



## **LGMSD 2021/22**

Kaberamaido  
District

(Vote Code: 514)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	67%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	80%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	45%
Educational Performance Measures	45%
Health Performance Measures	69%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	52%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	3%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was physical evidence that the three sampled infrastructural projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and were being utilized This was done by physically inspecting the following sampled projects;</p> <p>Rehabilitated District Drug Store ,</p> <p>Rehabilitated Education Office block phase two</p> <p>Supply of culverts to be used on community access roads and District feeder roads in FY 2022/23</p>	<b>4</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This will be reviewed after the National assessment of LLGS has been concluded</p>	<b>0</b>

Service Delivery  
Performance

Maximum 6 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

There was evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects for FY 2021/2022 were implemented and completed as per Annual work plan (Documentary evidence extracted and provided by the Planner)

There was evidence that the DDEG funded investments projects

implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022 were completed as per annual performance contract (with AWP): 1). Rehabilitation of Education office block page 43 of the Performance Contract (with AWP) and was completed as per page 56 of the 4th Budget Performance Report

2) Construction of 5 stance drainable pit latrine with washrooms for girls at Ocan Oyere P/page 43 of the Performance Contract/(with AWP)

3) Construction of market stall at Alwa daily market page 71 of the Performance Contract (with AWP) and was Completed as per page 73 of 4th Quarter Budget Performanc

Report

4)Supply of culverts to be used on community access roads and District feeder roads page 132 of Performance Contract (with AWP) and was completed as per page 101 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report.

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.	The LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY 2021/2022 on eligible projects/activities as per DDEG grant budget and implementation guidelines  DDEG budget was Shs 234,983,000 as per the budget book FY 2021/2022  DDEG Received and Spent as follows  Capacity Building Shs 23,000,000 Page 7 of approved budget  Rehabilitation of the District Drug Store at Shs 25,605,000 page 10 of the approved budget FY 2021/2022  Rehabilitation of Education office block at Sh Shs 119,476,436 page 24 of the budget FY 2021/2022  planning , Monitoring and evaluation Environmental and Social safeguards at Shs 20,500,000 ,  construction of market and toilet was at Shs.46,401,564 all totaling Shs 234,983,000	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	The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows:  · Phased renovation of education department block at District Htrs budgeted at UGX 121,068,000, actual was UGX 119,476,436 with a variation of UGX 1,5915,64 represented by - 1.3%  · Construction of market stall at Alwa daily market budgeted at UGX 20,000,000, actual was UGX 19,190,340 with a variation of UGX 809660 represented by - 4.0%  · Construction of 5 stance drainable pit latrine with washrooms for girls at Ocan Oyere P/s budgeted at UGX 26,932,727, actual was UGX 26,929,640 with a variation of 3087 represented by 0%.  The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual	2

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the approved staff structure for LLGs and Staff list from the HRM Division, it was noted that the three (3) sampled LLGs had some evidence on minimum staffing requirements as indicated below;</p> <p>At Aperikira Sub County the staff structure indicated 17 staff and only 10 were on the staff list of the Sub County. Some of the staff in place included; Mr. Elepu Emmanuel SAS, Olopo Richard CDO and Mr. Aiga Julius the Assistant Accountant among others.</p> <p>At Kaberamaido Sub County the staff list was displayed at the notice board. However, only one staff present on duty Amucu Mariam Babra Parish Chief</p> <p>Kaberamaido Town Council, approved staff structure had 53 staff and only 18 were verified from the Town Council staff list and some of the staff included: Okello William the Town Agent, Echamu Morgan the SAA, and Ezabu Simon the Office Attendant.</p>	0
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <p>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</p> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was evidence that the infrastructure constructed using the DDEG was 100% in place as per reports produced by the LG indicated below</li> <li>• Phased renovation of education department block at District Htrs page 43 of the Performance Contract (with AWP) and was completed as per page 56 of the 4th Budget Performance Report</li> <li>• Construction of market stall at Alwa daily market page 43 of the PerformanceContract/(with AWP)</li> <li>• 4 in one Staff house at Atapar Primary School page 71 of the Performance Contract (with AWP) and was Completed as per page 73 of 4th Quarter Budget Perform Report</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance drainable pit latrine with washrooms for girls at Ocan Oyere P/s page 132 of Performance Contract (with AWP) and was completed as per page 101 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	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 District consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the financial year 2022/23 to the MoPs on 26th September 2022, signed by CAO Mr. Kasadha John Stephen.</p>	2
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 District conducted a tracking and analysis reports of staff attendance for the month of May 2022, April 2022, March 2022 and February 2022</p>	2
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 FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From appraisal reports presented to the PAT, it was established that HoDs were appraised during FY 2021/22 ,however the performance reports were not signed by the CAO.</p> <p>For instance, Magambo Mathias the Senior Environment Officer was appraised by the CAO Mr.Kasadha John Bosco on 5/7/202,2 but the reports was not signed by CAO. On the otherhand, some staff likes Mr. Omwanet John Bosco, Principal Human Resource Officer, was appraised on 4/7/2022 by the CAO Mr.Kasadha John Bosco</p> <p>-</p>	0
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>From the appraisal report it was established that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented, for example Orech Emmanuel Assistant Accountant for over stayed annual leave without permission he was not paid for the month July - August 2021 salary.</p> <p>Mr. Oriekot Denis a driver ,on 15 / Nov /2021 while opening a sub county road in Katingi Alua sub county was found in gross misconduct and found red handed siphoning fuel. The interdiction was to receive half pay, not leave the country without permission from this office and to stay away from public office and any government road equipment.</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 was established but not yet functional, members included;  - Ms. Ayeko Stella (SCDO) member.  - Mr. Omwanet John Bosco secretary.  - Dr. Chakwa Wilfred member  - Mr. Ejoku Herman Chairperson.	0
8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	Not all members recruited during FY 2021/2022 accessed pay roll not later than two month . It was established that 183 staff were recruited during FY 2021/22 only three (3) accessed the pay roll within the regulated time frame they included;  1. Onapa James nursing officer started work on 4/April 22/ and accessed payroll in may 2022  2. Amooti Prisca enrolled nurse started working on 15/Feb/2022 and accessed payroll in May 2022  3. Olol Denise was appointed and stared work in April and accessed in April 2022	0
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	The LG had eleven (11) members retired in the previous FY 2021/2022 and only a few were accessed the pension payroll within in 2 months. The few that accessed the pay roll included;  -Emocu Moses Seda retired on 12/April/2022 and accessed pension in June2022  - Ewanu Mathias EDA retired on 8/April/2022 and accessed pension in May 2022.  -Atim Janet Nursing Assistant retired in march and accessed pension in May.  That represented $\frac{3}{11} \times 100 = 27.3\%$	0

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

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Direct transfers to LLGS were executed in accordance with the requirements of the Budget FY 2021/2022</p> <p>A total of Shs. 369,594,170 DDEG funds was released to six LLGs against a Budget of Shs 369,594,170 as per the Schedule provided by the District Accountant The six beneficiary LLGS were Kaberaimo Sub C ounty, Alwa Sub C ounty. O chero Sub County, Kabulubulu Sub County, Aperikira Sub County Kaberamaido Town Council</p> <p>Quarterly releases were as follows :</p> <p>Quarter one</p> <p>Shs 123,198,057 was released to LLGS against a budget of Shs 123,198,057</p> <p>Quarter two Shs 123,198,056 was released by the LG to LLGS against a budget of shs 123,198, 056 Quarter three</p> <p>Shs 123,198,057 was released by the LG to LLGS against a budget of Shs 123,098,057</p>	2
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did timely warranting /verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGS ( 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MOFPED) as indicated below Quarter one</p> <p>The LG received cash limit a total of Shs 123,148,057 from MOFPED on 23rd July 2021 and warranted to LLGS</p> <p>on 27th July 2021 under warrant number 514 Aww_2022-5 The process took 4 days</p> <p>Quarter Two The LG received cash limits from MOFPED a total of Shs 123,198056 on 7th October 2021 and warranted to LLGS on 11 October 2021 warrant number 514Aw_2022__11</p> <p>Quarter Three The LG Received c ash limits from MOFPED a total of Shs 123,198057 and warranted to LLGs on10 th January 2022 under warrant number 514AW-2022-17</p>	2



10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:  Score 2 or else score 0	There was no documentary evidence at the time of assessment that the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG Transfers to LLGS within 5 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 documentary evidence at the time of this assessment exercise that the District LG had supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District.	0
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	This was not applicable since there was no documentary evidence that the District LG had mentored//supervised LLGS,	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	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:  Score 2 or else score 0  <b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b>	There was documentary evidence in the form of a printed out assets register from IFMIS that was updated. The said assets register covered details on Buildings Vehicles Land such as Land for Hospital and its title deed category i.e. Lease hold, Vehicles covered included double cabin registration number LG 0005/46	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 documentary evidence at the time of assessment that the District had used the recommendations of the Board of survey report</p> <p>FY 2020/2021 Or FY2021/2022 to make Assets management decisions including procurement of new assets maintenance and disposal of assets.</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>There was insufficient evidence that the District had a functional physical planning committee in place at the time of assessment. This was because the physical planning committee had produced only 1 set of minutes for the meeting held on 5th August 2021 in Board room at 11.45 am against a</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);</li> <li>(ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG).</li> </ul> <p>If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Information was not availed to the assessment team at the time of assessment despite numerous requests in regard to appraisal of DDEG financed projects</p> <p>The Development Plan was not availed to the assessment team to establish as to whether prioritized investments were derived from the development plan.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not provide information on field appraisal at the time of assessment</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence at the time assessment that project profiles were developed for FY 2022/2023 and discussed by the TPC.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LGDP was not availed during the assessment</p> <p>Screening for current FY (2022/23) projects had not yet been done because no funds were provided in Quarter one for the screening exercise according to the SEO (No screening forms for Current year projects)</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>DLG had evidence that all infrastructure projects for current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan signed on 13th October 2022 by CAO</p> <p>Some of the projects included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 5 stance drainable pit latrine with washrooms for girls at Ocan oyere P/s, page6</li> <li>2. Opening of 0.5km community access road from Awelu to Akwei village, Page 6</li> <li>3. Fixing ceiling board in community hall and rehabilitation of 3 sub county pit latrines at Kobulubulu sub county, page 6</li> <li>4. Wiring of the office education block office building , page 7</li> <li>5. Construction of market stall at Alwa daily market Page. 8</li> <li>6. Construction of 2 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Alwa sub county headquarter, page 8</li> <li>7. Procurement and supply of 132 culverts for the 4 community access roads, Page 7</li> </ol>	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	The LG had evidence of Contracts Committee approval for all DDEG projects for previous FY contained in meeting dated 2nd November 2022, under min No CC/min/04/04/2/11/2022/2023-4(1)	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG did not have proof of PIT fully established	<b>0</b>
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 to show that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical design; An example of visited project, phased renovation of education department block at district headquarter, used pre painted iron sheets of gauge 28 as per design provided, doors were made of purpose made steel casement steel and size 1.8x2.4m as per designs provided, internal doors were made of wroth mahogany and size 0.9 x2.4m as per the design	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	From the reviewed site supervision report sampled below LG did not provided evidence of joint technical supervision of infrastructure projects;  -Supervision report for renovation of education block at District Headquarter prepared by the District Engineer on 15th March 2022 only the DE visited site	<b>0</b>

