial Year (FY) 2019/20 page 7 and draft accounts for the year 2020/21 page 13. | **2** |
| 20 | Local revenue administration, allocation, and | a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence provided to show that the LG remitted the mandatory share of local revenue to the LLGs. | **0** |

transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

**Transparency and Accountability**

21 shar s information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance

Measure

th procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 21 | LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance  Measure | b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score  0 | LG performance assessment results for the year 2019/20 together with the implications were available on the LG notice board at the time of the assessment on November 25,  2021. | **2** | | 21 | LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance  Measure | c. Evidence that the LG during the |  | **1** | | previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. The LG conducted discussions with the | | | 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 | public on service delivery on Sun radio and got feed back. Evidence were CDs and payment invoices number 331, voucher number 36154804 of Ugx260,000 dated  3/5/2021. | | 21 | LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance | 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 | Information on tax rates , collection procedures and appeals were on the notice board at the time of the assessment on  25/11/2021. | **1** |   Measure |

**0** The LG had an information board, but i did not have any information on the procurement plan and awarded contracts. There was also no information on the Municipal website mityanamc.go ug on the procured contract and the procurement plans.

22

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance

Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0 **1** The LG did not have any case for IGG during the year 2020/21.

**Education**

**Performance**

**Measures 2020**

**Summary of**

**No. Definition of compliance Compliance justification Score requirements**

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

1

Learning Outcomes:

The LG has improved PLE and USE pass

rates.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

1

Learning Outcomes:

The LG has improved PLE and USE pass

rates.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

2

Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.

Maximum 2 points

a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year

* If improvement by more than 5% score 4
* Between 1 and 5% score 2
* No improvement score 0

b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year

* If improvement by more than 5% score 3
* Between 1 and 5% score 2
* No improvement score 0

a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year

* If improvement by more than 5% score 2
* Between 1 and 5% score 1
* No improvement score 0

**2** The LG PLE pass rate had improved by 1% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:

2019: Div. one was 314, Div two was 1,571, and

Div. three was 583. The total pass, therefore, was 2,468 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 3,173. The calculated percentage for

1. was, therefore,2,468 /3,173x100=78%

2020: Div. one was 366, Div two was 1,792, and

Div. three was 572. The total pass, therefore, was 2,730 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 3,437 The calculated percentage for

1. was, therefore, 2,730/3,437x100=79%

Therefore 79%-78%=1 percentage improvement.

**2** The LG UCE pass rate had improved by 4% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:

2019: Div. one was 02, Div two was 12, and Div. three was 27. The total pass, therefore, was 41 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 106.

The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, 41/106x100=39%.

2020: Div. one was 09, Div two was 21, and Div. three was 47. The total pass, therefore, was 77 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 181.

The calculated percentage for 2020 was, therefore, 77/181x100=43%.

Therefore 43%-39%=4 percentage improvement.

**0** This was not assessed until LLGs are assessed.

3

Investm nt Performance: The LG has managed

education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

If th education developmen grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0 **2** The LG received a sum of **190,981,000UGX** development grant (Vote no.783 Mityana Municipality) which was on eligible activities as stipulated planning, budgeting, and implementation guidelines for local government dated May 2019 page 12, code 321470 as shown below:

1. Construction of 2 classrooms at Kalamba P/S in Busimbi division.
2. Construction on a 5 stances lined pit latrine at Naama DAS P/S in Busimbi division.
3. Construction of 2 classrooms at Maswa P/S in Ttamu division.
4. Completion of 2 classrooms at Nakibanga P/S in central division.
5. Renovation of 2 classrooms at Mbaliga UMEA in Ttamu division.

3

Investment Performance: The LG has managed

education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

**2** There was evidence that the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the year 2020/21 before the LG made payments to the contractors:-

1. A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block at Nakibanga primary school in central division worth Ugx 21,770,528 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 15/6/2021 before payment on 29/6/2021;
2. A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block at Maswa primary school in Tamu division division worth Ugx63,613,210 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 10/3/2021 before payment on 6/4/2021; and
3. A Contract for the construction of a 5 stance latrine at Naama junior school, Busimbi division worth Ugx21,865,577 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 6/5/2021 before payment on 29/6/2021.

3

Investm nt Performance: The LG has managed

education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c If the vari tions in the contrac price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0

**2** There was evidence that variations in the contract price were within +/-20% od the LG Engineer's estimates. The sampled projects were for:

1. Completion of a 2-classroom block with office at Nakibanga P.S Where the Contract price was 22,170,528 and the estimate was Shs. 22,000,000 hence the variation was +0.78%
2. Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Naama

DAS P.S Where the Contract price was 21,865,577 and the estimate was Shs. 22,000,000 hence the variation was -0.61%

1. Construction of a 52-classroom block at

Kalamba P.S Where the Contract price was 63,000,200 and the estimate was Shs. 64,000,000 hence the variation was -0.61%

3

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

**2** The LG did not have a project for a Seed Secondary School in the previous FY.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

* If 100%: score 3
* If 80 - 99%: score 2
* If 70 – 79% score: 1
* Below 70% score 0
  1. There was evidence from the Human resource

office, staffing structure, and teacher staff list that the LG had recruited 324 (99%) primary school teachers out of 327 teachers as per the prescribed

MoES staffing guidelines.

4

Achiev ment of b Perc nt of schools in LG tha

standards: The LG has meet basic requirements and met prescribed school minimum standards set out in the

staffing and DES guidelines,

infrastructure standards

* If above 70% and above score: 3

Maximum 6 points on

* If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 this performance

measure

* If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
* Below 50 score: 0
  1. Fr m the list of registered UPE nd USE schools;

an the consolidated Schools asset register for both UPE and USE schools from the previous two FYs, it was evident that 28 (76%) schools out of 37 UPE and all the 03 USE met the prescribed minimum standards.

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5

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

5

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

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

**2**

From the LG teacher deployment list of 2021, it was evident that the LG had accurately reported on teachers, this information was consistent with that found in sampled schools as shown below:

1). Mityana Public primary school in Busimbi division had 16 teachers.

2). Mityana Junior school in Central division 10 teachers.

3). Butega P/S in Ttamu division had 08 teachers.

* 1. From the sampled schools; Mityana Public primary school in Busimbi division, Mityana Junior school in Central Division, and Butega P/S in Ttamu division it was evident that the LG did not have an updated assets register as shown below; Butega was reported as having five latrine stances yet it had nine, Mityana Public was reported to have 271 yet it had 243 desks whereas mityana Junior was reported having 110 desks yet it had 149.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

The LG h s ensured th t 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
  1. N ne of the sampled schools h d which were;

Mityana Public P/S, Mityana Junior P/S and Butega P/S had fully complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and had submitted reports highlighting school performance, a reconciled cash flow statement, an annual budget, and expenditure report, and an asset register signed by the headteacher and chair of the SMC to the DEO by January 30. The above-mentioned schools submitted their reports as follows, Mityana Public on 03/02/2021, Butega

P/S on 3/03/2020 and Mityana Junior on

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 6 | School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure | b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:   * If 50% score: 4 * Between 30– 49% score: 2 * Below 30% score 0 | All the sampled schools (100%) which were  Mityana Public P/s, Mityana Junior, and Butega P/S, were supported to make SIP and thus came up with 2020-2021 School improvement plan. | **4** | | 6 | School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure | c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:   * If 100% score: 4: * Between 90 – 99% score 2 * Below 90% score 0 | There was evidence from MoES OTIMS data that the LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all (100%) registered schools from the previous FY year with 11,562 pupils. | **4** |   **Human Resource Management and Development** |

23/03/2021

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

Evid nce that the LG h s budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:

Score 4 or else, score: 0

**4** Fr m the LG performance contr ct, list of schools,

an staff list, it was evident that the LG had budgeted for a headteacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 as per the sector guidelines for the current FY 2021/2022 with a wage provision of 2,323,939,000 UGX.

7

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

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

**3**

From the teachers' list, school list, it was evident that the LG had deployed 324 teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY in the 37 UPE schools for example; Mityana Public primary school in Busimbi division had 16 teachers, Mityana Junior school in Central division 10 teachers and Butega P/S in Ttamu division had

08 teachers.

