



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%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	The toilet constructed under DDEG fund at the Municipal Headquarter at a cost of Ugx 20million was not being used.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	This was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	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

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence from the 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 6. Landtitles Ugx 14,645,000 7. Transfer to LLG Ugx 143,542,000	2
---	--	--	--	---

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the variations 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%	2
---	--	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the only DDEG project of a latrine at the municipal headquarter was 100% complete as reported, page 112 of the Annual Performance report:</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did NOT present information on the consolidation and submission of staffing requirements for the coming FY</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>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 2021 as per the monthly staff attendance reports contained in letters CR/M/154 of the respective months</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had eight (8) HoD, they were appraised on the following dates as per their appraisal reports reviewed, as follows;</p> <p>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</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>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</p>	1

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The Consultative Committee 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	1
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	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	0
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	Six employees retired during the FY 2020/21. Information on their accessing the payroll was NOT availed for review	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	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.	2
----	--	--	--	---

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED): Score: 2 or else score 0	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 Quarter 3 warrant was on 22/1/2021 , release date was 8/1/2021;14 days.	0
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 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 dated 16/3/2020 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.	2
11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	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	There was evidence that the reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, as seen from the TPC Min 29/6/2021 Min 08/TPC/29/06/2021 .	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG maintained an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, Land etc. as per format in the accounting manual and was last updated on June 30,2021.</p> <p>Assets breakdown were as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land Ugx ; 253,700,000 2. Building and structures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Non Residential buildings Ugx 1,031,496,323; b) Residential buildings Ugx 0 3. Roads and bridges Ugx 536,962,794 4. Motorvehicles Ugx 106,734,794 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Total Assets Ugx 2,157,533,942</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG Physical Planning Committee was in place and functioning, at least 4 sets of minutes were prepared but not submitted to MoLHUD as required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting held on 25/3/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021; 2. Meeting held on 22/4/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021; 3. Meeting held on 22/5/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021; 4. Meeting held on 1/6/2021 and submitted on 20/9/2021. <p>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.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are:</p> <p>(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2- class room block at Maswa PS, Ugx 64,000,000 2. Construction of 2- class room block at Kalamba PS Ugx 64,000,000 3. Completion of a 2-classroom block at Nakibanga PS Ugx 12,334,000 4. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala HCIII Ugx 26,093,000 5. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Ugx 20,000,000 	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports 10/6/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21. The projects appraised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2- class room block at Maswa PS, Ugx 64,000,000 2. Construction of 2- class room block at Kalamba PS Ugx 64,000,000 3. Completion of a 2-classroom block at Nakibanga PS Ugx 12,334,000 4. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Magala HCIII Ugx 26,093,000 5. Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit latrine at Municipal Headquarters Ugx 20,000,000 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the project profiles with costing 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of the Administration Block Ugx 200,000,000 2. Rehabilitation of Naama HCIII Staff house Ugx 20,000,000 3. Rehabilitation of Kabule HCIII Staff house Ugx 22,975,128 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 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 .</p> <p>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.</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all 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	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee. This was 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	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There is evidence of letters dated July 20, 2020 signed by the Town clerk appointing members of the Project Implementation teams for the various projects.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that 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 against the design dimension of 0.9 x 1.35. This was deemed acceptable.	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO participated in the project supervision. The sampled payments were for:</p> <p>.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;</p> <p>2.A Contract for the construction of a VIP latrine by Muluwa Enterprises Ltd at Naama Junior school Ugx21,865,577 submitted on 6/5/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 19/5/2021 and payment was made on 29/6/2021 inline with the contract; and</p> <p>3.A Contract for the construction of a 2 classroom block by Sebalamu Ltd at Maswa primary school Ugx63,613,210 submitted on 8/3/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 10/3/2021 and payment was made on 6/4/2021 inline with the contract.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract. The sampled projects were:</p> <p>1. The Construction of a 5 stance VIP toilet at Magala HC III where: the contractors invoice was received on April 4, 2021; the Supervisor of Works certified the invoice on March 3, 2021, the Distr. Engineer verified on 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.</p> <p>2. The Construction of a 2 classroom block at Maswa P.S where: the contractors invoice was received on March 8, 2021; the Supervisor of Works certified the invoice on March 10, 2021, the Distr. Engineer verified on 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</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:
 Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure
 Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence 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