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>The DLG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phased rehabilitation of Education department block at District headquarter by Geoflix Engineering Services Ltd was certified by District Engineer Ewayu Francis for Final payment (48,043,022/=) issued on 11th January 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 21st January, 2022 under voucher No 41147304</li> <li>• Wiring of office building at Kaberamaido sub county headquarter by Calpeak Ltd was certified by District Engineer Ewayu Francis for Final payment (8,372,643/=) issued on 1st February, 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 1st February, 2022 under voucher NO 42133971</li> <li>.Construction of market stall at Alwa daily market. by Romi General supplies and contractors Ltd was certified by District Engineer Ewayu Francis for final payment (19,190,340/=) issued on 1st February,2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 1st February, 2022 under voucher NO 42133972</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From sampled files, there was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. Examples of project files reviewed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Construction of 1 block of 5 stance drainable latrine with washroom for girls at Ocan Oyere P/s procurement ref Kabe514/wrks/2021/2022/00026 minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 26th November, 2021, minute cc/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2022-4(1), contract agreement signed 14th December 2021 and evaluation report dated 24thNovember, 2021</li> <li>· Construction of market stall at Alwa dally market, procurement Ref. kabe514/wrks/2021/2022/00045 minutes of contracts committee decision Ref; cc/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2021/2022-4(9) evaluation report dated 24thNovember 2021 and contract agreement signed on 14th December, 2021 were available on the file</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the appointment letter dated 1th July, 2020 to Mr. Ejotu Rogers by the CAO Mr. Omwanet John Bosco designating him as the focal person for grievance redressing.</p> <p>However; there was no evidence of functionality of the GRC since the GRC meeting Minutes and list of GRC members were not provided by Mr. Ejotu Rogers during the assessment .</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence centralized complaints log provided by the focal person with no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances</p> <p>There were not any public display stands displaying a defined complaints referral path.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had no publicized grievance redress mechanisms for aggrieved persons to know where to report and get redress</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Documentary evidence was not availed to the assessment team for verification. The assessment team continually requested for the Development plan which was never availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0

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 no evidence at the time of Assessment that the LG had disseminated to LLGS the enhanced DDEG guidelines	0
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	ESMPs for road projects and construction of market stall at Alwa daily market were developed however; they were not incorporated in the 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 project with costing of additional impact from climate change	3
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	Only the land title for Ocherro HCIII was provided during assessment.  There was no land ownership document for the site for the renovated Education block at the District Headquarters.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There were no monthly Environment & Social monitoring and supervision reports for;  Renovation of Education block at the District Headquarter.  Construction of a two-stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII.  Supervision and monitoring reporting was done Quarterly with excuses of limited funding.	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	The payment dates on contractor payment certificates were before dates on Environment & Social compliance certification forms signed by both the CDO (Mr. Odela Nelson) and SEO (Mr. Magambo Mathias) which was the reverse of the requirement.  Contract for the construction of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII.  Contractor: Robert Emadu construction.  Contractor certificate signed by District Engineer and DHO on 17/02/2022.  Environment & Social compliance certification form signed by SEO and DCDO on 22/07/2022.  Payment effected on 24/02/2022  More so, Environment & Social compliance certificates signed by the SEO and DCDO were not attached on the contract documents	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	The Local Government had not carried out bank reconciliations up to day at the time of assessment .  The LG maintained TSA and General fund Account (01473500239046 at DFCU Dokolo Branch) only as required which had been reconciled upto 30th June 2022 (end of FY)  However since the beginning of FY 2022/2023 the LG had not carried out monthly reconciliations	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------



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>1 st quarter report produced on 2nd December 2021</p> <p>2 nd Quarter report produced on 25th February 2022</p> <p>3 rd Quarter report produced on 24 th June 2022</p> <p>4th Quarter report produced on 16th August 2022</p>	<b>2</b>
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>There was no documentary evidence that the LG had provided information to the Council Chairperson and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>0</b>

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0

Submission of internal Audit reports to Accounting Officer

1st Quarter report submitted on 2 nd December 2021 as per acknowledgement date stamp

2nd Quarter report submitted on 25th February 2022 as per acknowledgement date stamp

3rd Quarter report submitted on 24th June 2022 as per acknowledgement date stamp

4th Quarter report t submitted on 16th August 2022 as per acknowledgement date stamp

submission of internal audit reports to LGPAC

1st Quarter report submitted on 2nd December 2021 as per acknowledgement stamp

2nd Quarter report submitted on 25th February 2022

3rd Quarter report submitted on 24th June 2022

4th Quarter report submitted on 16 th August 2022 as per acknowledgement date stamp

LGPAC did not review all the 4 Quarterly internal audit reports as required by the assessment manual LGPAC reviewed only 1st Quarter internal audit report as per LGPAC dated 24th August 2022,

**Local Revenues**

18

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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.

Original budget UGx 173,944,000 page 1 of approved budget

Local revenue collected UGx 154,901,305 page 10 of approve budget

Collection ratio was 154,901,303/173,944,000 giving 89%

Therefore deficit was 11% and the reason advanced was covid 19 restrictions

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% - 10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Local revenue decreased from UGX 177,874,230 page 10 of Audited accounts to UGX 154,901,305 page 10 of the draft final accounts to UGX 154, 901,305 .Decrease was 2,297,293 giving a percentage of 1.3%</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

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>Amount to be remitted was UGX 71,656,740 as per schedule of transfers of LG dated 3rd November 2022. Total amount transferred to LLGs was UGX 51,995,093. therefore percentage transferred to LLGs was 72% which was above the requirement of 65%</p>	<b>2</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer on 26th November 2021 and published on the procurement Notice Board. The sampled awarded contracts were:</p> <p>Construction of a market stall at Alwa daily market was awarded to Mi Romi general supplies and contractors Ltd at UGX 19,190,340.</p> <p>Construction of 5-stance drainable pit latrine with washroom for girls in Ocan Oyere P/S awarded to M/S Mi Romi general supplies and contractors Ltd at UGX 26,929,640</p> <p>Wiring of office building at Kaberamaido sub county headquarter awarded to M/s Cal Peak power at UGX 9,375,860</p>	<b>2</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that the LG performance assessment results and indications were published on the Notice boards and budget website for the previous financial year the assessment team held interview and discussions with the planner and communication officer and it was established that the Local government did not publicize the LG performance assessment and indicators results</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG during the previous year conducted radio talk shows on Dwanwa FM and Dokolo FM</p> <p>Health Education promotion activities were discussed during the radio programme as per the report dated 14th July 2022 and the panelists were District LC V chair person</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG had made publicly information available information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for tax appeal The afore said information reportedly was posted on the public Notice board on 18 th October 2021</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG had prepared an IGG report of 27th August 2021 by the District service Commission indicating a list of cases in relation to forgery of academic documents</p> <p>The following District officials were dismissed from service by the District service Commission arising out of IGG reports dated 20th January 2021 and 29th January 2021</p> <p>Ramond Eboyu - Assistant accountant</p> <p>Norman Etulu - Parish Chief</p> <p>Geoffrey Egadu-. Parish Chief. There was no documentary evidence that council had discussed IGG report</p>	1

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG PLE pass rate declined between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 6.6% as shown below;</p> <p>2019</p> <p>G1+G2+G3 50+863+554=1467</p> <p>1467/1888*100=77.701%</p> <p>2020</p> <p>G1+G2+G3 36+854+640=1530</p> <p>1530</p> <p>/2151*100=71.12%</p> <p>71.12%-77.701%= -6.6% decline.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG UCE pass rate improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 45.31% as shown below;</p> <p>2019</p> <p>G1+G2+G3 21+61+121=203</p> <p>203/448*100=45.31%</p> <p>2020</p> <p>G1+G2+G3 15+106+193=314</p> <p>314</p> <p>/354*100=88.7%</p> <p>88.7%-45.31%=43.39% improvement.</p>	<b>2</b>

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>This indicator will be assessed when the verified LLG performance assessment results become available in January 2023</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The Education department had a total Education Development Grant of shs. 92,399,000 as was reported on page 26 of the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/2022 generated on 7th July 2021 under vote 514. This development grant was used as follows;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shs. 80,000,000 was used to construct a classroom block at Bugoi Primary School.</li> <li>2. Shs. 12,399,000 was used to procure furniture in Kamuk Primary School (shs. 4,133,000), Kaingi Primary School (sh. 4,133,000) and 2. Bugoi Primary School (4,133,000)</li> </ol>	

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

Environment Officer and CDO were not  
certifying works as per Sampled Payment  
Vouchers and certificates for example;  
Payment voucher number 43965459 Date  
2nd

June 2022 Payee Payee Robert Emadu

Purpose Rehabilitation of 4 classroom block at  
Ababa Primary rimary School

Payment certificate in place

Amount Shs 46508475

date of payment certificate 6th June 2022

DEO signed the payment Certificate

The environment Officer and Community  
Development Officer did not sign

Payment Voucher Number 41147394 Date  
29th November 2021

Payee Geoflex Engineering Services

Purpose Rehabilitation of Education block

Amount Shs 54687981

Payment Certificate date 15th March 2022

DEO Signed the payment certificate

Environment officer and CDO did not sign the  
payment corticate

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

From the sampled 3 Education infrastructure projects, the variation in contract price was within the +/-20% limit of the MoES Engineer's estimate, as illustrated below;

· Phased renovation of education department block

Engineers estimate was UGX 121,068,000

Contract sum UGX 119,476,436

Variation -1591564

% variation  $(1591564/121,068,000) \times 100$

-13.1%

· Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Bugoi P/s

Engineers estimate UGX 83,153,774

Contract sum UGX 79,833,669

Variation -406,350

% variation  $(3320105/83,153,774) \times 100$

-4%

· Phased rehabilitation of 4 classroom block at Abata P/s

Engineers estimate UGX 49,000,000

Contract sum UGX 49,000,000

Variation UGX 0

% variation  $(0/49,000,000) \times 100$

-0%

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

LG did not have seed secondary school project during previous FY



4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines . The approved staff structure for UPE teachers was of 788 and 535 were recruited representing.</p> <p><math>535 \times 100 = 67.89\%</math> 788</p>	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"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The 2020/2021 asset register wasn't availed to the assessment team. Only the asset register for FY 2021/2022 was available.</p> <p>According to the asset register for 2021/2022 dated 7th July 2021, the Local Government had a total of 45 primary schools. Of these 44 met the basic requirements and minimum standards which included having at least two classrooms, two latrines and two staff houses. The only school that did meet these basic standards was Onyait Primary School with only had one teacher's house.</p> <p><math>(44/45) \times 100 = 97.8\%</math></p> <p>The assets included; 830 classrooms, 1251 latrines,</p> <p>14,523 desks, 311 teachers' houses for the 45 UPE schools. And 5 UCE schools with 32 classrooms, ,32</p> <p>latrines, 665 desks, 7 laboratories, and 6 teachers' houses.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assessor was able to access a teacher deployment list dated 1st July 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p> <p>Kaberamaido PS in Kaberamaido TC had 28 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>Okapel PS in Aperkira SC had 21 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>Kamuk PS in Kaberamaido SC had 16 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</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>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>Asset register 2021/2022 dated 7th July 2021, for 45 primary schools and 5 secondary schools.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assets included; 830 classrooms, 1251 latrines, 14,523 desks, 311 teachers houses for the 45 UPE schools. And 5 UCE schools with 32 classrooms ,32 latrines, 665 desks, 7 laboratories, and 6 teachers' houses.</p>	
			<p>From the sampled schools;</p>	
			<p>Kaberamaido PS in Kaberamaido TC had 13 classrooms, 15 latrines, 306 desks, 13 teachers houses</p>	
			<p>Okapel PS in Aperkira SC had 10 classrooms, 20 latrines, 266 desks, 25 teachers houses</p>	
			<p>Kamuk PS in Kaberamaido SC had 9 classrooms, 15 latrines, 138 desks, 7 teachers houses</p>	
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p>	<p>3 out of 45 UPE schools had handed in their reports as and they included;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>-Acamidako PS handed in on 26th January 2022</p>	
			<p>-Ochero PS on 28th January 2022.</p>	
			<p>-Bucoi Rainbow PS on 29th January 2022</p>	
			<p><math>3/45 \times 100 = 6.66\%</math></p>	