7

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

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

**1** From the LG notice board dated 2021 and from the notice boards of respective sampled schools it was evident that teacher deployment data was disseminated as shown below; Mityana Public primary school had 16 teachers, Mityana Junior school had 10 teachers and Butega P/S had 08 teachers.

erformance 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

If all prim ry school he d te chers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to

DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

**2** Municipal Council had thirty even (37) primary schools and therefore 37 H/Ts. Ten performance appraisal reports were sampled. The sampled H/Ts were appraised on the following dates;

Naama (CoU) PS - 39th December 2020, 2.

Ttanda PS – 29th December 2020, 3. Busubizi

Demonstration School – 29th December 2020, 4.

Nkonyo PS – 18th December 2020, 5. Naama

UMEA PS – 30th December 2020, 6. St. Kizito

Kito PS – 29th December 2020, 7. Mityana Junior

School – 18th December 22020, 8. Naaman DAS

PS – 22nd December 2020, 9. Kyakowe PS – 17th December 2020 and 10. Kawoko PS – 16th

December 2020

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

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

**0** The MC had four (4) secondary schools and therefore 4 HTs. Only two were appraised as per their performance appraisal reports presented for review.

1. HT, Busubizi SS appraised on – 20th

December 2020

1. Naama SS, appraised on 6th December 2020

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

c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans

score: 2. Else, score: 0

**0** The Education Department had two member of staff, only one was appraised;

1. Inspector of Schools – 18th July 2021

The Education Officer, Special needs was NOT appraised

8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance management:  Appraisals have been conducted for all education | d The LG has prepared a training pl n to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,  score: 2 Else, score: 0 |

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

MC did NOT prepare a training plan to ad ress identified staff capacity gaps

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

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

1. 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.

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

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

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

**2** On 20/10/2020 the LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) communicating corrections and revision of school list and enrolment of 11,562 pupils in 37 schools before the December 15th annual deadline.

**2**

From the annual sector work plan for the financial year 2020/2021, and MoES guidelines on planning, budgeting, and implementation for local government dated May 2019 page 17 output 0708401 and page 18 output 0708402, it was evident that the LG education department received a total of 36,208,000 UGX for inspection and monitoring functions. This money was spent on legible activities as indicated in the guidelines stated above, such activities include; monitoring the teaching-learning process, sensitisation of schools about standard operating procedures

(SOPs) of COVID 19.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c LG submitted

w rrants for school’s capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

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

LG did not submit all warrant for school’s capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as below:

Quarter 2 warrant was on 20/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020; 14 days

Quarter 3 warrant was on 27/1/2021, release date was 8/1/2021; 19 days and

Quarter 4 warrant was on 27/5/2021, release date was 6/5/2021;15 days.

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery:  The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | d) Evidence that the LG has There was no evidence that the LG invoiced all invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has capitation releases to schools within 3 working  communicated/ publicized days:  capitation releases to schools  Quarter 2 invoicing was on 20/10/2020 and within three working days of release | | **0** |
| from MoFPED.  If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0 | release date was 6/10/2020, 14 days;  Quarter 3 invoicing was on 26/1/2021 and release date was 8/1/2021, 16 days; and  Quarter 4 invoicing was on 13/4/2021 and release date was 31/3/2021, 13 days. |
| 10 | 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 | It was evident from the DIS records that on 01/10/2020, 02/12/2020, and 25/02/2021 the LG education department had prepared an inspection plans to cover the 2020/2021 financial year. | **2** |

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

**0** On average 67% of all the 37 registered UPE schools had been inspected at least once during the period of October 2020 to May 2021 when the schools were operational after COVID 19 relaxation and reports produced as follows:

October (2020): 37 out of 37 (100%). Jan-March (2021):0 out of 37 (0%) were inspected.April -May

(2021): 37 out of 37 (100%).

0

Routi e oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

c inspection reports

h ve been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring  *Maximum 10 points on this performance measure* | 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 | Acknowledgments from DES all dated 22/12/2020 and 2/08/2021 confirmed that DIS submitted reports to the Directorate of Education Standards  (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports  (MoES). | **2** |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring  *Maximum 10 points on this performance measure* | e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score:  0 | There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results as below:   1. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated   13/8/2020; and   1. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 3/1/2021.   These minutes were discussed in LG Council meetings on 20/8/2020 Min006/20/08/2021 and  16/3/2021 min 007/16/3/202. | **2** |
| 11 | Mobilization of parents to attract learners  *Maximum 2 points on this performance measure* | Evidence that the LG Education | There was no evidence that the LG Education | **0** |
| department has conducted activities department had conducted activities to mobilize, to mobilize, attract and retain attract and retain children at school. children at school,  *score: 2 or else score: 0* | |

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

evidence to show that inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY.

**Investment Management**

12

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a) Evidence that there is an up-todate LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

**0** From the sampled schools; Mityana Public primary school in Busimbi division, Mityana Junior school in Central Division, and Butega P/S in Ttamu division it was evident that the LG did not have an updated assets register as shown below; Butega was reported as having five latrine stances yet it had nine, Mityana Public was reported to have 271 yet it had 243 desks whereas mityana Junior was reported having 110 desks yet it had 149.

2 lan ing a d

budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

b 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*

LG conducted desk appraisal , the inv stment derived from the LG Development Plan ( Page 153-154) and were eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 19/3/2020 for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21. The projects appraised included:

1.Construction of two classrooms block at St Jude

Kitinkokola Primary School Ugx 75,000,000

2.Construction of a 5 stance Lined Pit latrine at

12

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

Ttamu Islamic Primary School Ugx 25,000,000

3.Procurement 3 Seater desk to Naama CU P/S,

Mityana Public School, Naama DAS, Mityana

Junior school and Busubizi core PTC Ugx

23,517,354

**1** The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports 10/6/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21. The projects appraised included:

1.Construction of two classrooms block at St Jude

Kitinkokola Primary School Ugx 75,000,000

2.Construction of a 5 stance Lined Pit latrine at Ttamu Islamic Primary School Ugx 25,000,000

3.Procurement 3 Seater desk to Naama CU P/S,

Mityana Public School, Naama DAS, Mityana

Junior school and Busubizi core PTC Ugx

23,517,354

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

**1** There was evidence that the LG education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The projects include: Construction of two classrooms block at St Jude Kitinkokola Primary School; and Construction of a 5 stance Lined Pit latrine at Ttamu Islamic Primary School.

3 rocureme t, cont a t management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

b t e 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* infrastructure project above the thr shold of Shs 200,000,000, requiring the clearance of the Solicitor General. However there evidence that all the other education infrastructure investments for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee, This was under minute

4 of the contracts committee meting which sat on

September 17, 2020. The sampled projects were:

Completion of a 2-classroom block with office at

Nakibanga P.S Phase 1 at 22,170,528; and Construction of a 35-stance pit latrine at Naama DAS P.S at 21,865,577.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | Procurement, contract c) Evidence that the LG established management/execution a Project Implementation Team | | There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY. This was by a letter dated July 20,2020 signed by the Town Clerk appointing: Mr.  Lawrence Kamya, the Municipal education officer;  Mr. Stuart Sekajugo, the Senior Engineer; Mr. Dan  Musisi, the Environment officer; Mr. Francis  Bogere, the Assistant Town Clerk; and Miss. Catherine Naluggya, the Senior Community development offfcer. | **1** |
| *Maximum 9 points on this performance measure* | (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. *score: 1, else score: 0* |
| 13 | Procurement, contract | d) Evidence that the school | The LG did not have a project for a seed school | **1** |
| management/execution infrastructure followed the standard  technical designs provided by the  *Maximum 9 points on*  MoES  *this performance*  *measure Score: 1, else, score: 0* | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract e) Evidence that monthly site management/execution meetings were conducted for all  sector infrastructure projects  *Maximum 9 points on* planned in the previous FY *score:*  *this performance*  *1, else score: 0* | | The LG did not have a project for a seed school | **1** |

