



**LGMSD 2021/22**

Kapelebyong District

(Vote Code: 627)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	36%
Education Minimum Conditions	40%
Health Minimum Conditions	25%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	40%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	59%
Educational Performance Measures	51%
Health Performance Measures	61%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	48%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	13%

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 evidence that the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG were functional and utilized for the purpose of the projects. The Performance Assessment team selected and inspected the following 3 previously completed projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at the District Headquarter was found to be functional and utilized for the intended purpose</li> <li>2. Phase 1 Fencing of Production Block found to be functional and utilized for the intended purpose</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of Akore - Oditel road 14 Km was found to be functional and utilized for the intended purpose</li> </ol>	4
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>LLGS were being assessed for the first time. awaiting LLG performance assessment results</p>	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects were Completed as per performance contract/ work plan FY 2021/2022</p> <p>5 Projects were planned to be implemented and all were completed constituting 100%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 6 stance Pit Latrine for Males and Females appeared a on page 16 of the performance Contract/Work Plan FY 2021/2022 was completed as per page 42 of 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report FY 2021/2022</li> <li>2. Construction of a fence phase1 around the Production Block page 17 of the Performance Contract/work plan and was completed as per page 42 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report FY 2021/2022</li> <li>3. rehabilitation of 3 roads Acowa- Kapelebyong road 8 km page 79 of the work plan and was completed as per page of 74 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report FY 2021/2022 Acowa _ Agerepo road</li> <li>4. 18 km page 79 of the Performance Contract/Work Plan was completed as per page 74 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report.</li> <li>5. Akore _Oditel road 14 km page79 of the Performance Contract/ work plan and was completed as per page 74 of the Annual Budget Performance Report</li> </ol>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG budget for DDEG Stood at UGX 207,693,000 and Spent UGX 205,783,000 Constituted 99% spent leaving a balance of UGX 1,910,000 The information was as per authenticated schedule dated 15th November 2022 by the District Planner</p> <p>DDEG infrastructure budget was UGX 134,000,00 and actual was UGX133,986,000, Monitoring budget stood at UGX 20,769,000 and actual was 20,731,000, Capacity Building and retooling budgeted at UGX 52,924,000 and Actual was UGX was 51,066,000</p>	0

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:

- Construction of a stance drainable latrine at the District headquarter budgeted at UGX 18,000,000, actual was UGX 16,513,144 with a variation of UGX 1,486,856 represented by 8.3%
- Fencing of the production block budgeted at UGX 30,000,000, actual was UGX 29,873,529 with a variation of UGX 126,471 represented by – 0.4%
- Construction of a 3 stance drainable pit latrine at District headquarters budgeted at UGX 18,000,000, actual was UGX 17,176,009 with a variation of 823,991 represented by 4.6%.

The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

Accuracy of reported  
information

Maximum 4 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

According to the approved staff structure for LLGs and staff list from HRM Division, there was evidence that the information on position filled at LLGs as per minimum standards is accurate.

According to the sampled Sub Counties and Town Council of Acowa Sub County ,Acinga sub county and Acowa Town Council it revealed that the HRM Staff list and the staff list at the LLG was the same.

At Acinga sub County the information on filled positions was the same with the HRM. Among key positions filled were ,Mr. Okello Joseph as the Senior Assistant Secretary, Mr. Elocu Moses as the Community Development Officer , Mr. Alepu Faustine as the Senior Accountant and Mr. Eceru John Bosco the Assistant Agriculture Officer among others

At Acowa Town Councils the Information on filled positions was the same with HRM. Among the key positions filled were, Mr. Aeno John Micheal as the Town CLerk , Ms. Amidiong Phoinah Grace the Accountant , Mr,Eceru John Peter the Assistant Agriculture Officer among others.

At Acowa sub county the assessor was not availed with the information because there was no body at the Offices despite the assessor waiting for them to show up.

0

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure constructed using the DDEG was in place as per reports produced by the LG. The Assessment team sampled the following 3 projects as required</p> <p>Constructed 3 Stance Pit latrine at the District Headquarters page 16 of the work plan ,was 100% Completed and in place page 42 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance report</p> <p>Constructed 3 Stance Pit latrine at the District Headquarters page 16 of the work plan ,was 100% Completed and in place page 42 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance report</p> <p>Constructed phase 1 Fence around Production Block page 17 of the Work Plan , was in 100%completed and in place as per page 42 of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the FY 2022/2023 to the MoPS on 13 /Sept/ 2022 with a copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</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 tracking analysis of staff attendance for the months of July, August and September 2021 as was evidenced by tracking reports that had been signed of by the Ag. Senior Human Resource Officer, Ms. Newegulo Bridget.</p>	2

7

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous

FY: Score 1 or else 0

Kapelebyong District LG conducted an appraisal with some of the Heads of Departments who were appointed as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous year 2021/2022.