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the DEO's office supported schools to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations.</p> <p>However at the sampled schools;</p> <p>Kaberamaido PS in Kaberamaido TC and Okapel PS in Aperkira SC didn't have SIPs. Only Kamuk PS in Kaberamaido SC had..</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment</p>	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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG 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 Financial year 2022/23</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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>The LG deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY as per the list of staff obtained from the DEO'S Office. The assessor was able to access a staff list from the DEO dated 1st July 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p> <p>Kaberamaido PS in Kaberamaido TC had 28 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>Okapel PS in Aperkira SC had 21 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>Kamuk PS in Kaberamaido SC had 16 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</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>Teacher deployment data was disseminated and publicized on the LG notice board dated 1st July 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools, namely Kaberamaido Primary School in Kaberamaido Town Council, Okapel Primary School in Aperkira Sub County and Kamuk Primary School in Kaberamaido Sub County, teacher deployment data had been displayed on the respective school notice boards though it was not dated.</p> <p>Kaberamaido Primary School had a display containing 28 teachers, Okapel Primary School had a display of 21 teachers and Kamuk Primary School had a display of 16 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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the primary school head teachers were appraised during school year 2021.</p>	0
<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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to show that the Secondary Schools Head Teachers were appraised by D/CAO or BoG for their performance contracts for School year 2021.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>It was evidenced that staff Education department were not appraised during FY 2021/22 by the DEO for instance and these included the District Sports Officer , Senior Inspector of Schools and the Senior Education Officer.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p>	<p>The Education and sports department Capacity building and Training plan for FY 2021/2022 dated 7th July 2021 prepared by the Ag DEO.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Training activities included among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Training of 20 games and sports teachers on CAPE 2 by NCS/CAPE 2 at 7,000,000</li> <li>-Training of 2 head teachers in school financial management by UMI/Consultancy at 6,000,000</li> <li>-Procurement of 2 laptop computers for DEO at 7,000,000</li> <li>-Induction of new head teachers and teachers by the district at 1,668,808</li> </ul>	

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>LG Approved budget estimates FY 2021/2022 VOTE: 514 Kaberamaido DLG generated on 7th July 2021 at 02:06 page 29</p> <p>Monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education was allocated 119,939,000.</p> <p>This was in line with sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UShs 4 million per LG, plus UShs 336,000 (6 inspections at UShs 56,000) per school for the 3 terms</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There evidence that the LG Submitted warrants for School Capitation within 5 days</p> <p>1st Quarter</p> <p>Cash Limit Date 16th July 2021 Amount Shs 224,604,167 Warrant date 16th July 2021 Amount Shs 224,604,167</p> <p>Quarter Two</p> <p>Date of release 31st October 2021 date of warrant 1st November 2021 amount Shs 224,604,167</p> <p>Quarter 4</p> <p>Date of release 13 th May 2022 , Date of warrant 17th May 2022 Amount Shs 224,604,104</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG invoiced and the DEO communicated/publicised capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED as evidenced below;

From the DEO's office

Quarter 1&2- 10,500,000 dated 3rd January 2022

Quarter 3-397,890,201 dated 4th March 2022

Quarter 4- 159,505,632 dated 9th May 2022

From the three sampled schools;

Kaberamaido PS in Kaberamaido TC

Term 1-2,879,000

Term 2- 1,900,000

Term 3- 6,567,000

Okapel PS in Aperkira SC had

Term 1-3.270.000

Term 2-3.385.700

Term 3-18.757.000

Kamuk PS in Kaberamaido SC

Term 1-2,429,000

Term 2-1,700,000

Term 3-7,000,000

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

Inspection work plan for FY Q1 2021/2022 prepared by the DIS dated 1st July, 2021

Activities included among many others;

- School inspection planning meeting by July 2021

- Maintenance of the motorcycle by July 2021

- School inspection exercise from July-sept 2021

- Review of inspection report by August-september 2021

- Dissemination of reports by september 2021

- Delivery of reports to kampala by september 2021

Inspection work plan for FY Q2 2021/2022 prepared by the DIS dated 4thh October, 2021

Activities included among many others;

- School inspection planning meeting by October 2021
- Maintenance of the motorcycle by October 2021
- School inspection exercise from Oct-Nov 2021
- Review of inspection report by December 2021
- Dissemination of reports by December 2021
- Delivery of reports to kampala by December 2021

Inspection work plan for FY Q3 2021/2022 prepared by the DIS dated 5th January, 2022

Activities included among many others;

- School inspection planning meeting by January 2022
- Maintenance of the motorcycle by January 2022
- School inspection exercise from January 2022
- Review of inspection report by March 2022
- Dissemination of reports by March 2022
- Delivery of reports to kampala by March 2022

Inspection work plan for FY Q4 2021/2022 prepared by the DIS dated 1st April, 2022

Activities included among many others;

- School inspection planning meeting by April 2022
- Maintenance of the motorcycle by April 2022
- School inspection exercise from may-june 2022
- Review of inspection report by june 2022
- Dissemination of reports by june 2022
- Delivery of reports to kampala by june 2022



-Minutes of meeting for the inspectorate sector held on 5th July, 2021. Minute 04/07/2021. where planning inspection for quarter one 2021 was done. A programme for inspection was drawn and Mr Ebinu Pius the team leader was tasked to allocate schools for individual inspectors. Inspection activity was scheduled to start by 12th July 2021. A budget of 3,220,800 was to be made

-Minutes of meeting for the inspectorate sector held on 6th January, 2022. Minute 04/01/2022 where planning inspection for quarter three 2021/2022 was done. A programme for inspection was drawn and Mr Ebinu Pius the team leader was tasked to allocate schools to inspectors. Inspection activity was scheduled to start on 10th January 2022. A budget of 7,157,333 was to be made

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>-School inspection report dated 30th September 2021 for Quarter one 2021/2022 carried out in July-september 2021 where 40 UPE schools were inspected.</p> <p><math>40/45 \times 100 = 88.88\%</math></p> <p>-School inspection report dated 31st December 2021 for Quarter TWO 2021/2022 carried out in October to December 2021 where 40 UPE schools were inspected.</p> <p><math>40/45 \times 100 = 88.88\%</math></p> <p>-School inspection report dated 31st March 2022 for Quarter three 2021/2022 carried out in January to March 2022 where 45 UPE schools were inspected.</p> <p><math>45/45 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>-School inspection report dated 5th August 2022 for Quarter four 2021/2022 carried out in April-June 2022 where 45 UPE schools were inspected.</p> <p><math>45/45 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p><math>88.88\% + 88.88\% + 100\% + 100\% = 94.44\%</math></p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p> <p>Kaberaimaido PS in Kaberaimaido TC was inspected on 2nd/11/2021, 5th 10/2021, 1st/2/2022 by Alweyo Molly Monica</p> <p>Okapel PS in Aperkira SC was inspected on 4th/2/2022 by Esuku James and on 24th/3/2022 by Ikwap John Peter.</p> <p>Kamuk PS in Kaberaimaido SC was inspected on 30th/3/2022, 4th/2/2022, 6th/8/2021 by Esuku James and on 5th October 2021 by Alweyo Molly Monica</p>
----	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>24th September, 2021 meeting minutes of the education department to discuss the inspection reports for Quarter one FY 2021/2022. Min 03/10/2021 Discussion of inspection findings where it was noted that some schools didn't appraise their teachers e.g Awelu, Kitingi, Omarai; most private schools didn't have the certificate of compliance; inadequate display of covid19 messages in schools; some schools didn't distribute home study materials to learners; most schools hadn't restricted entry and exit to and from the schools; most schools hadn't put up duty roster for teachers during lockdown; vandalism of school property in some schools; and 90% of head teachers were present in schools.</p> <p>Min 04/10/2021 recommendations included that authorities should enforce education ordinance 2011; DEO's office should</p>
----	---	---	---

strengthen supervision and monitoring; stakeholders should team up to mobilise the parents to prepare their children to return to school; community to be sensitized against burglary and destruction of school property; head teachers to appraise all their workforce to mention but a few.

22nd February 2022 Education Department meeting minutes to discuss inspection findings of 3rd quarter 2021/2022. Min 03/02/2022 where findings discussed included lack of funds for school inspection; inadequate deployment of teachers; increased enrolment in school; inadequate number of teachers; teaching and learning was ongoing in schools; appraisal of teachers was not yet complete in most schools.

Min 04/02/2022 resolutions included schools should redeploy teachers; repair doors for latrines; parents to be encouraged to provide mid day meals for their children; LG to recruit more teachers; and schools to share inspection reports with SMC, PTA and teachers

20th June 2022 Education Department meeting to discuss inspection report for Quarter four F/Y 2021/2022. Min 4 where findings included there was regular monitoring of the schools; there was good teaching and learning in schools; teachers had approved schemes; good attendance to duty by teachers; clean environment in most schools; low attendance of learners in schools; very few schools providing mid day meals to learners; congestion in classrooms; irregular school management meetings in schools.

Min 05 where recommendations made included: schools encouraged to conduct performance review meetings; parents to ensure learners attendance regularly; and school inspection reports should be shared with SMC, PTA, Teachers and other stakeholders

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0

There was no evidence availed to the assessment team during time of assessment.

0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Committee of Education and Social Services sat on the following dates 18th August 2021 and committee discussed the following issues;</p> <p>Quality education in UPE schools learning environment to inadequate classrooms</p> <p>Lack of separate washrooms for girls, a factor that was attending girl's attendance</p> <p>Lack of ramps for disabled learners</p>	<b>2</b>
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school</p>	<b>0</b>

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Asset register 2021/2022 dated 7th July 2021, for 45 primary schools and 5 secondary schools.</p> <p>The assets included; 830 classrooms, 1251 latrines, 14,523 desks, 311 teachers houses for the 45 UPE schools. And 5 UCE schools with 32 classrooms, ,32 latrines, 665 desks, 7 laboratories, and 6 teachers' houses.</p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p> <p>Kaberaido PS in Kaberaido TC had 13 classrooms, 15 latrines, 306 desks, 13 teachers houses</p> <p>Okapel PS in Aperkira SC had 10 classrooms, 20 latrines, 266 desks, 25 teachers houses</p> <p>Kamuk PS in Kaberaido SC had 9 classrooms, 15 latrines, 138 desks, 7 teachers houses</p>	<b>2</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

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, score: 1 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence at the time of Assessment that the LG had conducted desk appraisal for all sector projects and the LGDP was not availed to the Assessment team</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>there was no documentary evidence to show that LG conducted field appraisals for Education sector projects during Previous FY</p>	0
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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>LG did not have seed secondary school project during previous FY</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by contracts committee as per the sampled projects below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 2 classroom block with an office at Bugoi P/s was approved on 5th August 2021 under meeting minute NO cc/min/02/04/05/08/2021/2021/2022-4(1)</li> <li>2. Phased renovation of education department block at District headquarter was approved by contracts committee on 5th August 2021, under minute NO cc/min/02/04/05/08/2021/2021/2022-4(1)</li> <li>3. Phased renovation of 4 classroom block at Abata P/s was approved by contracts committee on 27th November 2021, under minute CC/min/11/03/14/03/2022/2021/2022</li> </ol>	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>	The LG did not have a project Implementation Team (PIT) for education sector projects implemented in the last FY	<b>1</b>
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>	LG did not undertake seed secondary school projects during previous FY	<b>1</b>
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>	LG did not undertake seed secondary school projects during previous FY	<b>1</b>
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>	LG did not provide documentary evidence to the assessment team to show that at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision of education sector projects was conducted	<b>0</b>