*measure*

13

Procurement, contract f) If there’s evidence that during management/execution critical stages of construction of

planned sector infrastructure

*Maximum 9 points on* projects in the previous FY, at least

*this performance*

1 monthly joint technical

*measure* supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted *score: 1, else score: 0*

**1**

The LG did not have a project for a seed school

3 rocureme t, cont a t management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

g If s ctor infr s ructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0* Th re was evidence that Education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as below:

13

Procurement, contract h) If the LG Education department management/execution timely submitted a procurement

plan in accordance with the PPDA

*Maximum 9 points on* requirements to the procurement

*this performance*

unit by April 30, *score: 1, else,*

*measure*

*score: 0*

1.A Contract for the construction of a 2 classroom block by Lint Engineering Ltd at Nakibanga p/s in central division Ugx21,770,528 submitted on

7/6/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 15/6/2021 and payment was made on 29/6/2021 inline with the contract;

2.A Contract for the construction of a VIP latrine by

Muluwa Enterprises ltd at Naama Junior school Ugx21,865,577 submitted on 6/5/2021was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and

CDO on 19/5/2021and payment was made on

29/6/2021 inline with the contract; and

3.A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block by Sebalamu ltd at Maswa primary school Ugx63,613,210 submitted on 8/3/2021was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 10/3/2021and payment was made on 6/4/2021 inline with the contract.

**1** There was evidence that the LG Education department submitted a procurement plan on April

9, 2020.

13

Procurement, contract i) Evidence that the LG has a management/execution complete procurement file for each

school infrastructure contract with

*Maximum 9 points on* all records as required by the PPDA

*this performance*

Law *score 1 or else score 0*

*measure*

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line | Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0 |

with the LG grievance redress framework.

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

**1**

The LG did not have a project for a seed school

**0** There was NO evidence that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in Education department. There was no Log and no display at the Education

Noticeboard.

5 for s vi e

.

*m 3 points on ormance e*

Evid nce tha LG as disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, ‘green’ schools, and energy and water conservation

*Score: 3, or else score: 0*

evid nce from both the environmental officer and sampled schools to show that LG had disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land, proper siting of schools, ‘green’ schools, and energy and water conservation.

16

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the

BoQs and contractual documents, *score: 2, else score: 0*

**0** There was NO evidence that ALL Education projects were costed and that these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Mbaliga UMEA Primary School. Costing was done by Mr.

Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer at UGX 300,000/-. This was not included in the BoQ;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Kalamba Primary School. Costing was done by

Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer at UGX 964,000/-. This was not included in the BoQ;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Nakibanga Primary School. Costing was done by

Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer at UGX 100,000/-. This was included in the BOQ.

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Maswa

Primary School. Costing was done by Mr. Musisi

Daniel, Environment Officer at UGX 100,000/-.

This was not included in the BoQ;

1. Construction of a lined pit latrine at Naama Das

Primary School. Costing was done by Mr. Musisi

Daniel, Environment Officer at UGX 2,000,000/-.

This was not included in the BoQ.

Therefore, save for Nakibanga primary school, the rest of the school ESMPs were not included in the

BoQs.

6

in th of investments

*m 6 points on ormance e*

1. If th re is proof of land proof of land ownership, access of ownership, access of school school construction projects.

construction projects, *score: 1, else*

*score:0* There were five schools where Mityana Municipal

Council implemented projects. Land ownership status was straightened in all cases as follows:

* 1. For Kalamba Primary School, a letter dated 27th September from Fr. Leonard Ssenyonjo the Treasurer General of Kiyinda Mityana Diocese was written to the Ministry of Education and Sports confirming that Kalamba Primary School, located on Block 170, Plot 46 could continue to use the 2 acres of land as long as it does not change its mission;
  2. For Naama Das Primary School, a letter dated 25/11/2020 written by Semiti Edward the

Headteacher to the Municipal Education officer Mityana stated that acquisition of the title for the school was in progress. He attached copies of submission from the Senior Assistant Town Clerk

Busimbi Division and quoted Minute No. PPC/039/09/09/20 of the Physical Planner Mityana Municipal Council.

* 1. For Mbaliga UMEA Primary School, a confirmation letter was written by Sheik Abdunoor Twebaze, District Kadhi of Uganda Muslim Supreme Council Mityana District. The letter was addressed to The Office of the Ag. Municipal Education Officer, Mityana Municipal Council. The letter confirmed that land offered by the late Hajji Kauma Ismail could continue being used by Mbaliga primary school as long as it was used for only the purpose it was requested for. The letter was dated 5th January 2021.
  2. Nakibanga Primary School, a letter dated 19th November 2020 from Fr. Leonard Ssenyonjo the Treasurer General of Kiyinda Mityana Diocese was written to the Ministry of Education and Sports confirming that Nakibanga Primary School, located on Block 156, Plot 108 could continue to use the 2 acres of land as long as it does not change its mission; and
  3. For Maswa Primary School, a letter dated 19th November 2020 written by The Rev. Canon James Rocky Sendegeya, Diocesan Secretary ascertained that the land where Maswa School is located is school land and that the school can use it for any new projects it proposes. It listed fourteen schools in this category.

6

in th of investments

*m 6 points on ormance e*

1. Evidence hat t e 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, *score:*

*2, else score:0*

videnc 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.

A monitoring Report for all five School projects dated 12/11/2020 was prepared and signed by

16

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer and Naluggya

Catherine, Senior Community Development

Officer.

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

E & S compliance certificates were available for all five school projects. They were for:

vi) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Mbaliga UMEA Primary School. Certificate No.

202 dated 2/6/2021;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kalamba Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 10/5/2021;
2. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Nakibanga Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 10/5/2021;
3. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Maswa

Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated

2/6/2021;

1. Construction of a lined pit latrine at Naama Das

Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated

2/6/2021.

**Health Performance**

**Measures 2020**

**Summary of**

**No. Definition of compliance Compliance justification Score requirements**

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

1 New\_Outcome: The LG

has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG registered

Increased utilization of

Health Care Services

(focus on total deliveries.

* By 20% or more, score 2
* Less than 20%, score 0

1. 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.
2. 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

**0** There was no evidence that the LG registered an increase in facility-based deliveries between FY2019/20 and FY 2020/21 at the three sampled health facilities. The total deliveries were 524 in FY2019/20 and these increased by 93 (17.7%) to 617 in FY2020/21. The numbers of deliveries at the sampled health facilities were as follows: 1. Kabule HCIII: FY2019/20 – 198; FY2020/21 – 253

2. Magala HCIII: FY2019/20 – 165; FY2020/21 – 176 3. Naama HCIII: FY2019/20 – 161; FY2020/21 – 188

**2** There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant Ugx 28,992,000 for the year 2020/21 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The projects were:

1. Construction of a Pit latrine at Magala HC III at

Ugx21,432,000;

2, Two tanks at Naama HCIII at Ugx 4,000,000

3. Impact Assessment, monitoring and retention at Ugx

3,560,000

**2**

There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors: It was only one payment that required all their certification,

1.Works byRosco Consult ltd on the construction of 5 star latrine at Magala HC III Tamu worth Ugx 21,432,000 were certified by the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO and the MHO on 19/5/2021 before payment on

15/6/2021.

3 Inves ment performanc : T LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If the varia ions in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-

20% of the MoWT

Engineers estimates, score

2 or else score 0

**2**

w s vid nc tha th variations in the contract

prices were all within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 3 | Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY   * If 100 % Score 2 * Between 80 and 99% score 1 * less than 80 %: Score 0 | The LG did not have a project for HC II’s being upgraded to HC III’s. | **2** | | 4 | Achievement of  Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility  standards  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure   * If above 90% score 2 * If 75% - 90%: score 1 * Below 75 %: score 0 | The Municipality has no Government HCIV and three  HCIIIs. There was no evidence that the LG had deployed staff at all HCIIIs as per the staffing structure. The average percentage of positions that were filled at the three HCIIIs was 36/57 (63.2%). | **0** | | 4 | Achievement of  Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility  standards  Maximum 4 points on this performance | b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.  • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 | The LG did not have a project for HC II’s being upgraded to HC III’s. | **2** |   measure  **Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement** |

The sampled contract was for Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala HC II Where the Contract price was 22,560,420 and the estimate was Shs. 24,000,000 hence the variation was -6.0%.