1. Mr. Ebuu Lawrence District Planner was appraised by Mr. Ebulu David on 30/Sept/2022
2. Mr. Ejiet John William DPO was appraised by Mr. Ssebandike Richard the CAO on 1/July/ 2021.
3. Ms. Apio Jesca DCO was appraised by Mr. David Ebulu the PAS on 30/June/202

Those who were not appraised were,

1. Mr. Epiu James Collins District commercial officer , Mr Emeru Simon the CFO and Mr. Oule Charles Ag. .
2. Mr. Emeru Simon the CFO.
3. Mr. Oule Charles Ag. DE.
4. Mr. Egule Paul District Natural Resource Officer

0

7

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

The LG Administrative Rewards and Sanction Committee was dully established and Functional and had considered cases as follows;

Mr. Edwaru Stephen Onyait Health information assistant had been sanctioned under minute number 03//03/2022 to be cautioned about theft .To be given a written warning and be asked to suggest the action to be taken against him.

Ms. Asio Justine enrolled nurse had been sanctioned under minute number 04/03/2022 to be cautioned about theft. To be given a written warning and asked to suggest the action to be taken against her.

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 on 10th June 2022 and it was functional.

It constituted of committee members who included;

1 Mr. Aeunu John Micheal Member.

2. Mr. Obua Emmanuel Member.

3. Mr. Ikidengit Dominac Member.

4 Ms. Nawegulo Bridget Member

5 Mr. Eteru Moses Secretary

6. Mr. Olinga Stephen Member .

7.Mr. Abeja district CAO. Chairperson.

Meeting was held on 21/3/2022

Min 1.Prayer

Min 02. Communication from the chairman.

Min 03.Reading and approval of Previous Minutes.

1

8

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

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

Score 1.

Not all recruited staff during financial year 2021/2022 accessed payroll in time. A total of 94 staff were recruited, of whom only 37 accessed payroll within the required 2 months. These included;

Mr. Olinga Stephen was appointed on 1/6/2022 and accessed payroll on 30 /6/2022

Ms. Akello Hellen was appointed on 1/6/2022 and accessed the payroll on 30/6/2022.

Mr. Epiu James was appointed on 1/6/2022 and access payroll on 30/6/2022 among others.

Those who didn't access payroll within the recommended time included;

Opuya Simon Peter Parish Chief,

Ajalo Gorret Town Agent

Ajiko Christine Town Agent

Abule Joseph head teacher

The reason for failure to access payroll on time included things like forged qualifications among others.

0

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.

Not all the retired staff during the previous financial YR 2021/2022 accessed the pension payroll, out of 9 retirees 3 did not access and that represented 71%.

Mr. Ocung Gnason, a head teacher retired on 1/4/2021 and accessed pension in May 2021.

Mr. Ejangu John Micheal, also a headteacher retired on 30/6/2021 and accessed pension in June /2021.

Ms. Atikuzebedde, a SEA retired on 30/5/2022 accessed pension in June 2022.

Mr. AlonguFesto, a deputy head teacher retired on 16/5/2022 and accessed pension on June 2022.

Mr. Olupot John Peter, an enrolled nurse retired on 15/3/2022 and accessed pension in April 2022

Mr. Okipi John Micheal, a SEA retired on 28/11/2021 and accessed pension in May 2022'

Those who did not access included;

Mr. Ochuli Peter EA retired on 3/04/2022 and accessed in October 2022

Mr. Esabu Patrick, an enrolled nurse, retired in 14/02/2022 and accessed in October 2022.

And Mr. Odoko Tom Valentine, a headteacher who retired on 27/01/2022 and accessed pension in July 2022.

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  
Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

Direct transfers (DDEG) TO LLGS were executed in accordance with the requirements of the Budget in FY 2021/2022 as follows

1st Quarter A total of UGX 103,697,115 was transferred to 11 LLGS on 12th July 2021 against a budget of UGX 103,697,115

2nd Quarter A total of UGX 103,697,115 was transferred to 11 LLGS on 15th October 2021 against a budget of UGX 103,697,115

3rd Quarter A total of UGX 103,697,115 was transferred to 11 LLGS on 12th January 2022 against a budget of UGX 103,697,115

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 (5 days from the date of receipt of Cash limits from MOFPED)</p> <p>1st Quarter</p> <p>Date of Cash Limit 10th July 2021, Amount UGX 103,697,115, Date of Warrant 14th July 2021, Amount UGX 103,697,115</p> <p>2nd Quarter</p> <p>Date of Cash Limit t 11th October 2021, Amount UGX 103,697,115, Date of Warrant 13th October2021, Amount UGX 103,697,115</p> <p>3rd Quarter</p> <p>Date of Cash limit 12th January2022, Amount UGX 103,697,115, Date of Warrant 14th January 2022, Amount UGX 103,697,115</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>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence at the time of assessment to show that LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence at the time of Performance Assessment that the LG had supervised/mentored LLGS in the District</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence at the time of Performance Assessment that the LG had supervised/mentored LLGS in the District</p>	0