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>From the sampled 3 projects, payments to the contractors we made within 2 months as specified in the contracts as illustrated below,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Phased rehabilitation of 4 classroom block at Abata P/s by Robert Emadu Ltd was certified by District Engineer for final payment UGX 46,508,475/= issued on 6th June 2022, recommended by DEO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 16th June 2022 under voucher N0 43965459</li> <li>· Construction of 2 classroom block at Bugoi P/s by Mi Romi General supplies was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 41,614,681 on 11th January 2022 recommended by the DEO and subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and paid on 21st January 2022 under voucher N0 41147339</li> </ul> <p>Phased renovation of education block at District headquarter by Geoflix Engineering services Ltd was certified by District Engineer for final payment (59,687,981/=) on 15th March 2022 recommended by the DEO and subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and paid on 11th April 2022 under voucher N0 42661187</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The DEO submitted the education sector procurement plan on 17th April 2021 which was within the 30th April requirement</p>	<b>1</b>
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 undertake seed secondary school projects during previous FY</p>	<b>1</b>

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a Grievance Redress framework in the LG. There was no grievance log book and the nothing concerning grievance redress was posted/pinned on the notice board.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>Costed ESMPs for the education projects were availed however; they were not incorporated in the respective BoQs</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>No land ownership document for any education projects as mentioned below was provided.</p> <p>Renovation of Education block at the District Headquarter</p> <p>Construction of a 2 classroom block at Bugoi Primary School stamped by Mr. Magambo Mathias (SEO) on 22/09/2021</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score:0</p>	<p>No monthly reports from monitoring and supervision provided due to limited funds to conduct the monitoring and supervision of projects.</p>	0



Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

Environment & Social compliance certification form signed by both the CDO (Mr. Odela Nelson) and SEO (Mr. Magambo Mathias) after the payment date of the contractor.

Contract for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Bugoi Primary School

Contractor: Romi General Supplies

Contractor certificate signed by District Engineer and DEO on 11/01/2022

Environment & Social compliance certificate signed by SEO and DCDO on 24/06/2022

Payment effected on 21/01/22

More so, Environment & Social compliance certificates signed by the SEO and DCDO were not attached on the contract documents

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Upon calculating the annual OPD attendance and deliveries for health facilities using the monthly reports (HMIS107). The summaries for the 3 sampled health facilities were as follows:</p> <p>(Percentage utilization = Registered attendance for previous FY minus registered attendance for current FY, divided by registered attendance for previous FY and multiply by 100)</p> <p>1). Alwa HCIII:  FY 2020/2021 OPD = 555 cases,  FY 2021/2022 OPD: 732 cases  increase in utilization = 177  % Increase <math>177/555 \times 100 = 31.8\%</math></p> <p>2). Kobulubulu HCIII  FY 2020/2021 OPD = 391 cases,  FY 2021/2022 OPD: 498cases increase in utilization = 107  % increase <math>107/391 \times 100 = 27.4\%</math></p> <p>3). Ozero HC III  FY 2020/2021 OPD = 1095cases,  FY 2021/2022 OPD: 1220cases increase in utilization = 125  % increase <math>125/1095 \times 100 = 11.4\%</math>  average increment = <math>11.4 + 27.4 + 31.8 / 3</math>  gives 23% which is above the threshold</p>	<b>2</b>

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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>There was evidence that the LG budgeted for UGX 79,074,000 and spent all the health development grant as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Renovation of staff house at Aperikira HCIII, budgeted for UGX 25,605,000 and spent all the budgeted amounts</li> <li>● Renovation of maternity ward in Alwa HCIII maternity ward, budgeted for UGX 37,996,000 and spent the same</li> <li>● Construction of drainable pit latrine at Ozero HCIII , budgeted for UGX 15,473,000 and spent all the amount</li> </ul>	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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>Voucher Number 41787818 Date 24th February 2022 Payee Robert Enadu Construction Co Ltd</p> <p>Purpose Construction of 2 stance Pit Latrine at Ozero HC11</p> <p>DHO signed the payment certificate Engineer Signed and CAO</p> <p>CDO and Environment Officer did not sign the payment certificate</p> <p>Voucher number 42089699 Date 17th February 2022 Payee Konyodano Services Purpose Construction of Generator House District Health Office D/Engineer signed the payment certificate CAO signed as well CDO DHO signed the payment certificate. CDO and Environment Officer did not sign.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0

From the sampled health infrastructure projects there was evidence to show that the variation in contract price was within +/- 20% of the MOH Engineers' estimates as illustrated below;

1. Rehabilitation of Children's ward at Kaberamaido Hospital

Eng estimate 29,837,620

Contract sum 30,000,000

Variation 162380

% variation  $(162380/29,837,620) \times 100$

-0.5%

2. Construction of generator house under UNEPI at district headquarter

Eng estimate 17,542,116

Contract sum 14,998,340

Variation -2543776

% variation  $(2543776/17,542,116) \times 100$

-14.5%

3. Construction of 1 block of 2 stances drainable Latrine at Achero HCII

Eng estimate 16,218,900

Contract sum 15,473,020

Variation 745880

% variation  $(745880/16218900) \times 100$

4.6%

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

LG did not undertake project for upgrade from HCII to HCIII

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1
- less than 80 %: Score 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>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The approved staff structure for all Health Center III's and IVs had a total of 275 staff. Out of these 201 positions were filled.</p> <p><math>(201/275)*100 = 73.1\%</math>. This below the 75% minimum requirement</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

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"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LG did not undertake projects for upgrade from HCII to HCIII</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

**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>The information on positions of health workers filled at the district was found to be accurate and consistent with the staff found at the sampled health centers which were as follows;</p> <p>For Ochero HC III, the DHO 's list had 18 and Health Centre had 18,</p> <p>For Kobulubulu HC III, the DHO's list had 17 and Health Centre had 17,</p> <p>And for Aperkira HC III, the DHO's list had 17 and the Health Centre had 17</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

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>The LG did not have any health facilities upgraded from HCII to HCIII during the previous financial year</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the workplans and budgets reviewed, the sampled facilities submitted past the 31st March deadline</p> <p>For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1).Alwa HCIII, prepared annual workplan and budget FY 2021/2022 by the Facility In charge on 15th July 2022,</li> <li>2).Ochero HCIII,prepared annual workplan and budget by facility in-charge on 15th October 2022</li> <li>3). Kobulubulu HC III prepared Annual workplan and budget by facility in-charge on 10th July 2022</li> </ol>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence from the DHO that the health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Budget Performance reports for FY 2021/2022. For example for;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1). Ochero HCII, was prepared and submitted on 11th April 2022</li> <li>2). Pakegido HC III was prepared and submitted on 6th July 2021</li> <li>3) Alwa HC III was prepared and submitted on 7th March 2022</li> </ol>	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 have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the Performance Improvement Plan dated 20th September 2021 for the health department, it was planned to transfer some health workers from one facility to another for instance Oyuru Denis SMCO was transferred from Alwa HCIII to Kaberamaido HCIII, Epwo Andrew MCO was transferred from Kobulubulu HCIII to Alwa HCIII as incharge. It was also planned to increase on the out reaches. There was also a plan to effect immunization against. All these activities were effected as was indicated in the PIP reports that were dated 20th September 2021, 15th May 2022 and 15th June 2022.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

LG health facilities submitted quarterly HMIS reports within the required timeline as illustrated below;

Kaberaimaido HCIII

Q1 submitted on 6th October 2021

Q2 submitted on 7th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 6th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 7th July 2022

Alwa HCIII HCIII

Q1 submitted on 5th October 2021

Q2 submitted on 7th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 7th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 6th July 2022

Pakegido HCIII

Q1 submitted on 6th October 2021

Q2 submitted on 6th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 7th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 7th July 2022

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

From sampled facilities;

Aperikira HC III

Q1 submitted on 11th October 2021

Q2 submitted on 15th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 12th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 4th July 2022

Kobulubulu HCIII

.Q1 submitted on 11th October2021

Q2 submitted on 9th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 12th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 5th July 2022

Alwa HCIII

Q1 submitted on 13th October 2021

Q2 submitted on 6th January 2022

Q3 submitted on 11th April 2022

Q4 submitted on 5th July 2022

Therefore, there were timely submission of RBF invoices by Health Facilities to DHO's office

y

1

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0

The four quarterly RBF invoices were submitted to MOH as follows;

Q1 was submitted 15th October 2021

Q2 was submitted on 21st January 2022

Q3 was submitted on 13th April 2022

Q4 was submitted on 8th July 2022

Therefore LG submitted to MOH within the required time line



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>There was evidence that the LG timely submitted the quarterly budget performance reports as follows;</p> <p>Q1 was submitted on 25th October 2021</p> <p>Q2 was submitted on the 15th January 2022</p> <p>Q3 was submitted on the 20th April 2022</p> <p>Q4 was submitted on the 10th of July 2022</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>PIP was developed for Alwa HCIII and was approved by CAO on 16th July 2021</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG implemented PIP for the weakest performing facility as evidenced by the transfer of Epwo Andrew, Medical Clinical offer from Kobulubul HCIII to Alwa HCIII as in charge</p> <p>Oyu Denis SMCO transferred from Alwa HCIII to Kaberamaido Hospital</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was proof of the approved budget for the Health workers for the financial year 2022-2023 as indicated Shs 1,829,749,106 was allocated towards the health workers wage bill as per approved budget estimates for FY 2022/2023.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the approved Health sector staff structure, it was indicated 256 staff required. However, 194 positions were filled substantively and deployed to various health facilities at the time of assessment. Thus means: 194/256x100 representing 76% which was slightly above the minimum requirement.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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 that the health workers were deployed in their respective HCs visited included,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Ozero HCIII, the duty roster dated 1st November 2022, 19 staff were deployed and this matched well with the deployment list at DHO's office.</li> <li>2. Kobulubulu HCIII, the duty roster dated 1st October 2022, indicated 20 staff were deployed and this matched well with the deployment list at DHO's office</li> <li>3. Kaberamaido HCIII, the duty roster dated 1st November 2022, indicated that 20 staff were deployed and this number matched well with the DHO's deployment list.</li> </ol> <p>As per the duty rosters there was evidence that staff were working at their respective places of deployment.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

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 had publicized health worker's deployment and dissemination as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities' notice boards.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The displayed lists indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, designation, and gender among others.</p>	
			<p>The list that was displayed at each of the visited health facilities (Ozero HC III, Kabulubutu HC III and Kaberamaido HC III) was in tandem with the deployment list from the DHO's office, dated 1st December 2021.</p>	
			<p>1.Ozero HC1II, the deployment list displayed at the notice board indicated 19 staff</p>	
			<p>2. Kobulubulu HCIII, the deployment list reflected 20 staff and was posted on notice board</p>	
			<p>3.Kaberamaido HCIII, the deployment list posted on notice board indicated 20 staff</p>	
			<p>All the displayed lists were not dated nor signed by the Health Facility In charges.</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to PAT that the all Health facility In-charges were appraised against the agreed performance plans.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</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>Only three(3) appraisal reports / forms out of 10 required were availed to the assessment team for verification , they included that of;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>1. Mr. Okalebo Ronard, a Lab Assistant, was appraised by Okello Charles Dickens the Medical lab Technician.</p>	
			<p>2. Elwau James 01 /7/2021-30/06/2022 was appraised by Officer Elasu Moses Kobululu health center 111.</p>	
			<p>3. Epwo Andrew 01/ 7/ 2021 - 30/ 06/ 2022 was appraised by Amuso Esther Alwa health center</p>	