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 is no evid n e tha information on positions of health workers filled is accurate at all the sampled health facilities. Only Naama HCIII had a staff list that matched that of the DHO. The variation at the other two sampled health facilities were as follows:

1. Kalule HCIII: i. Isabirye Henry (Health Assistant); ii.

Aliganyira (Nursing Assistant) who had recent;y been

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else

0

transferred were on the DHO list but not on the health

facility list

2. Magala HCIII: i. Isaiah Wadribo (Health Inspector) on the DHO list were not on the health facility list.

**2** There is evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate. The DHO informed the assessment that no health facilities had been upgraded during 2020/21. This information is consistent with that of the LG-approved work plan for

2020/21 (Page 65 – Output 088180).

6

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.

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

**2**

There was evidence that all the sampled 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 the Health Sector. The submission dates for the other two sampled health facilities were as follows:

1. Magala HC III 25/03/21
2. Naama HCIII 20/03/21
3. Kabule HCIII 20/03/21

t

e

o e

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented

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

w s no vi nce hat the sampl d health facilities prepared and submitted to the MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. The Annual Budget Performance Reports Naama HCIII was not available at the DHO. Kabule HCIII prepared a budget performance report dated 08/07/21 for the previous FY dated 08/07/21; 4 separate budget

performance reports were availed for Magala HCIII (Q1 – 20/08/2020; Q2 – 13/11/2020; Q3 – 18/03/2021; Q4 – 06/05/21) however the acknowledgment date was

missing for these reports although they were endorsed by the MMOH, so it was not possible to confirm whether the timelines were complied with.

6

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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

**0** There was no evidence that all the three sampled health facilities had developed and reported on the implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.

6

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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

**0** There was no evidence that sampled health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). Kabule HCIII and Naama submitted both the monthly and quarterly reports on or before the 7th of the month following the end of the reporting period. However, the third sampled health facility – Magala HCIII had late submissions for the monthly reports – February 2020 (10/03/2021), March 2020 (09/04/21); November 2020

(09/12/2020), and the 2nd quarter report (11/01/21).

t

e

o e

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented

Performance

Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

w s no evid nce hat the sampled health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). The submission details by quarter were as follows:

1. Magala HCIII Q4: 16/7/21 (late); Q3: 26/4/21 (late); Q2:

9/2/21; and Q1: 27/10/21 (late),

1. Naama HC III Q4: 15/7/21; Q3: 22/4/21 (late); Q2

11/2/21 (late); and Q1: 21/10/21 (late), and

1. Kabule HC III Q4: 20/7/21 (late): Q3: 28/4/2021 (late);

Q2: 8/2/21 (late); and Q1: 26/10/21 (late).

6

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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

**0** There was no evidence that 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

Q1. 7th January 2020 (late)

Q2. 26th February 2021 (late)

Q3. 27th May 2021

Q4. 30th July 2021 (late)

t

e

o e

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented

Performance

Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

g If th 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

He lth Department Submitted all th 4 Quarterly Budget Performance reports to the planner for consolidation late after a month as below: Quarter 1 was submitted on 17/12/2020;

Quarter 2 was submitted on 3/2/2021;

Quarter 3 was submitted on 29/5/2021; and

Quarter 4 was submitted on 18/8/2021

6

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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

h) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Developed an approved

Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

**0** There was no evidence that the LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the weakest performing health facilities.

6

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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented

Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score

1 or else 0

**0** There was no evidence that the LG had implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing facilities

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7

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).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

7

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).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

7

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).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0 | The Municipality has no Government HCIV and three HCIIIs. There was no evidence that the LG had budgeted for staff for all HCIIIs as per the staffing structure. The average percentage of positions budgeted in the PBS is 50. Of these 36 are at the sampled HCIIIs, making an average of 36/57 (63.2%). The main gaps were for  Askaris and Porters who are locally sourced by Health  Facilities using PHC Non-Wage funds. |  |
| a) Evidence that the LG has:  ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0 | The Municipality has no Government HCIV and three HCIIIs. There was no evidence that the LG had deployed staff at all HCIIIs as per the staffing structure. The average percentage of positions that were filled at the three HCIIIs was 36/57 (63.2%). | **0**  **3** |
| b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0 | There was evidence in the facility attendance book from the previous FY 2020/21 that health workers were working in health facilities where they are deployed at the sampled health facilities of Naama HCIII, Malagala HCIII, and Kabule HC III. |  |

**0**

Budgeting for, ac ual 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).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evid nce that he 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

**2**

re w s evidence tha the LG publiciz d health workers' deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY at all the sampled health facilities - Naama HCIII, Malagala

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | a) Evidence that the The MC had seven (7) health facilities. The Officers in DHO/MMOHs has: Charge of HCs were appraised on the following dates;  i. Conducted annual Kabuwambo HC II – 1st July 2021, 2. Ttanda HC II- 30th performance appraisal of June 2021, 3. Kabuule HC III – 30th June 2021, 4. Naama all Health facility In-charges HC III – 29th June 2021, 5. Katiko HC II – 5th July 2021, | | **1** | | against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0 | 6. Magala HC III – 30th June 2021 and 7. Nakaseeta HC  II – 21st June 2021 | | 8 | 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 | The MC had fifty three (53) health workers. Ten performance appraisal reports were sampled. The sampled health workers were appraised on the following dates;  Enrolled Midwife (Ttanda HC II – 14th July 2021, 2.  Laboratory Assistant (Magala HC III) – 30th June 2021, 3.  Enrolled Nurse (Kibule HC III) – 2nd July 2021, 4.  Enrolled Nurse (Magala HC III) – 30th June 2021, 5.  Clinical Officer (Naama HCIII) – 2nd July 2021, 6. | **1** |   Enrolled Nursr (Kibule HC III) – 2nd July 2021, 7. Enrolled  Midwife (Magala HC III) – 30th July 2021, 8. Enrolled  Nurse (Magala HC III – 30th July 2021, 9. Nursing  Assistant (Ttanda HC II) – 14th July 2021 and 10.  Assistant Nursing Officer (Kabule HC II) - 2nd July 2021 |

HCIII, and Kabule HC III.

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

**0** MMoH did NOT take any corrective actions based on the appraisal reports

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.  Maximum 6 points on this performance | b) Evid nce that h 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 |

measure

re w s no evidence hat the LG had conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at

District.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and | ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0 | There is no evidence that the LG documented training activities in the training/CPD database, Examples of the training activities included are: | **0** |

trained Health Workers.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

**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

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

1. 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

1. 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.

**0**

There was no evidence that the TC 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.

**2** There was evidence that the LG made allocations of

Ugx18,470,000(17.8%) out of the Ugx 103,484,068 PHC NWR Grant for LLHF towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines, which is above the required 15%. Page 22 of the LG Approved 2020/21 budget.

Plan ing, bud e ing,

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c If th LG made imely

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

LG did not warrant o all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2020/21 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:

Quarter 1 warrant was on 28/7/2020, release date was

9/7/2020; 21 days

Quarter 2 warrant was on 19/10/2020, release date was

6/10/2020; 15 days

Quarter 3 warrant was on 22/1/ 2021, release date was

8/1/2021; 14 days and

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

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

Quarter 4 warrant was on 12/4/2021, release date was 31/3/2021;12 days.

**0** The LG did not invoice nor communicate to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2020/21 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release as required:

Quarter 1 invoicing was on 15/7/2020, release date was

9/7/2020, 8 days;

Quarter 2 invoicing was on 20/10/2020, release date was

6/10/2020, 14 days;

Quarter 3 invoicing was on 26/1/2021, release date was

8/1/2021,19 days; and

Quarter 4 invoicing was on 13/4/2021, release date was

31/3/2021,14 days.