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>There was evidence that the District maintained an up to date Assets Register covering details of Buildings, Vehicles, District land sites There were s General Assets which included ICT equipment and Office Furniture The Assets Register conformed to requirements of covering three categories of Assets as per the LG Financial and Accounting Manual 2007 i.e. Land and Buildings, Motor Vehicles and General Assets such as Furniture.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Board of Survey Report For FY 2021/2022 was not availed to the Performance Assessment Team despite numerous requests therefore there was no documentary evidence to show that the LG used the Board of survey report of the previous FY to make Assets management decisions. The issue was highlighted during the exit meeting that was chaired by the CAO</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The District did not have a functional physical planning Committee. The Committee produced and submitted only 2 sets of minutes to MOLHUD against the requirement of 4 sets of minutes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minutes of Physical Planning Committee meetings held on 10th November 2021 were Submitted to MOLHUD Soroti Regional Office on 17th February 2022</li> <li>2. Minutes of Physical Planning Committee meeting held on 30th March 2022 were Submitted to MOLHUD Soroti Regional Office on 10th April 2022</li> </ol> <p>The LG did not have a Physical Development plan</p> <p>The Physical Planning Committee was not properly constituted , There were 10 members against the stipulated membership of 13 Section 9 of the Physical Planning Act 2010 (amended). The Committee lacked a District surveyor and a Physical Planner in private practice</p> <p>A list of members was as follows</p> <p>Johnson Angullo District Physical Planner appointed on 9th September 2019 as Secretary to the Physical Planning Committee</p> <p>Stella Imalingat member, Ag Assistant District Health Officer appointed on 9th September 2019</p> <p>Paul Ebulugelu member, District Natural Resources Officer appointed on 9th September 2019</p> <p>James Brown Okao Forestry Officer appointed as member on 9th September 2019</p> <p>David Ebulu Principal Assistant Secretary</p>	0

appointed as Chairperson of the District Physical Planning Committee on 9th September 2019

Isaac Odima, District Water Officer, appointed as member on 9th September 2019

Samson Okare Olaki Ag. District Education Officer appointed as member on 9th September 2019

Charles Oule A g District Engineer appointed as member on 9th September 2019

John William Ejiet Ag Agricultural Officer appointed as member on 9th September 2019

Jesca Apio Ag District Community Development Officer appointed as member on 9th September 2019

Building Plan Registration Book was maintained .Applications for Development were considered within a period of 30 days as required. Examples can be cited as follows On 9th June 2022 a Communication Company by the names of UBUNTU Submitted an Application for Construction of Mast and it was responded to on 16th June 2022. On 25th November 2021 Okoromit Sub County Submitted an Application for a land title and on 25th November 2021, the matter was Considered. The Sub County was recommended

To be issued with a Land title by the District Land Board.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d.For DDEG financed projects;

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence to show that LG carried out desk appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021 and the projects included;

Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrines at the District headquarter

Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrines at the District headquarter

Fencing of production block

2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG carried out field appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021 and the projects included;</p> <p>Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrines at the District headquarter</p> <p>Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrines at the District headquarter</p> <p>Fencing of production block</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had developed project profiles as per the sampled projects below</p> <p>Increasing access to inclusive safe water and sanitation projected UGX 199,611,734</p> <p>Increase of production volumes of Agro-Enterprises projected at UGX183,817,275</p> <p>Education promotion project with estimated cost of UGX 12,000,000</p> <p>Additionally TPC discussed the investment profiles according to minutes of District TPC meeting dated 23rd May 2022 under minute N0, 05/TPC/May/2022</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of any Environment and Social screening reports for the current FY 2022/2023 projects</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0	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 15th September 2022 by Ag CAO Ebulu David  Some of the projects included;  1. Construction of council chambers Page 1  2. Completion of Administration block at Acowa Sub County Page 1  3. Construction of 2 classroom block at Airabet P/S page 1  4. Rehabilitation of classroom block at Adepar P/S , page 1  5. Construction of a market shade at Acowa SubcountyPage.1  6. Fencing of Acowa HCIII page 1	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 24th November 2021, under min N0 CC/Nov/2021-2022/appr/19(c)	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	LG had proof of the PIT properly established as per letter of appointment by CAO dated 21st January 2022 and 21st July 2022. list of members included  ApioJesca- DCDO  Egelu Paul - NRO  Oule Charles-DE ( project Manager)  Okare Samson- DEO (contract Manager, Education sector)  Edeu Jesse-Clerk of works  Eteru Moses- Labour officer  walakira Margeret- Ag DHO (Contract manager, Health sector)	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical design; construction of boundary wall for Kapelebyong general hospital, materials used were precast concrete poles, galvanized chain link gauge 10 as per the design  Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at District Headquarter; pre painted iron sheets gauge 28 were used, roof structure was made of treated timber members as per the design, metallic doors size 2100 x900 were installed.  Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at District Headquarter; pre painted iron sheets gauge 28 were used, roof structure was made of treated timber members as per the design, metallic doors size 2100 x900 were installed	1
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	LG did not provide minutes for site meetings and attendance lists at the time of assessment, therefore the assessor could not verify whether relevant Technical officers were involved	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The DLG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes as indicated below:  Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at District head quarter by Junia Holdings (U) Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment (14,460,214/=) issued on 22nd April 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 17th May 2022 under voucher N0 43316418  Fencing of Production block by Sovia Engineering Services was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment (26,676,482/=) issued on 10th June 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 18th June, 2022 under voucher N0 44584167  Construction of 3 stance drainable pit latrine at the District headquarter by Frahah Amuria Enterprises was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment (13,995,133/=) issued on 6th June 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 29th June, 2022 under voucher N0 44584166	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