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to the assessment team to verify whether corrective actions were taken based on the appraisal reports.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted continuous professional training of Health workers as indicated below;  1.Okae Norman (Enrolled nurse) was pursuing a BSC Nursing at Mbarara University  2.Akech Agnes (enrolled nurse) pursuing a BSC Midwifery in Lira University  3.Lalweny Dorah Health Asst) was doing a BSC Public Health at Gulu University  4.Alaro Jenniffer (enrolled nurse) was pursuing a diploma in mental Health at Butabika Psychiatric Nursing School  5. Anena Jennifer (Lab assistant) was pursuing a diploma in medical lab at Lacor Lab training school  All these training were indicated in the health sector training plan dated July 2021.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of documenting training activities in the CPD database	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

**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>The CAO of Kaberamaido forwarded a list of HC which benefit from PHC grants to the MOH on 13t July 2021</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery. For instance ,</p> <p>Political monitoring of Health service delivery allocated UGX 1,200,000</p> <p>Monitoring of Health projects by Social services committee appropriated UGX 1,000,000</p> <p>Monitoring of health projects by TPC appropriated UGX 1,284,000</p> <p>Total amount allocated for monitoring services was UGX 3,284,000</p> <p>PHC allocation was UGX 7,554,000</p> <p>Percentage allocated to Monitoring was 3,284,000/7,554,000 giving 43.5%</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG provided evidence of timely warranting as per the schedule prepared by the district accountant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Q1 date of release was 6th August 2021 and date of warranting was 11 August 2021</li> <li>● Q2 date of release was 25th October 2021 and date of warranting was 29th October 2021</li> <li>● Q3 date of release was 17th January 2022 and date of warranting was 21st January 2022</li> <li>● Q4 date of release was 9th May 2022 and date of warranting 12th May 2022</li> </ul> <p>T otal amount warranted was UGX 120,948,439.</p> <p>All the 4 quarter releases were warranted within the confines of 5 days</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>LG did communicate within 5 working days as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 date of release was 7th August 2021 and date of communication was 12th August 2021</p> <p>Q2 date of release was 20th October 2021 and date of communication was 24th October 2021</p> <p>Q3 date of release was 10th January 2022 and date of communication was 14th January 2022.0</p> <p>Q4 date of release was 22nd April 2022 and date of communication 26th April 2022</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 LG published release of funds to the health centers with 5 working days after receipt of funds as indicated below</p> <p>Q1 (UGX 120,994,329) was released on 10th August 2021 and published on 10th August 2021</p> <p>Q2 (UGX 120,994,347) was released 18th October 2021 and published on 18th October 2021</p> <p>Q3(UGx 121,039,954) was released on 11th January 2022 and published on 11th January 2022</p> <p>Q4 (UGx 120,948,439) was release on 24th April 2022 and published on 24th April 2022</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was proof that the DLG implemented DHMT recommendations, evidenced by the;</p> <p>Q1 ;Transfers of staff were effected</p> <p>Q2; Transfer of staff were effected</p> <p>Q3; Transfer of staff were effected</p> <p>Q4; Increased number of outreaches increased from 6 to 12 for HCIIIs</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG quarterly performance review involved all in charges and implementing partner as indicated below</p> <p>Q1 minutes dated 17th August 2021 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, TASO</p> <p>Q2minutes dated 7th January 2022 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, TASO</p> <p>Q3minutes dated 15th April 2022 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, TASO</p> <p>Q4 minutes dated 10th July 2022 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, TASO</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFs 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>There were reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the lower Health facilities examples included;</p> <p>Q1 support supervision report which was compiled on 30th September 2021.</p> <p>Q2 support supervision report compiled on 5th of January 2022.</p> <p>Q3 support supervision report compiled on the 10th of April 2022.</p> <p>Q4 support supervision report compiled on 12th July 2022.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that HSDs carried out support supervision of lower-level health facilities. From the supervision and monitoring reports for the FY 2021/2022 by the Kaberamaido HSD</p> <p>It was evidenced by a report on the integrated support supervision to lower-level health centers in Kaberamaido HSD dated 7th January 2022 prepared by in-charge Kaberamaido HSD</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG proved proof of use of results from recommendations as illustrated through transfers instruction report dated 6th July 2021</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>This was evidenced by quarterly reports, SPARS quarterly supervision reports for Q1 dated 10th October 2021, Q2 dated 15th January 2023, Q3 dated 11th April and Q4 dated 6th July 2022 compiled by in charge drugs and medicine</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the budget release for health department of 2021/2022 , non wage was 53,037,062</p> <p>a) allocations</p> <p>school health UGX 2,540,000</p> <p>Trading center inspection UGX 2,312,000</p> <p>Building maintenance UGX 1,796,000</p> <p>Maternal &amp; child health Ugx 5,758,000</p> <p>Total 12,406,000</p> <p>percentage allocation 12,406,000/53,037,062 which 23.4%</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence presented regarding health promotion and prevention ,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A report on radio talk show dated 20th August 2021,</li> <li>● A report on mobilisation by district leadership for mass Covid 19 vaccination dated 8th November 2021</li> <li>● A report on health education programme dated 7th April 2022</li> </ul>	1



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 evidence that the DHT led the Health promotion Mobilisation activities according to the reports authored by DHE and forwarded to CAO through the DHO  There was a report on emergency support supervision conducted on 13th June 2022 compiled by the DHO	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

### Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	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	There was evidence of availability of asset register which includes land, equipment like computers, microscopes, IV stands etc. and machinery like fridges updated July 2021	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	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));	LG prioritized investments in the health sector during the FY 2021/2022 as indicated below;  ● Renovation of staff house at Aperikira HC III  ● Renovation of children’s ward at Alwa HCIII  ● Construction of 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII  However, the assessment team could not establish whether the said investment priorities were linked to the development plan since the plan was not availed at the time of assessment	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else score 0		

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that field appraisals were conducted at the time of the assessment</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 LG carried out Environmental social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works.</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII stamped on 01/02/2022 and ESMP costed at UGX. 400,000/- was also availed.</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>As per a copy of the Health sector procurement plan for current FY prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU was 16th April 2022 which was within the 30th April deadline. some of the projects included; Rehabilitation of children's ward at Kaberamaido hospital, Renovation of Alwa HCIII maternity ward, construction of 1 block of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochera HCIII</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 evidence to show that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (PP1) to PDU by 1st quarter of the current FY; as per sampled projects below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Rehabilitation of children ward at Kaberamaido hospital was submitted on 5th July 2022 by Hospital Administrator</li> <li>-Renovation of Alwa HC III maternity ward was submitted on 5th July 2022 by DHO</li> <li>-Construction of one block of 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII was submitted on 5th July 2022 by DHO</li> </ul>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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>There was evidence that the health sector's infrastructure projects for previous FY were approved by contracts committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where applicable) as shown in the sampled projects below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Rehabilitation of children's ward at Kaberamaido Hospital was approved by contracts committee on 22nd November 2021 under minute N0 cc/min/04/04/2/11/2021/2022-4 (1)</li> <li>· Construction of 1 block of 2-stance drainable latrine at Ochero HC III was approved on 22nd November 2021 under minute N0 cc/min/04/04/2/11/2021/2022-4(1)</li> <li>Construction of generator house under health for UNEPI generator at District head quarter was approved on 22nd November 2021 under minute N0 cc/min/04/04/2/11/2021/2022-4(1)</li> </ul>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	The LG did not provide documentary evidence to show that a project implementation team was established at the time of the assessment	0
13	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	LG did not undertake projects for upgrade during the previous financial year	1
13	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	The LG did not undertake projects for upgrade during the previous FY 2021/2022	1
13	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG did not undertake projects for upgrade during the previous FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>1</b>
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>The LG did not undertake projects for upgrade during the previous FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>1</b>

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had evidence that DHO verified works however some payments were initiated and effected beyond the 2 weeks timeframes as per the sampled projects below:

Renovation of staff house at Apenkira HC III by Geoflix Engineering Services Ltd was certified by District Engineer for final payment (23,087,898/=) issued on 15th March, 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 11thApril, 2022 under voucher NO 42661187

Construction of generator house for UNEPI services at district headquarter by Konydano services Ltd was certified by District Engineer for final payment (UGX 13,745,979/=) issued on 17th February, 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 4th March , 2022 under voucher NO 42089699.

Construction of a 2 stance drainable latrine at Ochero HCIII by Robert Emadu construction Ltd was certified by District Engineer for final payment (UGX 14,319,100/=) issued on 17th February, 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 17th February , 2022 under voucher NO 41787818.

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>The LG had evidence of existence of a complete procurement file for health infrastructure projects as required by PPDA law, the evidence was contained in the sampled project files below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of children’s ward at Kaberamaido hospital procurement ref; kabe514/wrks/2021-22/00065 had, minutes of contracts committee decision ref cc/mim/11/04/14/03/2022/2021/2022-4(1) dated 14thMarch2022, Evaluation report dated 14thMarch 2022 and contract agreement signed on 28thMarch2022</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 stance drainable latrine at Ochero HCIII, procurement ref; Kabe514/wrks/2021-22/00030 had, minutes of contracts committee decision ref cc/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2022-4(8) dated29th November2021, Evaluation report dated 24th November 2021 and contract agreement signed on 14thDecember2021</li> <li>3. Renovation of Alwa HCIII maternity ward , procurement ref; kabe514/wrks/2021-22/00024 had, minutes of contracts committee decision ref CC/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2022-4(2) dated 29th November 2021, Evaluation report dated 24th November 2021 and contract agreement signed on 14thDecember2021</li> </ol> <p>All the project procurement files were found to be complete with minutes of the Contracts Committee, Contract and Contracts’ acceptance letters among others.</p>
----	--	---	--

### 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 of any grievance log nor any defined grievance redress system provided by the grievance redress focal person.</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 were no guidelines specifically on healthcare waste management at Ochero HCIII</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The system for health care waste management was in place for the LG. However; at Ochero HCIII there was open burning of medical waste due to lack of an incinerator which was a requirement for medical waste management for every HCIII if there was no contracted waste handler.</p> <p>The DHO informed the assessor that there was a waste handler (Green Label company ltd) which was contracted by the MOH to collect transport and dispose off medical/health care waste. However, the contract documents for the waste handler were not availed</p> <p>For Kobulubulu HCIII, there was a functional Incinerator and well constructed and labeled placenta pit and implying a well functioning Healthcare Waste management system.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No training records were provided.</p> <p>However; the Health Department funds/ facilitates the Kasim Oyuu Senior Environment Health officer to conduct training according to the DHO and Emusu Joseph Health Accountant.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The ESMP for the construction of a 2 stance pit latrine at Ochero HCIII was not incorporated in the BOQs</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 of the land title for 2.637Hectares on Plot 57, Block 5 in Amotot, Ochero processed on 14/09/2012</p>	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 no monthly monitoring report availed by the SEO. This was due to limited funds to conduct monitoring and supervision according to the SEO</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>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environment and Social compliance certification forms signed by both the CDO (Mr. Odela Nelson) and SEO (Mr. Magambo Mathias) after payment dates of the contractors for example;</p> <p>Contract for the construction of a two-stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII</p> <p>Contractor: Robert Emadu construction</p> <p>Contractor certificate signed by District Engineer and DHO on 17/02/2022</p> <p>Environment and Social compliance certificate signed by SEO and DCDO on 22/07/2022</p> <p>Payment effected on 24/02/2022</p> <p>More so, Environment and Social compliance certificates signed by the SEO and DCDO were not attached on the contract documents</p>	0



**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the sector MIS report for access, functionality and population density for 2021/22, the functionality of water facilities for Kaberamaido LG was 84%, which was between 80 and 89%.</p>	<b>1</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the District Software MIS report for 2021/22, Kaberamaido District had functionality of water user committees of 99%. This was between 90 and 100%.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>This performance indicator will be assessed in January 2023 when the verified Lower Local Government assessment results have been made available.</p>	<b>0</b>

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

According to the sector MIS report for access, functionality and population density for 2020/21, Kaberamaido had a rural safe water access of 80%. There were two sub counties below this, Ochero Sub County at 68% and Aperkira Sub County at 78%.