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

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

**0** There was 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. The publication dates are as follows:

Q1: Release date 24/07/20, publication date 22/07/20 (2 days early)

Q2: Release date 22/10/20, publication date 20/10/20 (2 days early)

Q3: Release date 21/01/21, publication date 25/01/21 (1 day)

Q4: Release date 28/04/21, publication date 13/04/21 (11 days early)

0

Rou i e vers h and

moni oring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a Evid nce that h 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

re w s no evidence that the LG health department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT

Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY. For example, there was a recommendation on page 11 (Action Plan for Issues identified and Discussed) of the Mityana Municipal Performance Review

Meeting, Jan-Mar 2021 held on 4th June 2021 to train VHTs to care for pregnant mothers as part of community engagement. The evidence provided to confirm follow-up action dated 18/09/21 was for another activity – “VHT

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

training on Home-Based Care of COVID-19.” and predates the recommendation.

**0** There was no evidence that 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.

The attendance for Quarters 1- 4 was as follows:

Q1: Mityana Municipal Health Team Meeting for the first quarter 2020 held on 29/09/2020 (No original attendance sheet) 6/17 facilities represented and MMHT members

Q2: Mityana Municipal Health Team Meeting for the first quarter 2020 held on 13/11/2020 (No original attendance sheet) 7/17 facilities represented and MMHT members

Q3: Mityana Municipal Health Team Meeting for the first quarter 2020 held on 13/11/2020 (No original attendance sheet) 7/17 facilities represented and MMHT members

Q4: 17 persons including 11/17 I/c and/or representatives and members of the MHMT (04/06/2021);

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

|  |
| --- |
| **0** The Municipality has no HCIV and hospitals. |

If not applicable, provide the score

Rou i e vers h and

moni oring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

d 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

• If not applicable, provide the score

is no designated HSD in the Municipality.

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

**1**

There was some 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 was followed up during the previous FY. The examples are as follows:

1. Kabule HCIII – Q1 report following integrated support supervision for the 1st quarter FY 2021 (undertaken 1st to 8th August 2020) – recommended that the Municipal Engineer should assess the Health Unit for planning purposes and eventual repair (no follow up).
2. In charge to display the following – duty roster, list of HUMC members, PHC releases, staff list – this was observed during the field visits to the sampled health facilities – Magala HCIII, Kabule HCII and Naama HCIII
3. The same report indicated that the PMO and i/c of Magala HCIII should follow up on the land-issued title dated March 2020 shows completion of survey demarcation and installation of mark stones over 5.8 acre Magala Health Centre land in Magala ‘A” LC1 which predates the recommendation.

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health

facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

**0** There was no evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities (7 public, 5 PNFP and 10 PFP) in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY. The Medicines support supervision report of

23/01/21 shows that 3 facilities were supervised; on 21/06/21 – 1 facility was supervised; that on 30/06/21 - 2 facilities were supervised; one facility that was supervised was not dated – a total of 7/22 health facilities.

He l h pr mot on,

disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a If th LG alloca d at

least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities,

Score 2 or else score 0

**2**

LG llocat d only Ugx 5.5million (30%) out of the Ugx 18.5million LG Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, which was at least the required minimum. Page 22 of the LG 2020/21 approved budget.

11

Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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 **1** There was evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, as per the following examples:

1. Report on community dialogue meetings in divisions of

Mityana Municipality on Family Planning uptake dated 26th March 2021 (pages 1-2).

1. Report on Support Supervision of VHT activities in

Ttamu Division, dated 22nd June 2021 (Pages 1-2)

11

Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

**Investment Management**

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

**0**

There was no evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports.

l nning a d

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a G has

an updat d As et register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards:

Score 1 or else 0

**0**

no vid nce at the LG ha an updated Asset

register that sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. Both the Municipal asset register dated 5th May 2021 and the District Health Facility inventory of 2020 include only fixed assets and not medical equipment.

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan

(LGDPIII);

1. desk appraisal by the

LG; and

1. eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant,

Discretionary Development

Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0 **1** The LG conducted desk appraisal, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan ( Page 182) and was eligible for funding under sector guidelines as indicated in the minutes dated 19/3/2020 for the one project implemented in the year 2020/21. The project was the

Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala

HCIII Ugx 26,093,000.

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

**1** The LG conducted field appraisal, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and was customized for investment as indicated in reports 10/6/2020, for the one project implemented in the year 2020/21.The project was the Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala

HCIII Ugx 26,093,000.

2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | l nning a d  Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out  Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | d health  facility investme ts 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 | evid nc hat t e health f cility investment  was screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist.  According to the Municipal Planners records, there was only one Health project implemented, namely,  Construction of a lined pit latrine at Magala HC III.  Environmental Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel,  Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the  Social Screening was done on 15 December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development  Officer. |  |
| 13 | Procurement, contract | a. Evidence that the LG | There was evidence under Minute 06/TPC/05/03/2021 of the joint meeting of Technical Planning committee and PDU which sat on March 5, 2021 that the Municipal health officer Dr. Jackson Sekajugo presented procurement request to the PDU. | **1** |
| management/execution: health department timely The LG procured and (by April 30 for the current managed health FY ) submitted all its contracts as per infrastructure and other guidelines procurement requests to  PDU for incorporation into  Maximum 10 points on the approved LG annual  this performance work plan, budget and  measure procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0 | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract b. If the LG Health management/execution: department submitted The LG procured and procurement request form managed health (Form PP1) to the PDU by contracts as per 1st Quarter of the current guidelines FY: score 1 or else, score 0  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | | There was no evidence that the LG Health department had submitted procurement request form in the 1st  Quarter of the current FY. | **0** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract c. Evidence that the health management/execution: infrastructure investments The LG procured and for the previous FY was managed health approved by the Contracts contracts as per Committee and cleared by guidelines the Solicitor General  (where above the  Maximum 10 points on threshold), before  this performance commencement of  measure construction: score 1 or else score 0 | | There was no health infrastructure investments for the previous FY above the Shs 200,000,000 which needed the Solicitor General's clearance. | **1** |

3

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ocurem t, contract d G evid nc tha t e LG st bli hed a Project  management/execution: prop ly s abli hed a Implementation Team (PIT) for health infrastructure | | |  |
| The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | Project Implementation projects constructed within the last FY. This was by a team for all health projects letter dated July 20,2020 signed by the Town Clerk composed of: (i) : score 1 or appointing: Dr. Jackson SSekikubo, the Municipal Health | |
| else score 0  If there is no project, provide the score | officer; Mr. Stuart Sekajugo, the Senior Engineer; Mr. Dan Musisi, the Environment officer; Mr. Francis Bogere, the Assistant Town Clerk; and Miss. Catherine Naluggya, the  Senior Community development offfcer. |
| 13 | Procurement, contract | e. Evidence that the health | There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY. | **1** |
| management/execution: infrastructure followed the The LG procured and standard technical designs managed health provided by the MoH: score contracts as per 1 or else score 0  guidelines  If there is no project, Maximum 10 points on provide the score this performance measure | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract f. Evidence that the Clerk of management/execution: Works maintains daily The LG procured and records that are managed health consolidated weekly to the contracts as per District Engineer in copy to guidelines the DHO, for each health  infrastructure project: score  Maximum 10 points on  1 or else score 0  this performance  measure If there is no project,  provide the score | | There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY. | **1** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract g. Evidence that the LG management/execution: held monthly site meetings | | There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY. | **1** |
| The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town  Clerk and comprised of the  Sub-county Chief (SAS), |
| the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community  Development and  Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0  If there is no project, provide the score | |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

h G

carri d out ech ical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 13 | Procurement, contract i. Evidence that the management/execution: DHO/MMOH verified works | | There was evidence that the MHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe of 10 days. The 2 projects were:  1.Works by Rosco Consult ltd on the construction of 5 star latrine at Magala HC III Tamu divUgx 21,432,000 submitted on 22/4/2021 were verified and initiated for payment by the MHO on 15/6/2021, (23 days) and payment made on 15/6/2021; and  2.Works by Rosco Consult ltd Supply of tanks to Naama health III Bsimbi div Ugx 4,014,564 submitted on  21/6/2021 were verified and initiated for payment by the  MHO on 21/6/2021, (1 day) and payment made on  29/6/2021. | **1** | | The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score  1 or else score 0 | | 13 | Procurement, contract | j. Evidence that the LG has | There was evidence that the LG had a complete | **1** | | management/execution: a complete procurement file procurement file for each health infrastructure contract The LG procured and for each health with all records as required. The sampled project was: managed health infrastructure contract with Mitymc783/Wrks/20-21/00071 Construction of a 5-stnce contracts as per all records as required by VIP latrine at Magala HC III where: the procurement guidelines the PPDA Law score 1 or requisition was received on April 8, 2020; the approval of  else score 0 procurement was on September 1, 2020; the Invitation for  Maximum 10 points on bids was on September 17, 2020; evaluation was  this performance concluded on October 7, 2020; the award was made on  measure | | |   December 12, 2020  **Environment and Social Safeguards** |

no proj c for Upgrad of HC II to a HC III in the previous FY.