Score 1 or else 0

From a sample of 3 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;

- Fencing of Production block ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 18th January, 2022, minute cc/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36, contract agreement signed 3rd February 2022 and evaluation report dated 5th January 2022

- Construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at District Headquarter; minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 18th January, 2022, minute cc/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36, contract agreement signed 3rd February 2022 and evaluation report dated 5th January 2022

- Construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at District Headquarter; minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 18th January, 2022, minute cc/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36, contract agreement signed 3rd February 2022 and evaluation report dated 5th January 2022

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was evidence of an appointment letter for Mr. Ebulu David (Principal Assistant Secretary) as the Chairperson Grievance Redress Committee by Ms. Angela Akurut for CAO on 7/08/2020.

The Grievance Redress Committee was in existence justified with the meeting minutes of the GRC held on the 17/06/2022 at Alito Primary School

GRC members are listed below;

-Mr. Ebulu David -Chairperson

-Mr. Eteru Moses (CDO/Labour Officer)-Secretary

-Imalingat Stella (ADHO/MCH) - Member

-Opio Emmanuel (communications officer)-Member

-Oule Charles (District engineer) Member

2

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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

If so: Score 2 or else 0

The LG never had a centralised grievance log book however it had initially a labour book as seen from the top book cover which was just canceled and replaced with grievance log book name.

The complaints log book had no clear and systematic information and complaints referral path with columns of date case and action taken only.

0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.  If so: Score 1 or else 0	There Local Government had not publicised any grievance redress mechanisms on the notice boards and on their district website by assessment time.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	No evidence was availed to the assessment team at the time of assessment	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 documentary evidence that the LG had disseminated to LLGS 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	There was evidence of screening reports for the sampled DDEG projects and costed ESMPs developed and incorporated in BOQs.  Screening report for the Construction of a three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: Junja Holdings (U) Limited) signed by Senior Environment Officer Mr. Egely Paul and DCDO Ms. Apio Jesca on 10/01/2022 with ESMP costed at UGX. 300,000/-  Screening report for the Construction of a three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: FRAHAH Amuria Enterprises Ltd) signed by Senior Environment Officer Mr. Egely Paul and DCDO Ms. Apio Jesca on 10/01/2022 with ESMP costed at UGX. 300,000/-  Screening report for the Fencing of the production block at the District Headquarters signed by the SEO and DCDO on 14/01/2022 with ESMP costed at UGX. 500,000/-	3



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	Planting of trees to act as wind breakers had been costed for in the respective BOQs for the construction of the three-stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor- Junja Holdings (U) limited) and construction of the three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: FRAHAH Amuria enterprises Ltd) DDEG financed projects.	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	There was no evidence of any land ownership document provided during assessment time.	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 Environmental and social monitoring and supervision reports provided by the Ag. DNRO/SEO and DCDO during the assessment. The SEO provided a combined quarterly monitoring and supervision report for all the DDEG projects which he did without the DCDO.  The SEO and DCDO informed the assessment team that no funds are always allocated for project monitoring and supervision.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There were no Environmental and Social Compliance certificates provided during assessment time.  However, only the Ag. DNRO/SEO signed on the contractor payment certificate. There Was no space for the DODO\'s signature.  Payment certificate for Construction of a three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: Junja Holdings (U) Limited) signed by Senior Environment Officer Mr. Egely Paul only on 26/04/2022 and payment effected on 30/06/2022.  Payment certificate for Construction of a three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: FRAHAH Amuria Enterprises Ltd) signed by Senior Environment Officer Mr. Egely Paul only on 13/06/2022 and payment effected on 30/06/2022.  Payment certificate for the Fencing of the production block at the District Headquarters signed by the SEO only on 13/06/2022.	0

## Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was evidence that the LG had carried out monthly reconciliation of the following bank Accounts as on 31st October 2022/2023</p> <p>Revenue Account at Bank of Uganda, General Fund Account at DFC Soroti Treasury Single Account with Bank Of Uganda was reconciled by the LG up to end FY</p> <p>2021/2022 but after closure of FY 2021/2022, Bank of Uganda took over the responsibility of reconciling the Single Treasury Account</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was evidence that the LG had produced all the four Quarterly internal audit reports in FY 2021/2022 as indicated below</p> <p>1st Quarter internal audit report dated 5th January 2022</p> <p>2nd Quarter internal audit report 18th February 2022</p> <p>3rd Quarter internal audit report dated 20th June 2022</p> <p>4th Quarter internal audit report dated 20th July 2022</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence by way of two letters dated 3rd November 2022 that the LG had provided information to the Chairperson of the Council and LGPAC on the Status of implementation of two internal audit reports / findings The LG had acted on 1st and 2nd internal audit reports against the requirement of all the four reports</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY 2021/2022 were submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC had reviewed only 1st and 2nd internal audit reports against the requirement of all the four reports.</p> <p>The Performance Assessment Team found out from the Clerk to Council that LGPAC failed to review and follow up on all internal audit reports because of inadequate funding</p> <p>1st Quarter internal audit report submitted to Accounting Officer on 14th January 2022 and LGPAC on 14th January 2022 2nd Quarter internal audit report submitted to Accounting Officer on 18th February 2022 and LGPAC on 18th February 2022 3rd Quarter</p> <p>internal audit report submitted to Accounting Officer on 19th July 2022 and LGPAC on 19th July 2022</p>	0

## Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Local revenue budget FY 2021/2022 UGX 157,354,000 page 1 of approved budget FY 2021/2022 Local revenue collected UGX 217,798,966 page 8 of Draft Final Accounts</p> <p>FY 2021/2022</p> <p>UGX 217,798,966 X100 = 138%</p> <p>UGX 157,354,000</p> <p>% of Local revenue collected against planned was 138% resulting into a Surplus of positive</p> <p>38%</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The local revenue for the FY 2020/2021 was UGX 211,344,273 as was reported on page 9 of the Final Accounts for 2020/2021. It increased to UGX 217,798,966 in 2021/2022 and the resulting increment was UGX 6,454,693</p> <p>Percentage increment was (6,454,693/211,344,273) X 1000= 3%</p> <p>Increase was 3% which was less than 5%</p>	0
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>UGX 24,030,000 was subjected to Sharing between HLG and LLGS (source authenticated schedule provided by the CFO) UGX19,959,500 was remitted to LLGS</p> <p>UGX19,959,500/24,030,000 X 100</p> <p>UGX 24,030,000</p> <p>The LG remitted 83% to all 11 LLG share of Local revenue during FY 2021/2022 , For instance</p> <p>Obalanga sub county received UGX 1,170,000</p> <p>Acowa Sub County received UGX 1,235,000</p> <p>Alito sub county received UGX 780,000</p> <p>Note; Note all local revenue is sharable i.e property tax, bidding fees among others</p>	2

## Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer on 18th January 2022 and published on the procurement Notice Board. The sampled awarded contracts were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 3 stance drainable pit latrine at District headquarter awarded to Junia Holdings (U) Ltd at UGX 17,176,000.</li> <li>• Construction of 3-stance drainable pit latrine District headquarter awarded to Frahah Amuria Enterprises Ltd at UGX 13,995,133</li> <li>Fencing of production block awarded to Sovia Engineering services Ltd at UGX 29,873,529</li> </ul>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Performance Assessment results and implications were published on the Budget website on 23rd September 2021. Some of the results were: Accountability 83%, Cross Cutting Performance measures 55% Education Performance measures 68% Water Performance measures 63%</p>	2
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 feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted radio talk show was held on 22nd September 2021 at Youth FM Radio Station in Amuria Town. The objective of the talk show was to sensitize the public on ways to cope up with negative impact of COVID 19 in the Community. The panelists included the Deputy RDC District Health Officer and District Communication Officer</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 evidence that the LG had made publicly available information relating to Approved Local Taxes on Website. The said information was published on the Website on 11th May 2021,</p> <p>However, the aforesaid information was devoid of Collection and appeal procedures as required. The issue was highlighted during the exit meeting</p>	0
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>LG had prepared a report dated 19th October ref CR/901/8 in reference to IGG report dated 23rd July, 2021. The IGG had received complaints that there were irregular deductions of Salaries of Health Workers in Kapelebyong District which needed to be rectified by the District. In the aforesaid report the LG had taken appropriate action that the wrong assignments with wrong Salary Scales of Health Workers were ended in August 2021 and their salaries for July 2021 were adjusted. The matter was administratively handled</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG PLE pass rate declined between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 8.62% as shown below;</p> <p>2019</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>81+1394+1186=2661</p> <p><math>2661/3625 \times 100 = 73.40\%</math></p> <p>However it should be noted that by 2019 Kapelebyong was not yet a district, but was part of Amuria DLG.</p> <p>2020</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>10+578+547=1135</p> <p><math>1135/1752 \times 100 = 64.78\%</math></p> <p><math>64.78\% - 73.40\% = -8.62\%</math> decline.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG UCE pass rate improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 10.92% as shown below;</p> <p>2019</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>19+167+333=519</p> <p><math>519/1107 \times 100 = 46.88\%</math></p> <p>However it should be noted that by 2019 Kapelebyong was not yet a district, but was part of Amuria DLG.</p> <p>2020</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>18+122+149=289</p> <p>289</p> <p><math>289/500 \times 100 = 57.8\%</math></p> <p><math>57.8\% - 46.88\% = 10.92\%</math> improvement.</p>	3