Kaberamaido LG planned and implemented 10 boreholes in 2021/22 namely;

1. Ocanoyere B Community Borehole in Ochero Sub County (DWD 90912)

2. Olara Community Borehole in Ochero Sub County (DWD 90911)

3. Agule Community Borehole in Kobulubulu Sub County (DWD 90913)

4. Ojangai Community Borehole in Kobulubulu Sub County (DWD 90914)

5. Ereu Community Borehole in Kaberamaido Sub County (DWD 90919)

6. Orio Community Borehole in Kaberamaido Sub County (DWD 90917)

7. Agule B Community Borehole in Aperkira Sub County (DWD 90916)

8. Angorom Community Borehole in Aperkira Sub County (DWD 90915)

9. Palatau Community Borehole in Alwa Sub County (DWD 90920)

10. And Gwaya A Community Borehole in Alwa Sub County (DWD 90922)

Of the ten constructed boreholes, 2 were constructed in Ochero Sub County and 2 in Aperkira Sub County to make a total of 4. This amounted to an allocation of 40% which was below the minimum recommended 80%.

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Kaberamaido LG constructed 10 boreholes which were contracted in two lots of 5 boreholes each, rehabilitated 7 boreholes and constructed a 2 stance VIP latrine at Oraimo markets.</p> <p>Each of the two lots of boreholes were estimated at UGX 111,590,480 and contracted at UGX 111,300,500 with a variation of + 0.26%</p> <p>The 7 rehabilitated boreholes were estimated at UGX 31,156,600 and were contracted at UGX 31,057,600 and the variation was + 0.31%</p> <p>Finally the 2 stance VIP latrine at Oriamo market was estimated at UGX 15,000,000 and was contracted at UGX 14,420,000 with a variation of 3.9%</p> <p>All the awarded contracts had variations within +/- 20% of their engineers' estimates.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the Work Plan for 2021/22. Kaberamaido LG planned to construct 10 boreholes, rehabilitate 7 boreholes and a 2 stance VIP latrine at Oraimo market. All these projects were reported to have been completed within the financial year of 2021/22 representing 100% completion.</p>	2
3	<p>New Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The functionality of water facilities was 84% in 2020/21 and also 84% in 2021/22, hence no increment between the two financial years.</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 &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>The functionality of water and sanitation committees was 99% in 2020/21 and also 99% in 2021/22, hence no increment between the two financial years.</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>There was evidence that the District Water Officer accurately reported on water and sanitation facilities constructed in 2021/22. Three facilities were sampled and visited as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agule B community borehole in Aperkira Sub County (DWD 90916)</li> <li>2. Ereu community borehole in Kaberamaido Sub County (DWD 90919)</li> <li>3. Amoru community borehole in Alwa Sub County (DWD 90920)</li> </ol> <p>All these facilities were found to have been completed and were functional as had been reported in the Fourth Quarter Progress Report for 2021/22 date 8th July 2022.</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Local Government Water Office collected and compiled quarterly information on sub county water supply and sanitation. On file were compiled form 4 monitoring reports for all the four quarters of 2021/22. The Quarter 1 reports was dated 3rd August 2021, Quarter 2 reports dated 18th October 2021, Quarter 3 reports dated 19th April 2022 and Quarter 4 reports dated 18th July 2022</p>	2

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>All the quarterly form 4 monitoring reports for 2021/22 were submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment as follows; Quarter 1 reports were submitted on 3rd August 2021, Quarter 2 reports on 18th October 2021, Quarter 3 reports on 19th April 2022 and Quarter 4 reports on 18th July 2022</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Awaiting the LLGs results in January 2023.</p>	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO had made a staff budget of UGX 80,800,000 which was to cover himself, the Assistant Engineer (water) and a Secretary.</p> <p>The other required positions of the 2 Assistant water officers and 1 borehole maintenance Technician were not filled.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>This information was not provided at the time of assessment</p>	0

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence on file that the District water officer appraised the Assistant Water Officer among other staff in the section during FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to show that these had been captured in the Capacity needs training report and no training report was provided to prove that the said Assistant Water Officer had been trained in the said capacity gaps.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of planning for financial year 2022/23, Kaberamaido LG had a safe water coverage of 81%. Two sub counties had their safe water coverage below this and these were Ochero Sub County at 68% and Aperkiro Sub County at 78%.</p> <p>Ochero Sub County was allocated 1 VIP latrine estimated at UGX 13,393,384, 1 borehole estimated at UGX 24,933,333, a motorized well at UGX 36,000,000, 1 borehole rehabilitation at UGX 4,200,000, repair of a piped water system at UGX 15,000,000 and design of another piped water system at UGX 24,304,768. Aperkira Sub County on the other hand was allocated 2 boreholes both estimated at UGX 49,866,666 and 2 borehole rehabilitations both estimated at UGX 8,400,000.</p> <p>A total of UGX 176,098,151 was allocated to the above two sub counties out of the entire development budget of UGX 429,498,149. This amounted to an allocation of 41% which was below the 60% minimum threshold.</p> <p>The District Water Office attributed this low allocation to political intervention which in most cases dictated where water facilities were allocated as opposed to following the requirements of the sector guidelines.</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>The District Water Officer communicated to the respective Lower Local Governments their allocations per water source in a letter that was dated 8th August 2022. Copies of this letter were seen at Aperkiro Sub County offices and Kaberamaido Sub County Offices.</p>	3
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had a total of 368 safe water points and these had been monitored in each of the 4 quarters as was evidenced by the form 4 monitoring reports for all the sub counties.</p> <p><math>(368/368) \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>Therefore over 95% of the WSS facilities had been monitored on a quarterly basis</p>	4
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>The District Water Officer conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings on 25th August 2021 for quarter 1, 7th October 2021 for quarter 2, 16th February 2022 for quarter 3 and 17th May 2022 for quarter 4.</p> <p>It was observed that only minutes for quarter 4 had been signed off by the meeting chairperson.</p> <p>Also, there was no evidence that the District Water Officer presented key issues identified during the quarterly monitoring except in the minutes for quarter 1 under the section for his report.</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>The budget allocations for 2022/23 to the different sub counties were not displayed both on the notice boards at the District Water Office and the sampled sub counties of Aperkira and Kaberamaido.</p>	0

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:  • If funds were allocated score 3  • If not score 0	The Non-wage Recurrent budget for the water department in 2021/22 was UGX 53,483,359. Of this UGX 22,013,943 was spent on mobilization and software activities which amounted to 41.2% allocation.	<b>3</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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.	Training for water user committees in the different sub counties was conducted between 4th and 22nd July 2022 and among the items they were trained in was on maintaining good hygiene at the water sources, basic operation and maintenance works and bookkeeping.  During the field visit of the boreholes, a one Okello Michael (Caretaker for Agule B borehole) and Ebitu Emmanuel (Secretary for Ereu borehole) were interviewed and demonstrated recall of knowledge relating to sanitation and hygiene. Also the facilities maintained records of monthly contributions and minutes of meetings.  It was however noted that the training of the said water user committees was conducted in 2022/23 and not in 2021/22 as was required.	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

**Investment Management**

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:  Score 4 or else 0	The LG water office had an asset register in the form of sector MIS reports from the Ministry of Water and Environment. It had a total of 337 functional point water sources and among these were all the water points which were constructed in 2021/22. These included Gwaya A Community Borehole in Alwa Sub County, Amoru Community Borehole also in Alwa Sub County, and Ereu Community Borehole in Kaberamaido Sub County among others.	<b>4</b>
----	---	---	---	----------



11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Whereas desk appraisal was conducted and appraisal reports were accessed and assessed, the approved Local Government Development Plan III was not availed for assessment to check whether the planned facilities had been derived from it. Also the allocation of water facilities, especially the new boreholes, was not in line with the water sector grant guidelines which required that sub counties with safe water coverage below that for the district were given priority over the others.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The District Water Officer had on file community applications for all the planned water facilities for 2022/23. For example the community of Kirabet A village in Okile Sub County applied for a borehole on 21st September 2022, that of Aperkira village applied for a borehole on 20th October 2022, and finally the community of Obirai village in Kobulubul Sub County applied for a borehole on 18th October 2022 among many others.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that field appraisal had been done for all the 9 planned boreholes and VIP latrine. For example the field appraisal for the planned borehole in Akwei village in Ochero Sub County was conducted on 8th August 2022 that for Akani village in Oriamo Sub County was done on 2nd August 2022, and for the planned 2 stance VIP latrine in Ochero sub county was done on 8th August 2022.</p> <p>All the projects were found to be technically feasible, and were environmentally and socially acceptable. Also none of the planned projects for implementation required customized designs.</p>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence in the form of screening reports regarding Environment and Social project risks.</p> <p>Screening for current year projects had not yet been done by assessment time.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the WSS infrastructure investments for previous FY were incorporated in the LG procurement plan approved by CAO on 13thOctober2021;</p> <p>Sampled projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Siting,drilling and Construction of 5 deep boreholes at Kaberamaido District page 7</li> <li>· Construction of block of drainable pit latrine with 3 stances and Urinal at Oriamo RGC page 7</li> <li>· Rehabilitation of 7 deep boreholes in Kaberamaido District Page7</li> </ul>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement as indicated below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Siting, drilling and installation of 5 deep bore holes in Kaberamaido District was approved by contracts committee on 5thAugust 2021, under minute N0 cc/min/02/04/05/2021/2022-4(1)</li> <li>2. construction of 3 stance drainable latrine at Oriamo RGS was approved by contracts committee on 5thAugust 2021, under minute N0 ; cc/min/02/04/05/2021/2022-4(1)</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of7 deep bore holes in Kaberamaido District was approved by contracts committee on 5thAugust 2021, under minute N0 ; cc/min/02/04/05/2021/2022-4(1)</li> </ol>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>LG did not provide evidence of establishment of the project implementation team</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	.			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>The three boreholes that were visited in the field, namely Agule B community borehole, Ereu community borehole, and the 2 stance latrine at Oriamo market were found to have been constructed as per the designs. However specifically for the 2 stance latrine, defects had already started to show up. For example there were many large cracks in the aprons which could have been as a result of using too fine sand or failure to properly cure the cement works. Also sections of the external paint works were starting to peel off.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	.			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	.			