G i vanc 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 ocal

Gov nm n ha recorded,

investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0 **0** NO vid nce hat gri vance had been

recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in Health department. There was no Log and no display at the

Health Noticeboard.

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

**2** There was evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities.

The 42-page File titled ‘National Health Waste Management Plan 2009/10 – 2011/12’ was distributed to ten Health Centres. Health Centre recipients signed on the face page of the Guideline upon receipt of the guidelines. A copy of the front page was therefore littered with signatures of H/Centre representatives who had received the Guidelines.

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

**2** There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste.

A letter dated 16th October, 2020 written by Kibenge Paul, Medical Superintendent of Mityana general Hospital gave a positive response to the Municipal Medical Officer stating that Hospital management had accepted to receive and dispose off medical waste from eleven Health Centres. The letter was in response to an earlier request from the Municipal to assist in collecting and disposing off medical waste from Health Centres. Also, Mityana

Hospital had an incinerator.

for s rvice delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

c G has

conducted raini g (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0

**1** E e Mityana Municipal DLG

conducted training and created awareness in healthcare waste management

A document dated 16th August 2020 titled “facility based mentorship report on waste management” written by Nakibuule Lydia, Ag. MHE had on it appended lists of staff who attended this mentorship as follows:

1. Kabule HC III, done on 8/8/2020 – 7 staff;
2. Banda HC II, done on 13/8/2020 – 3 staff;
3. Magala HC III, done on 14/8/2020 – 10 staff;
4. Kabuwambo HC III, done on 15/8/2020 – 3 staff.

16

Safeguards in the

Delivery of Investment

Management: LG

Health infrastructure projects incorporate

Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

**0** There was NO evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. The only Health project was construction of a lined pit latrine at Magala HC III. Costing was done and the value costed was UGX5,000/-. The costing was done on 10 July 2020 by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer, Mityana Municipal Council. However, this value was not reflected in the BoQ for the pit latrine.

in th

Delivery of Investment

Management: LG

Health infrastructure projects incorporate

Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b all health

secto 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

**2**

e all Health sector projects were

implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership.

A series of communication leading to acquisition of Land title for Magala HC III, the only Health project implemented, were presented. These included:

1. Minutes of Land Board meeting dated 18th April 2019;
2. “Council intervention to resolve issues regarding land ownership of Magala Health Centre land” dated 6th May

2019;

1. “Emergency HUMC meeting requesting for registration of Magala H/C III Land on 23/6/2019”;
2. “Registration of Magala Health Centre Land” dated 2nd

July 2019;

1. “Request for registration of 5.8 acre allocated to Magala Health Centre”
2. Index Diagram showing Survey of plot of land at Kanye; and
3. A report on “Completion of survey, demarcation and installation of mark stones over 5.8 acre Magala Health

Centre land in Magala ‘A’ LCI.
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Safeguards in the

Delivery of Investment

Management: LG

Health infrastructure projects incorporate

Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

**2**

There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports.

Two Monitoring Reports dated 25 Jan. 2021 and 26th

April 2021 were prepared and signed by Musisi Daniel,

Environment Officer and Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer. The reports covered a series of projects and had a section for ‘Construction of a five-stance lined pit latrine at Magala Health Centre III.

6 in th

Delivery of Investment

Management: LG

Health infrastructure projects incorporate

Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d

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

**2**

e e 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 the health infrastructure project.

Certification Form No.206 dated 10/5/2021 was availed. It was the Certification for the 5-stand lined pit latrine at

Magala HC III.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Water &**  **Environment**  **Performance**  **Measures 2020** | | |  |  |
| **Summary of**  **No. Definition of compliance**  **requirements**  **Local Government Service Delivery Results** | | | **Compliance**  **justification** | **Score** |
| 1 | Water & Environment a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  Outcomes: The LG has  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: registered high  functionality of water o 90 - 100%: score 2  sources and management committees o 80-89%: score 1  *Maximum 4 points on* o Below 80%: 0  *this performance measure* | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 1 | Water & Environment b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees  Outcomes: The LG has (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the registered high approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional functionality of water WSCs is:  sources and  o 90 - 100%: score 2 management committees | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| *Maximum 4 points on this performance measure* | * 80-89%: score 1 * Below 80%: 0 |
| 2 | Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  *Maximum 8 points on this performance measure* | a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is   1. Above 80% score 2 2. 60 -80%: 1 3. Below 60: 0   (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts) | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 2 | Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  *Maximum 8 points on* | b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.   * If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 * If 80-99%: Score 1 * If below 80 %: Score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

*this performance measure*

2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Service D livery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  *Maximum 8 points on this performance measure* | c If variations in th contract price of sampled WSS infrastruc ure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer’s estimates   * If within +/-20% score 2 * If not score 0 |  |  |
| 2 | 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.   * If 100% projects completed: score 2 * If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 * If projects completed are below 80%: 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 3 | 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   * If there is an increase: score 2 * If no increase: score 0. | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 3 | New\_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS  infrastructure facility  standards  *Maximum 4 points on* | 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).   * If increase is more than 1% score 2 * If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 * If there is no increase : score 0. | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

*this performance measure*

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4 performance

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Accuracy o Reported  Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS  infrastructure projects and service performance  *Maximum 3 points on this performance measure* | The DWO has accura ely reported on WSS facilities construc ed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3 |  |  |
| 5 | Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  *Maximum 7 points on this performance measure* | a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 5 | Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  *Maximum 7 points on this performance measure* | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 5 | Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their | 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  *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.* | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Budgetin for Wa er &  Sanitation and  Environment & Natural  Resources: The Local Government has  budgeted for staff  *Maximum 4 points on this performance measure* | a Evidence hat th DWO has budgeted for the following Wa er &  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 |  |
| 6 | Budgeting for Water &  Sanitation and  Environment & Natural  Resources: The Local Government has  budgeted for staff  *Maximum 4 points on this performance measure* | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 7 | Performance  Management: The LG  appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.  *Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* | a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 7 | Performance  Management: The LG  appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

training plans.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

8 lan ing, Budge ing and a) Evidence tha the DWO has p ioritized budget alloca ions to

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The | sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the  district: |

Local Government has allocated and spent • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to funds for service delivery S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 as prescribed in the • If 80-99%: Score 2 sector guidelines. • If 60-79: Score 1

• If below 60 %: Score 0

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* |  |  |  |
| 8 | Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.  *Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* | b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 9 | Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.  *Maximum 8 points on this performance measure* | a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)   * If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 * If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 * If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 9 | Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support. | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

9

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Routi e Oversigh and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.  *Maximum 8 points on this performance measure* | The Distric Wat r Officer publicize budget allocations for he current | |  |
| FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all subcounties: Score 2 |  |
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted  *Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* | 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:   * If funds were allocated score 3 * If not score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted  *Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* | 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. | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| **Investment Management** | |
| 11  Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure* | | a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:  Score 4 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 11  Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure* | | Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal | **0** |
| investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district Council.  average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:  Score 4 or else score 0. | |

1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | lan ing a d Bu geting  for Investments is conducted effectively  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure* | All budg ed inv s men s for cu ren FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2 |  |  |
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure* | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure* | e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.  Score 2 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | Procurement and  Contract  Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS | 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: | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

.