2. 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;

3. 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

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Municipality had i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. This was done as follows:</p> <p>i) A letter dated July 20th, 2021, written by Nakawuka Juliet, Deputy Town Clerk Mityana Municipal Council, appointed The Physical Planner as Chairperson of the Grievance and Complaints Committee.</p> <p>ii) The same letter that appointed the chairperson also appointed six members to the GRC. They were:</p> <p>Mr. Dan Musisi as Secretary</p> <p>Ms. Nakuya Grace,</p> <p>Mr. Wadroboh Isaiah,</p> <p>Mr. Kironde James Muwanga,</p> <p>Mr. Bukenya Steven, and</p> <p>Ms. Naluggya Catherine as Members.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was 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.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was 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.</p>	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate 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.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that DDEG guidelines were given to LLGs in the 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 this performance measure	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
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was NO evidence that all 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.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports.</p> <p>Four reports were presented on monitoring and supervision activities as follows:</p> <p>i) 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;</p> <p>ii) 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</p> <p>iii) Monitoring report about construction works dated 25th Jan 2021 prepared and signed by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer and Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer.</p>	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	1

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the 3 bank accounts sampled did not have monthly reconciliations done up to October, 2021 as required. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 3. General Fund was reconciled up to October 31, 2021. 	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports in the FY 2020/21 as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was prepared on 30/11/2020;</p> <p>Quarter 2 report was prepared on 22/2/2021 ;</p> <p>Quarter 3 report was prepared 24/6/2021; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was prepared on 30/8/2021.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had provided status of implementation of internal audit findings to the LG PAC for all the 4 quarters:</p> <p>Quarter 1 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 30/11/2020;</p> <p>Quarter 2 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 22/2/2021;</p> <p>Quarter 3 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 24/6/2021; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 17/11/2021.</p>	1

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly 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.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>(Source: LG draft Final accounts for FY 2020/21 page 10 and the LG Approved Work Plan and Budget for 2020/21 page 4.)</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The LG OSR increased by 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.</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that the LG remitted the mandatory share of local revenue to the LLGs.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	The LG had an information board, but it 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.	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 previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG conducted discussions with the 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.	1
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	Information on tax rates , collection procedures and appeals were on the notice board at the time of the assessment on 25/11/2021.	1
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	The LG did not have any case for IGG during the year 2020/21.	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The LG PLE pass rate had improved by 1% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>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 2019 was, therefore, $2,468 / 3,173 \times 100 = 78\%$</p> <p>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 2020 was, therefore, $2,730 / 3,437 \times 100 = 79\%$</p> <p>Therefore $79\% - 78\% = 1$ percentage improvement.</p>	2
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The LG UCE pass rate had improved by 4% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, $41 / 106 \times 100 = 39\%$.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2020 was, therefore, $77 / 181 \times 100 = 43\%$.</p> <p>Therefore $43\% - 39\% = 4$ percentage improvement.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>This was not assessed until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The LG received a sum of 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>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:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that variations in the contract price were within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The sampled projects were for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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% 3. 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% 	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The LG did not have a project for a Seed Secondary School in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	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.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>From the list of registered UPE and USE schools; and 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.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>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:</p> <p>1). Mityana Public primary school in Busimbi division had 16 teachers.</p> <p>2). Mityana Junior school in Central division 10 teachers.</p> <p>3). Butega P/S in Ttamu division had 08 teachers.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>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.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p>	<p>None of the sampled schools had 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 23/03/2021</p>	0
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 		
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p>	<p>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.</p>	4
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 		
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p>	<p>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.</p>	4
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 		