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts	From the sampled projects below, payment to contractors were initiated and made within specified 2 months timeline,:	2
	<i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling and construction of 5 deep bore holes.at Kaberamaido District by Multec Consults (U) Ltd was verified by DWO for payment (69,450,200/=) issued on 12th January 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 19th January 2022 under voucher NO 41533459</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of 7 bore holes by Wjap holdings Ltd was verified by DWO for 1st payment (27,483,120/=) issued on 14th March2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 15th March 2022 under voucher NO 42206734</li> </ol>	
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements	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:	The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;	2
	<i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Score 2, If not score 0	<p>Sampled contracts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contract for construction of 3 stances drainable latrine at Oriamo RGS, Minutes of contracts committee ref; cc/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2022-4(6) dated 26th November 2021 , evaluation report dated 24th November 2021, contract agreement signed on 14thDecember 2021,</li> <li>2. Contract for drilling and construction of 5 deep bore holes in Kaberamaido District, Minutes of contracts committee decision ref; cc/min/03/05/08/09/2020/2021/2022-5(3) dated 7th September 2021 , evaluation report dated 2nd September 2021, contract agreement signed on 28th September 2021</li> <li>3.Contract for Rehabilitation of 7 bore holes in Kaberamaido District, Minutes of contracts committee ref; cc/min/05/04/26/11/2021/2022-4(10) dated 26th November 2021 , evaluation report dated 24th November 2021, contract agreement signed on 14th December 2021</li> </ol>	

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no Grievance Redress framework and grievances log book was no availed by the time of assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the guidelines for water source and catchment protection and natural resource management and were disseminated by Ag. District Natural Resource Officer/ SEO to CDOs/ extension staff in the Inter-Sub County meeting for third quarter of the FY 2021/2022 held on 24/06/2022 at the District Water Office. The meeting was held by the DWO Elomunait David and it involved CDOs</p>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>All the water projects that where implemented in previous FY were screened for Environmental and social risks</p> <p>There was evidence of the water source protection plan developed for deep boreholes in the ten villages in 5 sub counties of Kaberamaido for FY 2021/2022 dated 04/08/2021 compiled by the DWO</p>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Local Government constructed water facilities on land where there was consent from the land owners. For example on 7th October 2021, a one Eyabu James of Agule village gave part of his land to construct the community borehole, on 10th October 2021, a one Eriebu Patrick of Okille village gave part of his land to community a borehole, and finally 11th September 2021 a one Etuku Raymond of Angorom village gave part of his land to the community for construction of a borehole among many others</p>	<b>3</b>

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>From sampled payment vouchers , it was established that the CDO and Environment officer were not appending their signatures on the payment certificates as indicated below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Payment Voucher N0 42206734 paid on 21th March 2022 to Wjap holdings Ltd for rehabilitation of 7 bore holes. payment certificate dated 15th March 2021, DWO signed certificate, Environment officer and CDO didn't sign</li> <li>● Payment Voucher N0 41533459 paid on 9th March 2022 to Multec Consults Ltd for construction of 5 bore holes. payment certificate dated 19th January 2022, DWO signed certificate, Environment officer and CDO didn't sign</li> </ul>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>No monthly monitoring reports were availed by assessment time</p>	0

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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>No data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were presented for the assessment. The District Agriculture Officer mentioned that some 14 farmer groups were benefiting from some micro scale irrigation installed with support from some NGOs but no evidence was available.</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"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were presented for the assessment</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 because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and thus had no support for the project. Even the approved District procurement and disposal plan for FY 2020/21 submitted by the CAO (Kasadha John Stephen on 25/10/2021 had no plans for micro scale irrigation. Neither sensitization nor any activities related to micro scale project was planned. However, the approved procurement plan for the FY 2022/23 had planned to secure field demonstration equipment for micro scale irrigation at a cost of 41,286,863 Ugx. The CAO (Kasadha John Stephen) submitted the approved plan on 13/10/2022 to the regional PPDA regional office in Soroti.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable, the micro scale irrigation equipment were not yet procured and installed, therefore, no payment was made. The DPO reported that they were still assessing and collecting the baseline information for the implementation of the micro scale irrigation projects.	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 because the projects had not yet started. Therefore, no supplier quote/contract and Engineer estimates/Bill of quantities were presented for assessment.	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  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable, micro scale irrigation equipment for both demonstration and farmers were not yet procured and installed as the District is in the second phase of the project	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  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	The staff structure of extension workers was 5 and per the staff list was 4  (4/5) x100=80%	1
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  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed as the District was in the second phase of the project which begins implementation in FY 2022/23	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 as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed as the District was in the second phase of the project with most activities planned to begin implementation in FY 2022/23	0
---	---	---	--	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	A sample of two Sub Counties and one Town Council was taken these were, Kaberamaido Town Council, ,Kaberamaido Sub County and Aperikira Sub County.	0
---	---	---	---	---

At Kaberamaido Town Council the position of agriculture officer had not been filled yet the position was provided in the staff structure, thus 2/4x100 positions were not filled reflecting 50% ( Agriculture and Entomologist) not filled.

At Kaberamaido sub county they had only one out of three extension workers that was Ms. Ajjeru Jesca Veterinary and Animal Husbandry. 1/3x100=33.3%

Aperikikira Sub County Mr. Oryekot Peter was the agricultural officer and no other extension staff was at the Sub County reflecting 1/3x100= 33.3%

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed. The District was in the second phase which starts the project implementation in FY 2022/23. There was no installation at either the demonstration site or the farmer's site	0
---	---	--	---	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	The LG provided no Quarterly supervision and monitoring report during the assessment. The district was in the second phase of micro scale irrigation and most of the project activities were just planned for implementation in FY 2022/23. They had no irrigation systems installed to warrant reporting on their functionality	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	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	No MIS report was presented for the assessment. The staff was reportedly still being trained on the use of Irritrack system.	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	No evidence that the District prepared quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS was presented during the assessment.	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 since the District was on the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and had not implemented the project at the time of assessment. Similarly, the Performance Assessment for the micro-scale irrigation project was not yet conducted at the LLGs because the projects were nonexistent.	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 since the District was on the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and had not implemented the project at the time of assessment. Similarly, the Performance Assessment for the micro-scale irrigation project was not yet conducted at the LLGs because the projects were nonexistent.	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	Information was not availed to the assessment team at the time of assessment.	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	There was no information availed to PAT during the time of assessment	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	Information on extension workers deployment was not provided to the PAT during the time of assessment.	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	The extension works deployment list were not publicized at the DLG and in all the three visted LLGs	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	Information was not availed to the assessment team	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	Information was not availed to the assessment team	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	No Training Plan and Training Reports were presented for assessment. However, the DPO presented a District Agriculture Officer Samuel Etwomu, who was trained on the implementation of Micro Scale Irrigation and he was reportedly collecting baseline information	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was no Training Database although the DPO reported to have trained several staff in different areas of their work. He cited examples of different project trainings but showed no attendance list or relevant training reports.	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the District was in the Second Phase of the micro scale irrigation project and the implementation of the project was planned in the FY 2022/23. Even the Approved District Procurement Plan for the FY 2021/22 signed by CAO on 10/10/2021 showed that no activities related to micro scale irrigation were planned.	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>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 because the District was in the Second Phase of the micro scale irrigation project and the implementation of the project was planned in the FY 2022/23. The Approved District Work and Procurement Plan for the FY 2021/22 signed by CAO on 10/10/2021 showed that there was no evidence of activities related to micro scale irrigation in the FY 2021/22.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
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) 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, the micro scale irrigation project had not reached co-funding stage and therefore, it was not reflected in the LG Budget for FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable as micro scale irrigation project had not reached co-funding stage because its implementation was planned for the FY 2022/23</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the District was in the Second Phase of the micro scale irrigation project and the implementation of most project activities was planned in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not yet applicable since the micro-scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed to warrant monitoring. The District was in the second phase and all micro scale irrigation activities were just planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable since the micro-scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed to warrant monitoring. The District was in the second phase and all micro scale irrigation activities were planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No supervision reports and minutes of field meetings with the LLGs extension workers were availed during the assessment.</p> <p>Trainings were not yet done as the project was just planned by the time of the assessment. None of the activities outlined in the work plan prepared by the Senior Agricultural Officer, approved by the DPO and verified by CAO on 26/05/2022 was implemented at the time of the assessment</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The District provided a list of 30 farmer field schools which they established with support from FAO and plan to use for the implementation of the micro scale irrigation project. The schools were active and have been used to implement various Operation Wealth Creation projects.</p>	2

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation had not started. The District was in the second phase of the project and most of the activities were planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation under UGIFT was not planned in the FY 2021/22.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

**Investment Management**

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and the irrigation equipment had neither been procured nor supplied.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and implementation of most of the activities were planned for FY 2022/23	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and all the implementation activities were planned for FY 2022/23, the year of assessment.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 8			

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the activities were planned for FY 2022/23, the year of assessment.</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>LG did not provide evidence since micro scale irrigation had not yet started in the district</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG did not provide evidence since micro scale irrigation had not yet started in the district</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG did not provide evidence since micro scale irrigation had not yet started in the district</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>LG did not provide evidence since micro scale irrigation had not yet started in the district</p>	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation  score 2 or else 0	LG did not provide evidence since micro scale irrigation had not yet started in the district	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 yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the activities were planned for FY 2022/23, the year of assessment.	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 yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the activities were planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23	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 because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project. Therefore, the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed to warrant functionality test	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 because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project. Therefore, there was no micro scale irrigation equipment or installations to be handed over	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 because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project. Therefore, the micro scale irrigation equipment was neither yet procured nor installed to warrant payment.	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

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 because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project. Therefore, the procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment had not yet started nor were bids invited.	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  i). Recorded score 1 or else 0  ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0  iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0  iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation project had not yet started in the previous year. Most of the project activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	There was no micro-scale irrigation project implemented in previous financial FY 2021/2022	0

**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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>	The district had substantively recruited Mr. Kihembo James Nsubuga as Senior Agriculture Engineer on 30 / June / 2022 Ref number CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 43 /2022/ (ii)-1 signed by the CAO Mr. kasadha John Stephen.	<b>70</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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.	There was no Micro Scale Irrigation project implemented in previous FY. Micro-scale Irrigation projects were planned for the current year 2022/2023	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG had substantively recruited Mr.Elomuniat David as Civil Engineer ( Water ) on 21 /January/2020 under reference number CR /156/2 as directed by DSC Minute number 4 / 2020 /( c )-1 as signed by Ogwang Bernard CAO.	<b>15</b>
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.	Mr.Elobu Emmanuel was substantively recruited as assistant engineering officer (Mobilization )under Ref : CR /156 /2 , 1 /Feb / 2021 as directed by DSC Minute number 14 /2020 ( j )-1 signed by Akera John Bosco ( CAO ).	<b>10</b>
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.	According to the staff structure of Kaberamaido District dated 18 April / 2019 this position was not provided for	<b>0</b>
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.	Mr. Magabo Mathias Senior Environment officer KDLG was appointed in acting capacity on 22 /Nov /2021 Ref numberCR /115 01 minute number 82/2021 ( a )-2 as was directed by the DSC and Signed by the CAO MrKasadha John Stephen	<b>15</b>
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.	Ms.Areto Dorcus was appointed as Environmental officer, on 1 / Feb / 2021 Ref : CR /156 /2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 14 / 2020 ( p )-1 signed by CAO, Akera John Bosco.	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	<p>The District had substantively recruited Mr.Olupot Isaac as Forestry Officer on 25 /May /2018 under Ref: CR /156 /2 as directed by DSC Minute number 14 /2018 ( k )-1 signed by Mr. Oryono Grand Field Omonda CAO.</p>	<b>10</b>
---	---	--	---	-----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works.</p> <p>Screening Report for Sitting and drilling of Agule B borehole in Aperkira Sub-county stamped on 16/10/2021 by SEO.</p> <p>Screening Report for Sitting and drilling of borehole at Gwaya A, Oriamo Parish in Alwa sub-county stamped on 01/10/2021 by SEO.</p>	<b>10</b>
---	--	---	---	-----------

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The above-mentioned sampled projects never required full ESIA since they lie within projects listed under Schedule 4 Part 2 section 3(a) "Construction of community water points with very minimal Environmental and Social significant impacts that require timely implementation of ESMP.</p> <p>However; not all borehole projects had ESMPs for example sitting and drilling of borehole at Gwaya A, Oriamo Parish in Alwa sub-county never had an ESMP</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

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

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

The LG constructed a total of 10 deep boreholes which all did not require obtaining abstraction permits from the Directorate of Water Resource Management