2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | rocureme t an  Contract  Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*  . | Evidenc hat th Distric Wate Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines | |  |
| Score 2: |  |
| 12 | Procurement and  Contract  Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*  . | d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the  DWO: Score 2 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | Procurement and  Contract  Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*  . | e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | Procurement and  Contract  Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements | 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   * If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 * If not score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

.

2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| rocureme t an g Evidenc hat a comple e procu ement file for water infrastructure Contract investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by  Management/execution: the PPDA Law:  The LG has effectively  Score 2, If not score 0 managed the WSS procurements  *Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*  .  **Environment and Social Requirements** | | |  |  |
| 13 | Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  *Maximum 3 points this performance measure* | Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:  Score 3, If not score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 14 | Safeguards for service delivery  *Maximum 3 points on this performance measure* | Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated Not | | **0** |
| guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0 | applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. |
| 15 | Safeguards in the  Delivery of Investments  *Maximum 10 points on this performance measure* | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the  Delivery of Investments  *Maximum 10 points on this performance measure* | b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the  Delivery of Investments  *Maximum 10 points on this performance* | c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal | **0** |

Council. *measure*

5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Safeguards in the  Delivery of Investments  *Maximum 10 points on this performance* | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal |

Council. *measure*

**Micro-scale irrigation**

**performance measures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of Compliance**  **No. Definition of compliance**  **requirements justification**  **Local Government Service Delivery Results** | | | | **Score** |
| 1 | Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land  Maximum score 4  Maximum 20 points for this performance area | a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last Not  two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant applicable to beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0 Mityana | | **0** |
|  | Municipal Council. |
| 1 | Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land  Maximum score 4  Maximum 20 points for this performance area | b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:   * By more than 5% score 2 * Between 1% and 4% score 1 * If no increase score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per | b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

guidelines

Maximum score 6

3

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | Evidence that he variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0 |  |  |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY   * If 100% score 2 * Between 80 – 99% score 1 * Below 80% score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure   * If 100% score 2 * If 75 – 99% score 1 * If below 75% score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards | b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last  FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal | **0** |

Council. Maximum score 6

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence tha information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 |  |  |
| 5 | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 6 | Reporting and  Performance  Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6 | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 6 | Reporting and  Performance  Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into | b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into  MIS: Score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

Reporting and c. the LG has prepared a quarterly report using

Performance information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0 Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

6 **0**

Reporting and d) Evidence that the LG has: Not

Performance applicable to

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the

Improvement: The LG Mityana

lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0

has collected and Municipal

entered information into Council.

MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

6 **0**

Reporting and ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing Not

Performance LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 applicable to

Improvement: The LG Mityana has collected and Municipal

entered information into Council.

MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7 **0**

Budgeting for, actual a) Evidence that the LG has: Not

recruitment and applicable to

i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with deployment of staff: The Mityana

the staffing norms score 1 or else 0

Local Government has Municipal budgeted, actually Council.

recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Budget for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | ii Deployed ex ension workers as per guidel nes score 1 or else 0 |  |  |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6 | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 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:  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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

Workers

Maximum score 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension  Workers  Maximum score 4 | | ) :  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 |  |  |
| 8 | | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension  Workers  Maximum score 4 | | ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | | b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations,  Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0 | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

Maximum score 10

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | lan , budgeting and  transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10 | c co-funding is refl cted n the LG Budget and  allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 |  |  |
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10 | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10 | e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| hands-on support and ran water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water farmer field schools as conservation, etc.) per guidelines   * If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2   Maximum score 8   * 70-89% monitored score 1   Less than 70% score 0 | |

0

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Routi e oversight and . has overseen techn cal train ng & support to  monitoring: The LG the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the monitored, provided warranty period: Score 2 or else 0 hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | |  |  |
| 10 | Routine oversight and c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG monitoring: The LG extension workers during the implementation of complementary monitored, provided services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0 hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 10 | Routine oversight and d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools monitoring: The LG as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 monitored, provided hands-on support and ran | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 |  |
| 11 | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted  activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 11 | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted  activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated | b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at  District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

agriculture.

Maximum score 4

**Investment Management**

2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | lan a d budgeting  for investm nts: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | a has an updat d reg ter of m cro-scale  irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0 |  |  |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8 | 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 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per | 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. | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

guidelines

Maximum score 18

3

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ocurem t, contract managem nt/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18 | requested for quota on from rrigation  equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal  Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0 |  |  |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18 | c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18 | d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per | 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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

guidelines

Maximum score 18

3

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ocurem t, contract managem nt/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18 | g have conduct d reg lar technical supervision  of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale  irrigation contracts as per | 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 to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

guidelines

Maximum score 18

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

4

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | G ievanc redress: The a ocal Government has displayed details of the  LG has established a nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple mechanism of addressing public areas: Score 2 or else 0 | |  |  |
| micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6 |  |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The  LG has established a | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 mechanism of addressing  micro-scale irrigation ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0  grievances in line with the LG grievance redress iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0  framework | |
| iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or | | |
| Maximum score 6 else 0 | |  |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  LG has established a  ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 mechanism of addressing  micro-scale irrigation iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0  grievances in line with the LG grievance redress iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or  framework  else 0  Maximum score 6 | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  LG has established a  iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 mechanism of addressing  micro-scale irrigation iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or  grievances in line with else 0 | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |

the LG grievance redress framework

Maximum score 6

4

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| G ievanc redress: The b M cro-s ale irrigation grievances have been:  LG has established a  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or mechanism of addressing  else 0 micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6  **Environment and Social Requirements** | | |  |  |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6 | ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6 | iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6 | iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | Not  applicable to  Mityana | **0** |

Municipal Council.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Micro-scale irrigation minimum conditions** |  |  |  |
| **No. Summary of requirements**  **Human Resource Management and Development** | **Definition of compliance** | **Compliance**  **justification** | **Score** |
| 1  New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  *Maximum score is 70*  **Environment and Social Requirements** | If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  *score 70 or else 0.* | Not applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| 2  New\_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. | If the LG:  Carried out Environmental,  Social and Climate Change | Not applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** |
| screening score 30 or else 0 . | |

*Maximum score is 30*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Wate & environment minimum conditions** | |  |  | |  | | |
| **No. Summary of requirements**  **Human Resource Management and Development** | | **Definition of compliance** |  | **Compliance**  **justification** | **Score** | | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0. |  | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | b. 1 Assistant Water |  | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0. | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | c. 1 Borehole  Maintenance  Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else  0. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else  0. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Maximum score is 70* | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **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 | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | **0** | | |
| screening/Environment, score 10 or else 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. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | | **0** |
| 2 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate  Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or  else 0. | | Not  applicable to Mityana  Municipal Council. | | **0** |

**Heal h minimum**

**conditions**

**Definition of**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Summary of requirements compliance**  **Human Resource Management and Development** | | **Compliance justification** | **Score** |
| 1 |  |
| New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Applicable to Districts only.*  *Maximum score is 70*  1 | a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0. |  |  |
| New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Applicable to Districts only.*  *Maximum score is 70*  1 | b. Assistant District  Health Officer Maternal,  Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0 |  |  |
| New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  *Applicable to Districts only.*  *Maximum score is 70*  1 | c. Assistant District Health Officer  Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0. |  |  |
| New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. | d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0. |  |  |

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

1

New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.

1

New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

1

New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Applicable to Districts 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.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

1. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.
2. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.
3. Medical Officer of Health Services

/Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else

0.

**30**

The Principal Medical Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  *Applicable to MCs only.*  *Maximum score is 70* | i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0. | The Principal Health Inspector was NOT substantively appointed. Duties were assigned to the Senior Health Inspector as per the assignment letters CR/M/350050 dated 6th July 2020 | **0** | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is | j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0 | The Health Educator was NOT substantively appointed. Duties were assigned to the Officer on  6th July 2020 as per the letter CR/M/350009 | **0** |   in place in place for all critical positions.  *Applicable to MCs only.*  *Maximum score is 70*  **Environment and Social Requirements** |

CR/CR/M/350055 dated 14th December 2017

2

E idence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out:

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social

Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental,

Social and Climate

Change

screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

**15** There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.

According to the Municipal Planners records, there was only one Health project implemented, namely, Construction of a lined pit latrine at Magala HC III. Environmental Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 15 December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior

Community Development Officer.