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY: Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>From the LG performance contract, list of schools, and 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.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council had thirty seven (37) primary schools and therefore 37 H/Ts. Ten performance appraisal reports were sampled. The sampled H/Ts were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>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 2020, 8. Naaman DAS PS – 22nd December 2020, 9. Kyakowe PS – 17th December 2020 and 10. Kawoko PS – 16th December 2020</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The MC had four (4) secondary schools and therefore 4 HTs. Only two were appraised as per their performance appraisal reports presented for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HT, Busubizi SS appraised on – 20th December 2020 2. Naama SS, appraised on 6th December 2020 	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education Department had two member of staff, only one was appraised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inspector of Schools – 18th July 2021 <p>The Education Officer, Special needs was NOT appraised</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The MC did NOT prepare a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did not submit all warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as below:</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 20/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020; 14 days</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 27/1/2021, release date was 8/1/2021; 19 days and</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrant was on 27/5/2021, release date was 6/5/2021;15 days.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG invoiced all capitation releases to schools within 3 working days:</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 20/10/2020 and release date was 6/10/2020, 14 days;</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoicing was on 26/1/2021 and release date was 8/1/2021, 16 days; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 invoicing was on 13/4/2021 and release date was 31/3/2021, 13 days.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <p>• If 100% score: 2</p> <p>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>• Below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>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%).</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up, Score: 2 or else, score: 0	There was no evidence to show that inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0	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 <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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 2. 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 <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.	0

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	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.	0
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals, the investment derived from the LG Development Plan (Page 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG conducted field appraisals, the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were customized for investment as indicated in reports 10/6/2020, for the projects implemented in the year 2020/21. The projects appraised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that 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.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no infrastructure project above the threshold 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 meeting 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.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence 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 Kamyia, 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 officer.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG did not have a project for a seed school	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not have a project for a seed school	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not have a project for a seed school	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as below:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>2.A Contract for the construction of a VIP latrine by Muluwa Enterprises Ltd at Naama Junior school Ugx21,865,577 submitted on 6/5/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 19/5/2021 and payment was made on 29/6/2021 inline with the contract; and</p> <p>3.A Contract for the construction of a 2 class room block by Sebalamu ltd at Maswa primary school Ugx63,613,210 submitted on 8/3/2021 was certified by the MEO, Environment Officer and CDO on 10/3/2021 and payment was made on 6/4/2021 inline with the contract.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department submitted a procurement plan on April 9, 2020.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG did not have a project for a seed school</p>	1
----	--	--	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence 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.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	<p>There was NO evidence that ALL Education projects were costed and that these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents</p> <p>i) 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;</p> <p>ii) 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;</p> <p>iii) 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.</p> <p>iv) 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;</p> <p>v) 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.</p> <p>Therefore, save for Nakibanga primary school, the rest of the school ESMPs were not included in the BoQs.</p>	0

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, *score: 1, else score:0*

There was proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects.

There were five schools where Mityana Municipal Council implemented projects. Land ownership status was straightened in all cases as follows:

i) 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;

ii) 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.

iii) 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.

iv) 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

v) 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.

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports.</p> <p>A monitoring Report for all five School projects dated 12/11/2020 was prepared and signed by Musisi Daniel, Environment Officer and Naluggya Catherine, Senior Community Development Officer.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments.</p> <p>E & S compliance certificates were available for all five school projects. They were for:</p> <p>vi) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Mbaliga UMEA Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 2/6/2021;</p> <p>vii) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kalamba Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 10/5/2021;</p> <p>viii) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Nakibanga Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 10/5/2021;</p> <p>ix) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Maswa Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 2/6/2021;</p> <p>x) Construction of a lined pit latrine at Naama Das Primary School. Certificate No. 202 dated 2/6/2021.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was no evidence 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant Ugx 28,992,000 for the year 2020/21 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The projects were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors: It was only one payment that required all their certification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works by Rosco 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. 	2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the variations in the contract prices were all within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimate.</p> <p>The sampled contract was for Construction of a 5-Stage 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%.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The LG did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>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%).</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The LG did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There is no evidence that 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kalule HCIII: i. Isabirye Henry (Health Assistant); ii. Aliganyira (Nursing Assistant) who had recently been 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. 	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There 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).</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Magala HC III 25/03/21 2. Naama HCIII 20/03/21 3. Kabule HCIII 20/03/21 	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the sampled 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.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>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.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was no evidence that 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).</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no evidence that 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Magala HCIII Q4: 16/7/21 (late); Q3: 26/4/21 (late); Q2: 9/2/21; and Q1: 27/10/21 (late), 2. Naama HC III Q4: 15/7/21; Q3: 22/4/21 (late); Q2 11/2/21 (late); and Q1: 21/10/21 (late), and 3. Kabule HC III Q4: 20/7/21 (late); Q3: 28/4/2021 (late); Q2: 8/2/21 (late); and Q1: 26/10/21 (late). 	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Q1. 7th January 2020 (late) Q2. 26th February 2021 (late) Q3. 27th May 2021 Q4. 30th July 2021 (late) 	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Health Department Submitted all the 4 Quarterly Budget Performance reports to the planner for consolidation 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</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing facilities</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The 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.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>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%).</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	3