**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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.	Dr.Odongo James Daniel was appointed in acting capacity as the DHO on 22/Nov/2021 under reference number CR/115/01 as was directed by the DSC Minute number:82/2021(a)-3 signed by Kasadha John Stephen CAO.	<b>0</b>
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	Ms.Acio Susan had been recruited substantively as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal,Child health nursing on 6 April/2021 under Minute number 14/2021(b)-2 signed by Akera John Bosco ( CAO )	<b>10</b>
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.	The district had substantively recruited the assistant district health officer Mr.Ocen Gregory under appointment letter Ref : CR/156/1 dated 9/ May /2013 as directed by DSC Minute number 15(v) 2013. Signed by Richard Sajjabi CAO.	<b>10</b>
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.	The district had substantively recruited the assistant district health officer Mr.Ocen Gregory under appointment letter Ref : CR/156/1 dated 9/ May /2013 as directed by DSC Minute number 15(v) 2013. Signed by Richard Sajjabi CAO	<b>10</b>
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.	The district substantively appointed Ms.Tino Grace as a Senior Health Educator on 12/2021 through reference number CR/156/2 as directed DSC Minute number 27/2018(a)-6 signed by Kasadha John Stephen CAO .	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The district had substantively recruited Mr.Edadu Charles as Biostastician on 1/Feb /2021 reference number CR 156/2 as was directed by DSC Minute number14 /2020 ( d )-1 signed by Akera John Bosco CAO.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Okello Francis was substantively recruited as District Cold Chain Technician on appointment letter referenced CR / 156 /2 ,on 10 / Sept /2008 under Minute number 21 /2008 /-2-18. Signed by Adongo Roseline Luhoni CAO.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works.</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII stamped on 01/02/2022</p>	<b>15</b>
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>The above mentioned project did not require full ESIA because in the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019, it is categorized under schedule 4 part 2 Section 4 which consists of projects with very minimal significant Environmental and social Impacts which can be easily mitigated by timely implementation of the ESMP thereby requiring Environment and social screening and ESMP</p>	<b>15</b>

**Education Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The District did not have a substantively recruited DEO. However, Mr. Elyebu Richard was appointed by CAO in acting capacity under letter Ref: CR/115/6 on 22 /Nov/21 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 82 /2021 (a )-4 signed by CAO Mr. Kasadha John Stephen.	<b>0</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The District had substantively recruited Mr. Ebinu Pius as Inspector of schools on 20/ April / 2021 under Ref; CR/156/2 as directed by DSC Minute number 30 / 2021/ signed Akera John Bosco CAO	<b>40</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works.  Screening report for construction of a 2 classroom block at Bugoi Primary School stamped by Mr. Magambo Mathias (SEO) on 22/09/2021	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	The above mentioned project did not require ESIA because in the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019, it was categorized under schedule 4 part 2 which consists of projects with very minimal significant Environmental and social Impacts which can be easily mitigated by timely implementation of the ESMP thereby requiring Environment and social screening and ESMP	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District had substantively recruited Mr. Ojur Francis as Chief Financial Officer on 8/Oct/2008, as per appointment letter Ref:CR/156/2 as directed by DSC minute number 27/2008(x) and signed by Adongo Roseline Luloni (CAO).	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG did not have a substantively recruited District Planner. However, Mr. Elalu Albert was appointed by CAO in acting capacity as a District Planner on 22/Nov/2021 under appointment letter reference CR/115/01 as was directed by the DSC minute number 82/2021 {a)-6 endorsed by Kasadh John Stephen (CAO)	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The District had not substantively recruited a DE. However, the CAO appointed Mr. Ewayu Francis as District Engineer ( in acting capacity) on 22/Nov/2021 under appointment letter reference CR/115/01 as was directed by the DSC minute number 82/2021(a)-5 signed Kasadha John Stephen (CAO).	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	According to the approved staff structure of Kaberamaido DLG, Mr. Magambo Mathias was appointed by the CAO in acting capacity as Senior Environment Officer on 22/Nov/2021,Ref :CR/115/01 as was directed by the DSC under Minute No.82/2021(a)-2 endorsed by Kasadha John Stephen ( CAO ).	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District substantively recruited District Production Officer Mr. Chakua Wilfred under appointment letter Ref:CR/156/2 dated 20/March/2017 as directed by DSC Minute number 11(i)0 2017-1 as signed by Bimbona Simon ( CAO ).	<b>3</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Mr Odela Nelson was appointed substantively as a DCDO on accelerated promotion under Minute No:28 (vii)2015,Ref: CR/156/2 dated 16/June/2015 as signed by Francis A.O Oluka (CAO).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had not yet recruited a substantive DCO. However, Mr. Eyamu David an Accountant was assigned duties of the DCO by the CAO under letter Ref: CR/115/01 dated 30/Nov/2021 and signed by Kasadha John Stephen ( CAO ).	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The District had substantively recruited a Senior Procurement Officer by names of Mr. Ejupu Michael Oyuu under appointment letter Ref: CR/156//2, dated 21/June/2019 as was directed by the DSC Minute No.18/2019(a)-7 and endorsed by the CAO Ogwang Bernard .	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively recruited Etoku Emmanuel as a Procurement Officer of Kaberamido DLG on 1/Feb/2021 through letter reference no CR//156/2 as directed by DSC Minute number,14/2020(r)-1 signed by the CAO Mr. Akera John Bosco.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Omwanet John Bosco was substantively recruited as a Principal Human Resource Officer on 15/Oct/2018 through a letter reference CR/156/2 as was directed by DSC Minute No 27/2018 (a)-4 signed by the CAO Ogwang Bernard.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively recruited Mr. Magambo Mathias as a Senior Environment Officer under appointment letter Reference No:CR/156/02 dated 26/OCT/2017as was directed by the DSC Minute number 30/2017(a)-1 endorsed by the CAO Mr. Oron Grand Field Omondo.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	According to the Kaberamido LG approved staff structure dated 18/April/2019, this position was not provided for.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Enuru ELEMU Charles was substantively recruited as a Senior Accountant on 21/June /2019 under letter Ref: CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 18/2019 (a) signed by Ogwang Bernard (CAO).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Ebwamu Milton was appointed as a Principle Internal Auditor on 1/ February/ 2021 letter Ref; CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute No;14 /2020 (s)-1 and letter signed by Akera John Bosco ( CAO).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The District had substantively recruited Mr. Ochen Peter as Principal Human Resource Officer (DSC) on 22 / Nov /2021 under letter Ref; CR/156 /2 as was vide by the DSC Minute number 82 //2021(b)-2 signed by Kasadha John Stephen ( CAO ).	2

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

- According to the approved staff structure, Kaberamaido DLG had 5 Sub Counties and 1 Town Council; These included; Aperikira Sub-County, Kaberamaido Sub-County, Alwa Sub-County, Ochero Sub-County, Kobulubulu Sub-County and Kaberamaido Town Council.

1. Mr. Eripu Emmanuel was appointed SAS for Aperikira Sub County on 8th October 2021, reference number CR/156/1 as was directed by DSC minute number 63/2001(a)-1.

2. Ms. Amuso Esther was appointed on transfer of services from Amolatar District to SAS for Alwa Sub County under letter Ref: CR /156 / 2 dated 30 /May / 2019 as was directed by DSC Minute number 12 / 2019(ii)-1 endorsed by Ogwang Bernard (CAO).

3. Mr. Opio Anthony was appointed on transfer of services from Amolatar District to SAS for Ochero Sub County under letter Ref: CR /156 / 2 dated 30 /May /2019 as was directed by DSC Minute number 12/ 2019(ii)-2 endorsed by Ogwang Bernard (CAO).

4. Ms. Aliano Jane was appointed on promotion to SAS for Kaberamaido Sub-County 15/Oct /2018 letter Ref; CR/156/2 as was directed by DSC Minute No 27 /2018 (b)-5 endorsed by Ogwang Bernard (CAO).

5. Ms. Ayeco Stella was appointed on assignment as Town Clerk Kaberamaido Town Council on 30th November 2021 under letter Ref: CR/115/01 endorsed by Kasadha John Stephen (CAO).

6. At Kobulubulu Sub County, the Ag. SAS was appointed by CAO on 1st July 2022 under letter reference No. CR/115/05 signed by CAO Kasadha John Stephen.



2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>According to the approved staff structure of Kaberamaido District Local Government, not all positions of CDO's were substantively filled, for instance; The following were not dully appoined and they included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Apaso Fiona appointed on probation as CDO of Kobulubulu Sub County on 16th / Oct /2019, under reference number CR/156/2, Minute number 27/2019(d) (i)-1 signed by Ogwang Bernard.</li> <li>2. Ms. Ayudo Jane Judith was appointed on probation as CDO of Alwa Sub County on 16th /Oct /2019 under reference number CR/156/2,Minute number 27/2019(d)(i)-2 signed by Ogwang Bernard</li> <li>3. Ms. IcwaloAnnet was appointed on probation as CDO of Kaberamaido Sub County on 30th May 2019 under reference number CR/156/2, minute number 12/2019(xvii)-2 signed by Ogwanga Bernard</li> </ol> <p>The appointment letters for the CDOs / Senior CDOs for Aperkira Sub County, Ochero Sub County and Kaberamaido Town Council were not availed for assessment.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>All positions of Senior Accounts Assistant were filled substantively for instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mrs. AKello Christine Omara was appointed on probation 1/ Feb /2021 reference number CR/156/2 Minute number 14/2020/( t)-2 signed by Akeria John Bosco.</li> <li>2 Ekadu Michael was appointed on probation 6/May/2013 under reference number CR/156/2 Minute number DSC15(XV)/2013</li> </ol>	5
---	---	--	--	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Natural Resources department,</li> </ol> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Natural Resources department: Budgeted shs142.342.281 warranted shs 142,342,281 Actual Expenditure Shs 142,180,306 , Shs. 161,975 (Negative), therefore expenditure against warranted was 99.9% page 10 Draft final Accounts FY 2021/2022</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Community Based services</p> <p>Budgeted shs 216,102,042 warranted shs 216102,042 Actual Expenditure Shs 210,475,559 variance Shs 5,626,483 (Negative), there expenditure against warranted was 97.4% page 10 Draft final Accounts FY 2021/2022</p>	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,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works.</p> <p>Screening report for renovation of Education block at the District Headquarters signed by Mr. Magambo Mathias (SEO) on 23/09/2021.</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of a two stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII signed by SEO on 01/02/2022</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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>All the above mentioned DDEG financed projects did not require full ESIAs because in the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019, they are categorized under schedule 4 part 2 which consists of projects with very minimal significant Environmental and social Impacts which can be easily mitigated by timely implementation of the ESMPs thereby requiring Environment and social screening and ESMPs</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);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>All the above mentioned DDEG financed projects had Costed ESMPs</p> <p>Renovation of Education block at the District Headquarter with a costed ESMP at UGX:400,000/-.</p> <p>screening report for the construction of a two-stance drainable pit latrine at Ochero HCIII with a costed ESMP at UGX:400,000/-</p>	4

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Kaberamaido LG had a clean / unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>10</b>
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>Information was not availed to the Assessment team despite numerous requests in regard to the provision of information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings</p>	<b>0</b>
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>LG had submitted an annual performance contract on 7th July 2022 time 02: 07</p>	<b>4</b>
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 had submitted the annual Performance Report for FY 2021/22 on 30th August .2021</p>	<b>4</b>

Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

1st Quarterly Budget Performance report FY 2021/2022 was submitted on 18th November 2021.

2nd Quarterly Budget performance report FY 2021/2022 was submitted on 2 nd July 2022

3rd Quarterly Budget performance report FY 2021/22 was submitted on 17th May 2022

4th Quarterly Budget performance report FY 2021/2022 was submitted on 30th August 2022