2

LG has carried out:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the | b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0. |

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social

Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

**15**

Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education minimum conditions** | | |  |  |
| **Definition of**  **No. Summary of requirements compliance**  **Human Resource Management and Development** | | | **Compliance justification** | **Score** |
| 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.  *The Maximum Score of 70* | a) District Education  Officer (district)/  Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | The Principal Education Officer was NOT substantively appointed. Duties were assigned to the Senior Education Officer as per the assignment letter CR/10056 dated 6th July  2020 | **0** |
| 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.  *The Maximum Score of 70* | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | During the FY 2020/2021 the district had one Senior Inspector of Schools who was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter – CR/D/34179 dated 17th May 2021. | **40** |

The Inspector of Schools was appointed during the current FY 2021/2022 , appointment letter – CR/D/38477 dated 25th October 2021.

**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.

**15**

There was evidence that Mityana Municipal

DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.

Five Education projects were implemented by Mityana Municipal Council according to the records from the District planner. Screening for these projects was done as follows:

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Mbaliga UMEA Primary School. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 16 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 16

December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kalamba Primary School. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 15

December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Nakibanga Primary School. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 15

December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at

Mbaliga UMEA Primary School. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 16 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 16

December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior

Community Development Officer;

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Maswa Primary School. Environmental

Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 15

December 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer;

1. Construction of a lined pit latrine at Naama

Das Primary School. Environmental Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 15 December 2020 whereas the

Social Screening was done on 15 December

2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer.

2

Evidence that prior o commenc men If the LG carried out:

of all civil works for all Education

b. Social Impact sector projects the LG has carried out:

Assessments (ESIAs) ,

Environmental, Social and Climate

score 15 or else 0.

Change screening/Environment

Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

The Maximum score is 30

**15** Screening r sults indicated no need for ESIA.

**Crosscutting minimum conditions**

**Definition of**

**No. Summary of requirements Compliance justification Score**

**compliance**

**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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

1. Chief Finance

Officer/Principal Finance

Officer, score 3 or else 0

1. District Planner/Senior

Planner, score 3 or else

0

1. District

Engineer/Principal

Engineer, score 3 or else

0

1. District Natural

Resources

Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0

1. District Production

Officer/Senior Veterinary

Officer, score 3 or else 0 **3**

The Municipal Treasurer / Principal Finance Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10061 dated 14th

December

**3** Senior Planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10082 dated 13th January

2021

**0** The Principal Engineer was NOT substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Senior Engineer as per the appointment letters CR/10053 dated 13th January 2021

**0**

The Senior Environment Officer was NOT substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Environment Officer as per the letters CR/10063 dated 6th July 2020

**0**

The Senior Veterinary Officer position was not on the staff structure

1

critical

th

Distr ct/Municipal Council departments.

Maximum score is 37.

f District Community

Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0

**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 | The Principal Commercial Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10080 dated 9th September 2020 | **3** | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37. | i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: | N/A | **0** | | Procurement Officer, 2 or | | | else 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 | The Procurement Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10079 dated 9th September 2020. The Assistant Procurement Officer position was vacant | **2** | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human  Resource Officer, score  2 or else 0 | The Senior Human Resource Officer was NOT substantively appointed.  Duties were assigned to the Human Resource Officer as per the assignment letter CR/10067 dated | **0** |   27th October 2021 |

Principal CDO was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/CR/10076 dated 18th August 2021. However, the P/CDO was appointment during this FY

1

New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the

District/Municipal Council departments.

Maximum score is 37.

j. A Senior Environment

Officer, score 2 or else 0 **2** Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters dated 14th December 2017

1

critical

th

Distr ct/Municipal Council departments.

Maximum score is 37.

k Senior Land

Management Officer

/Physical Planner, score

2 or else 0

**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. | l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0 | The Senior Accountant was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/ M/10009 dated 13th January 2021 | **2** | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37. | m. Principal Internal  Auditor /Senior Internal  Auditor, score 2 or else 0 | The Senior Internal Auditor substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10055 dated  2nd December 2020 | **2** | | 1 | New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. | n. Principal Human  Resource Officer | The Principal Human Resource  Officer (Secretary DSC) was | **2** | | (Secretary DSC), score 2 substantively appointed as per the  or else 0 appointment letter – CR/10655 dated | |   26th October 2015 Maximum score is 37. |

Physical planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/ xxxxxxx

2

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (SubCounties) /Town Clerk

(Town Councils) / Senior

Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

**5** The MC had three (3) LLGs and therefore 3 Senior Assistant Town Clerk positions. They were all substantively filled as per the appointment letters :

1. CR/10048 dated 9th May 2017, 2.

CR/10049 dated 9th May 2017 annd

3. 3.CR/10081 dated 13th January

2021

2

essential

ev ry LLG

Max mum score is 15

b A Community

Development Officer /

Senior CDO in case of

Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0. **0**

MC had thr e Community Development Officer positions. Two were substantively filled, as per their appointment letter and one Officer performed duties of a CDO, as follows;

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 2  New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15  **Environment and Social Requirements** | c. A Senior Accounts  Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0. | All three Accounts Assistant were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters , as follows   1. CR/10041 dated 22nd April 2021, 2. CR//M/10069 dated 17th December   20218 and 3. M/10062 dated 9th  September 2020 | **5** | | 3  Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4 | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0 | The LG released 63.3% of funds allocated in the year 2020/21 to  Natural Resources department. The  LG budgeted Ugx 213,010,280(LG  Approved Budget 2020/21) and only  Ugx 134,993,675 was spent ( LG draft  Financial statements for the year | **0** |   2020/21 page 10). |

1. CR/10084 dated 22nd April 2021, 2. CR/10085 dated 22nd April 2021 and 3. CR/10058 dated 31st May 2019

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.

**0** The LG released 72.3% of funds allocated in the year 2020/21 to Community Based Services department. The LG budgeted Ugx 76,373,122 (LG Approved Budget 2020/21) and Ugx 54,704,335 was spent ( LG draft Financial statements for the year 2020/21 page 10).

4

Evidence that the LG as carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact

Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed

Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or else 0

**4**

re was evid nce that Mityana

Municipal DLG carried out

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the DDEGfunded project.

There was only one DDEG project. It was construction of a 5-Stance pit latrine at the Municipal Headquarters. Environmental Screening was done by Mr. Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 30 November 2020 whereas the Social Screening was done on 30 November 2020 by Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer.

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact

Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed

Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement

of all civil works for all

projects implemented using the Discretionary

Development

Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

**4** The Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact

Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed

Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

**Financial management and reporting**

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development

Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

score 4 or 0

**4** There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development

Equalization Grant (DDEG

The screening was costed at UGX100,000 on a Costing Form prepared by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer on 10 July 2020, and verified by the Head of Natural resources Department.

6

Evidence that the LG as provid d information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and

Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).

maximum score is 10

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

2g),

score 10 or else 0.

**0**

LG submitt d status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General audit issues for the year 2019/20 on 26 February and 12 April 2021 respectively to PS/ST, after the February 2021 deadline for both responses.

9

Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August

31, of the current Financial Year

Maximum score is 4

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY  Maximum Score 4 | If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,  score 4 or else 0. | The LG submitted an annual performance contract for 2021/22 on  26 July 2021 before the deadline of  August 31st, 2021. | **4** |
| 8 | Evidence that the LG has submitted the  Annual Performance Report for the previous  FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year  maximum score 4 or else 0 | If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous  FY on or before August  31, of the current Financial Year,  score 4 or else 0. | The LG submitted late the Annual  Performance Report for the year 2020/21 on 15/9/2021 after the deadline of August 31, 2021. | **0** |

If the LG has submitted

Quarterly Budget

Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

**0**

The LG did not submit all the quarterly budget Performance Reports for the year 2020/21 by the deadline of August 2021:

Q1 was submitted on 20/9/2020 ;

Q2 was submitted on 10/2/2021;

Q3 was submitted on 1/6/2021 ; and Q4 was submitted on 15/9/2021.