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG publicized 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 HCIII, and Kabule HC III.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had seven (7) health facilities. The Officers in Charge of HCs were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>Kabuwambo HC II – 1st July 2021, 2. Ttanda HC II- 30th June 2021, 3. Kabuule HC III – 30th June 2021, 4. Naama HC III – 29th June 2021, 5. Katiko HC II – 5th July 2021, 6. Magala HC III – 30th June 2021 and 7. Nakaseeta HC II – 21st June 2021</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had fifty three (53) health workers. Ten performance appraisal reports were sampled. The sampled health workers were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>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. 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</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>MMoH did NOT take any corrective actions based on the appraisal reports</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the LG documented training activities in the training/CPD database, Examples of the training activities included are:</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>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.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not warrant to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2020/21 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 28/7/2020, release date was 9/7/2020; 21 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 19/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020; 15 days</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 22/1/ 2021, release date was 8/1/2021; 14 days and</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrant was on 12/4/2021, release date was 31/3/2021;12 days.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not 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:</p> <p>Quarter 1 invoicing was on 15/7/2020, release date was 9/7/2020, 8 days;</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 20/10/2020, release date was 6/10/2020, 14 days;</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoicing was on 26/1/2021, release date was 8/1/2021,19 days; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 invoicing was on 13/4/2021, release date was 31/3/2021,14 days.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the 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:</p> <p>Q1: Release date 24/07/20, publication date 22/07/20 (2 days early)</p> <p>Q2: Release date 22/10/20, publication date 20/10/20 (2 days early)</p> <p>Q3: Release date 21/01/21, publication date 25/01/21 (1 day)</p> <p>Q4: Release date 28/04/21, publication date 13/04/21 (11 days early)</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was 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 training on Home-Based Care of COVID-19.” and pre-dates the recommendation.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the 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:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>Q4: 17 persons including 11/17 l/c and/or representatives and members of the MHMT (04/06/2021);</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The Municipality has no HCIV and hospitals.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is no designated HSD in the Municipality.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was 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:</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 pre-dates the recommendation. 	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was 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.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	The LG allocated 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.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	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). 2. Report on Support Supervision of VHT activities in Ttamu Division, dated 22nd June 2021 (Pages 1-2)	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has 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.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>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.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>		
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility investment was screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist.</p> <p>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.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence 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.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Health department had submitted procurement request form in the 1st Quarter of the current FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no health infrastructure investments for the previous FY above the Shs 200,000,000 which needed the Solicitor General's clearance.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for health infrastructure projects constructed within the last FY. This was by a letter dated July 20,2020 signed by the Town Clerk appointing: Dr. Jackson Ssekikubo, the Municipal Health 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 officer.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no project for Upgrade of a HC II to a HC III in the previous FY.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe of 10 days. The 2 projects were:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required. The sampled project was: 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</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that grievances 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.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities.</p> <p>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.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste.</p> <p>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.</p>	2