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This will be assessed when the verified LLG assessment results become available in January 2023</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>A total of Ushs 133,039,000 of the education development grant was used on eligible activities as evidenced below;</p> <p>LG Approved budget estimates FY 2021/2022 Vote:627 Kapelebyong DLG generated on 5th July 2021 at 05:07, page 30</p> <p>-classroom construction and rehabilitation at Alito PS103,000,000</p> <p>-latrine construction and rehabilitation at Ajeleik PS and Odiding PS at 30,039,000</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Verification of the following sampled vouchers reveled that the Environment officer and CDO did not sign the payment certificates as indicated below</p> <p>Voucher N0 44584139 dated 29th June 2022 paid to Smart Agro (U) Ltd amounting to UGX 7,144,000 for construction of 4 classroom block at Alito P/S, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on final payment certificate</p> <p>Voucher N0 44584178 dated 29th June 2022 paid to Aliwar General works (U) Ltd amounting to UGX 38,974,475 for fencing Akomoroti Seed School, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on final payment certificate</p> <p>Voucher N0 44499740 dated 13th June 2022 paid to Aliwar General works amounting to UGX 63,925,183 for construction of classroom block at Alito P/S, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on final payment certificate</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled Education sector projects were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reroofing of a 2 classroom block at Alito P/S budgeted at UGX 19,000,000, actual was UGX 19,000,000 with a variation of UGX 0 represented by 0%</li> <li>• Construction of a 2 classroom block, office and store in Alito budgeted at UGX 98,000,000, actual was UGX 76,000,000 with a variation of UGX 22,000,000 represented by – 22.4%</li> <li>• Construction of a 3 stance drainable pit latrine at Angatuny P/S budgeted at UGX 13,500,000, actual was UGX 17,925,233 with a variation of 4,425,233 represented by 32.8%.</li> </ul> <p>The variations for two of the reviewed projects were outside the range of +/- 20% as per requirement</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</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>As per the latest copy of Inspection progress report on construction of Akoromit seed secondary School dated 27th June 2022 compiled by the DE, the percentage of works done was not indicated, therefore the assessment team was not able to establish the percentage of works completed, However a review of payment certificate N0.1 issued on 17th June 2022, 30% of the works were completed</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>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 district had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. The district had a total of 40 schools and according to the guidelines, each school was supposed to have a minimum of 7 teacher giving a total requirement of 280 teachers (40x7)</p> <p>From the Human Resource Office, it was established that the District had a total of 343 teachers.</p> <p><math>(343/280) \times 100 = 122.5\%</math></p> <p>The LG therefore had a teacher staffing ratio of over 100%.</p>	3

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

The LG consolidated Assets register 2020/2021 dated 20th April 2021 that captured assets (The assets included; 786 classrooms, 291 latrines, 12,693 desks, 37 laboratories 654 teachers\` houses) for the 68 UPE schools.And 7 UCE schools was in place.

The LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 dated 12th May 2022 that captured assets (The assets included; 790 classrooms, 298 latrines, 12,893 desks, 38 laboratories 664 teachers\` houses) for the 68 UPE schools.And 7 UCE schools was in place.

This implies that in both Financial years, 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format.

Percentage of schools that met DES guidelines was:

Total schools that complied/total(UPE & USE)\*100

$75/75*100=100\%$

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The PAT was able to access a teacher deployment list dated 2nd August 2022.

From the sampled schools;

Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC had 10 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.

AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC had 14 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.

Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC had 12 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.



5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 that captured assets (The assets included; 790 classrooms, 298 latrines, 12,893 desks, 38 laboratories, 664 teachers houses) for the 68 UPE schools. And 7 UCE schools was in place.</p> <p>From sampled schools;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC had 7 classrooms, 1 latrine, 164 desks, 4 teachers houses</p> <p>Akore Acowa PS in Akore TC 16 classrooms, 2 latrines, 110 desks, 3 teachers houses</p> <p>Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC 11 classrooms, 1 latrines, 126 desks, 7 teachers houses</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 40 annual budgeting and performance reports were handed in past the deadline of January 30th</p> <p>For example all the samples schools namely; Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC, Akore Acowa PS in Akore TC, and Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC all handed in in February 2022</p>	0
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 availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment from the DEO indicating that meetings or trainings were held to support to prepare and implement SIPs.</p> <p>From sampled schools;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC and AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC did not have SIPs. Only Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC had one</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>The LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the 40 registered schools from the previous FY year. This was evidenced by a letter from the CAO to the Permanent Secretary on submission of enrolment data for primary and secondary schools for Amuria DLG, dated 5th October, 2021, Ref:CR/213/29</p> <p>40/40*100=100%</p>	4
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>LG approved budget estimates</p> <p>FY 2021/22 with a wage bill of UGX 3,281,776,000 as per the Kapelebyong District, vote: 853, Page 33, not dated as a result of system issues according to the planner.</p> <p>This was for 383 teachers on ground as per the staff list as at 2nd August 2021, and This was for 40 UPE schools in the current financial year as per the staff list.</p> <p>383/40=9.6 teachers per school</p>	4
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>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 2nd August 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC had 10 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC had 14 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p> <p>Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC had 12 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p>	3
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Teacher deployment data was disseminated and publicized on the LG notice board dated 7th November 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools namely;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC, AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC, and</p> <p>Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC, teacher deployment data had been displayed on the respective school notice boards though it was not dated.</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC had displayed 10 teachers, AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC displayed 14 teachers, while Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC displayed 12 teachers</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the primary school head teachers had been appraised during the FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no information availed to assessment team during the time of assessment</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>None of the staff in the Education department had been appraised during the financial year 2021-2022.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Education and sports department Capacity building and Training plan for FY 2021/2022 dated 15th March 2022 prepared by the Ag DEO.</p> <p>Training activities included among many others;</p> <p>-training of games masters built to manage games and sports under covid19 -3,000,000</p> <p>-training of head teachers on appraisal system &amp; HIV at the workplace -15,000,000</p> <p>-Organizing seminars for 500 supervising and monitoring SNE activities in schools - 3,000,000</p>	2

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually as per the document below;</p> <p>Letter from the CAO to the permanent secretary on submission of planning statistics to facilitate generation of local government inductive planning figures (IPFS) dated 5th October 2021. Ref CR/213/29 for</p> <p>40 UPE schools with 41,845 pupils and</p> <p>7 UCE schools with 3,737 students</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>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: 627 Kapelebyong DLG generated on 5th July 2021 at 05:07 page 33</p> <p>Monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education was allocated 20,056,000.</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
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>LG Submitted warrants for School Capitation Grant within 5 days after receipt of cash Limit as indicated below</p> <p>1st Quarter Cash Limit date Amount 12th July 2021 U GX 188,396 667 Warrant Date 16th July 2021 Ant U GX 188,396, 667</p> <p>3rd Quarter Cash Limit date Amount 6th Jan 2022 U GX 188,396 667 Warrant Date 10th Jan 2022</p> <p>4th Quarte Cash Limit date Amount 12nd April 2022 U GX 188,396 667 Warrant Date 15th April 2022 Amt U GX 188,396,667</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Q1- 121,976,833 dated 13th January 2022</p> <p>Q3- 188,396,667 dated 20th January 2022</p> <p>Q4- 188,396,667 dated 4th May 2022</p> <p>From sampled schools;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC</p> <p>Term 3-5,057,000</p> <p>Term 1- 5,057,000</p> <p>Term 2-5,057,000</p> <p>AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC</p> <p>Term 3-8,975,523</p> <p>Term 1-7,227,33</p> <p>Term 2-7,227,33</p> <p>Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC did not display its capitation releases</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Inspection work plan for FY 2021/2022 prepared by the DIS dated 3rd September, 2021</p> <p>Activities included among many others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-school inspection</li> <li>-monitoring and evaluation of observation of covid19 standard operating procedures(SOPS) in schools</li> <li>-induction of Head Teachers on the national teachers policy</li> <li>-refresher training for P.7 Subject teachers on test item writing</li> <li>-refresher training of early grade reading 1,2,3 teachers</li> <li>-performance review meetings with Head Teachers, Deputy Head Teachers and Directors of schools</li> <li>- PLE performance review meeting</li> <li>-refresher training for games and sports teachers</li> </ul> <p>13th May 2022 meeting on inspection preparation held at AkoreAcowa PS. Minute 6 where an inspection plan for Term 2 2022 was discussed. Priority was given to 40 government aided primary schools and eventually community and private schools</p> <p>6 people were identified to do the inspection of which each was to go to 10 primary schools.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <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>Only Term 3, 2021 inspection report was available dated 7th February 2021 where inspection was done between 10th January- 15th January 2021. 40 schools were inspected.</p> <p>Term 1 and Term 2 2022 inspection reports were missing</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,  Score: 2 or else, score: 0	Only one meeting was held to discuss one inspection report for Term 3, 2021. The findings from the other 2 terms were not discussed.  2nd June 2022 meeting for sharing of inspection findings/ reports. Min 5/2022 where findings included; poor learners attendance; poor attendance of some teachers; scheming and lesson planning not duly done by most teachers; poor classroom environment; late arrival of teachers among many others. Recommendations included; absentee teachers to face rewards and sanctions committee; repair broken furniture; recruit more teachers; lobby construction of more pit latrines in some schools	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0	Only Term 3, 2021 and Term 1 2022 inspection reports were handed in to DES on 12th August 2022.  There was no evidence that Term 2 2022 inspection report had been handed in to DES	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0	The committee responsible for Education met and discussed service delivery issues in the Education sector , for instance;  Committee held a meeting on 25th November 2021 , and discussed the issue of provision of solar panel to schools to enhance effective learning and teaching  Committee held a meeting on 12th May 2022, and discussed the issue of dilapidated schools that needed renovation	2
11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners  <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,  <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	9th July 2021 teachers and Head Teachers meeting. Min 03/07/2021 effects of covid19 in the school were discussed; learners were encouraged to borrow the home study learning materials to read and return  10th July 2021 monitoring meeting for Acumet cluster by the DIS whose purpose among many others was to ascertain the effect of covid19 on the school enrolment; to make sure that learners are allowed to borrow study materials for specific periods of time.	2