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was Evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG conducted training and created awareness in healthcare waste management</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Kabule HC III, done on 8/8/2020 – 7 staff; ii) Banda HC II, done on 13/8/2020 – 3 staff; iii) Magala HC III, done on 14/8/2020 – 10 staff; iv) Kabuwambo HC III, done on 15/8/2020 – 3 staff. 	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that 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.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all Health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership.</p> <p>A series of communication leading to acquisition of Land title for Magala HC III, the only Health project implemented, were presented. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Minutes of Land Board meeting dated 18th April 2019; ii) "Council intervention to resolve issues regarding land ownership of Magala Health Centre land" dated 6th May 2019; iii) "Emergency HUMC meeting requesting for registration of Magala H/C III Land on 23/6/2019"; iv) "Registration of Magala Health Centre Land" dated 2nd July 2019; v) "Request for registration of 5.8 acre allocated to Magala Health Centre" vi) Index Diagram showing Survey of plot of land at Kanye; and vii) A report on "Completion of survey, demarcation and installation of mark stones over 5.8 acre Magala Health Centre land in Magala 'A' LCI. 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports.</p> <p>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.</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of 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.

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

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <p>o If within +/-20% score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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 training plans. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	--	--	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	--	---	--	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	--	---	--	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	---	---	--	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	---	--	--	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
----	---	--	--	---

15

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

Not
applicable to
Mityana
Municipal
Council.

0

**Micro-scale irrigation
performance
measures**

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

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	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	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 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	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 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	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	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	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 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	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 Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools 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 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 agriculture. Maximum score 4	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

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	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	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 guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable 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	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable 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	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 guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mityana Municipal Council.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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
	Maximum score 6			
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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
	Maximum score 6			
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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
	Maximum score 6			
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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
	Maximum score 6			
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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 Municipal Council.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Micro-scale irrigation minimum conditions

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

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, 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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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 screening/Environment, 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	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

Health minimum
conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, 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. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, 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. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, 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. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), 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. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The Principal Medical Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/CR/M/350055 dated 14th December 2017	30
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	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
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	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
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.</p> <p>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.</p>	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.</p>	15

Education minimum conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	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. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	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. The Inspector of Schools was appointed during the current FY 2021/2022 , appointment letter – CR/D/38477 dated 25th October 2021.	40

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

The Maximum score is 30

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:

i) 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;

ii) 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;

iii) 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;

iv) 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;

v) 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;

vi) 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.

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

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

Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.

The Maximum score is 30

Crosscutting minimum conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Treasurer / Principal Finance Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10061 dated 14th December</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10082 dated 13th January 2021</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>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</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>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</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Senior Veterinary Officer position was not on the staff structure</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The 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</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Principal Commercial Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10080 dated 9th September 2020</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	N/A	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Procurement Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10079 dated 9th September 2020. The Assistant Procurement Officer position was vacant</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>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 27th October 2021</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters dated 14th December 2017</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Physical planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/ xxxxxxx</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Senior Accountant was substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/ M/10009 dated 13th January 2021</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Senior Internal Auditor substantively appointed as per the appointment letters CR/10055 dated 2nd December 2020</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter – CR/10655 dated 26th October 2015</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The MC had three (3) LLGs and therefore 3 Senior Assistant Town Clerk positions. They were all substantively filled as per the appointment letters :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CR/10048 dated 9th May 2017, 2. CR/10049 dated 9th May 2017 and 3. 3.CR/10081 dated 13th January 2021 	5

2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The MC had three Community Development Officer positions. Two were substantively filled, as per their appointment letter and one Officer performed duties of a CDO, as follows; 1. CR/10084 dated 22nd April 2021, 2. CR/10085 dated 22nd April 2021 and 3. CR/10058 dated 31st May 2019	0
---	--	---	--	---

2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	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
---	--	---	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	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 2020/21 page 10).	0
---	---	--	---	---

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.	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).	0
---	---	--	--	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the DDEG-funded project.</p> <p>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.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mityana Municipal DLG costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)</p> <p>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.</p>	4

Financial management and reporting

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted 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.</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an annual performance contract for 2021/22 on 26 July 2021 before the deadline of August 31st, 2021.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted late the Annual Performance Report for the year 2020/21 on 15/9/2021 after the deadline of August 31, 2021.</p>	0
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not submit all the quarterly budget Performance Reports for the year 2020/21 by the deadline of August 2021:</p> <p>Q1 was submitted on 20/9/2020 ;</p> <p>Q2 was submitted on 10/2/2021;</p> <p>Q3 was submitted on 1/6/2021 ; and</p> <p>Q4 was submitted on 15/9/2021.</p>	0