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 that captured assets(The assets included; 790 classrooms, 298 latrines, 12,893 desks, 38 laboratories 664 teachers houses) for the 68 UPE schools.And 7 UCE schools was in place.</p> <p>From sampled schools;</p> <p>Akum-Acowa PS in Acowa SC had 7 classrooms, 1 latrine, 164 desks,4 teachers houses</p> <p>AkoreAcowa PS in Akore TC 16 classrooms, 2 latrines, 110 desks, 3 teachers houses</p> <p>Obalanga PS in Obalanga SC 11 classrooms, 1 latrines, 126 desks, 7 teachers houses</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG carried out desk appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021, and some of the projects included;</p> <p>8 new classrooms in 5 primary schools were constructed</p> <p>2 class block at Amoni P/S were completed</p> <p>% stance pit latrines in 4 P/S constructed</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG carried out field appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021, and some of the projects included;</p> <p>8 new classrooms in 5 primary schools were constructed</p> <p>2 class block at Amoni P/S were completed</p> <p>% stance pit latrines in 4 P/S constructed</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the Procurement Plan for the FY 2022/2023, which was approved by CAO on 15th September 2022, the LG had incorporated the Construction of Alito Seed Secondary School.</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, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></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. Reroofing of a 4 classroom block at Alito P/S was approved on 18th January 2022 under meeting minute N0 CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36</li> <li>2. Construction of Akoromit seed secondary school was approved on 11th April 2022 under meeting minute N0 CC/April/2021-2022/Apr/58 and Solicitor General clearance dated 15th June 2022, ref ;AG/SRO/C/1/22</li> <li>3. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Alito P/S was approved on 18th January 2022 under meeting minute N0 CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>LG had proof of the PIT for Education sector projects properly established as per letter of appointment by CAO dated 21st January 2022 and 21st July 2022. list of members included:</p> <p>ApioJesca- DCDO</p> <p>Egelu Paul - NRO</p> <p>Oule Charles-DE ( project Manager)</p> <p>Okare Samson- DEO (contract Manager, Education sector)</p> <p>Edeu Jesse-Clerk of works</p> <p>Eteru Moses- Labour officer</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG followed standard technical designs provided by the MoES; a site visit to construction of Akoromit Seed Secondary school, 2 classroom blocks were being constructed and each classroom measuring 8x6m, the roof structure was made out of mild steel members, each class iwas provided with 6 windows measuring 1.2 x1.5m as per the design provided</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>LG did not provide any copies of minutes of site meetings at the time of the assessment</p>	0

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>	There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team to show that joint technical supervisions were carried out for the education sector projects	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>The DLG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reroofing of a 4 classroom block at Alito P/S by Smart Agro (U) SMS Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment (7,144,000/=) issued on 15th June 2022 recommended by DEO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 29th June, 2022 under voucher NO 44584139</li> <li>• Fencing of Akoromit Seed Secondary school was certified by District Engineer for Final payment (33,974,475/=) issued on 14th June 2022 recommended by DEO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 29th June, 2022 under voucher NO 44584178</li> </ul> <p>.Construction of 2 classroom block at alito P/S by Aliwar general works (U) Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 2nd payment (63,925,183/=) issued on 3rd May ,2022 recommended by DEO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 13th June 2022 under voucher NO 44499740</p>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	A copy of the education sector plan was not availed to the assessment team for review at the time of assessment	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>From the project file for Construction of Akoromit Seed Secondary School, there was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA as shown below;</p> <p>Evaluation report dated 30th March 2022, contracts committee decision dated 11th April 2022 under min NO CC/April/2021-2022/Appr/58 and contract agreement signed on 16th June 2022</p>	1

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>The LG never had a centralized grievance log book however it had initially a labour book as seen from the top book cover which was just canceled and replaced with grievance log book name.</p> <p>The complaints log book had no clear and systematic information and complaints referral path with columns of date case and action taken only.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green schools and energy and water conservation</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Only one of the three projects had an ESMP developed and it was incorporated in the BOQ. That is, the construction of 2 classroom block with office and store in Alito primary school. Only planting of trees was put in the BOQ.</p> <p>Projects which had no ESMP developed were;</p> <p>Construction of Akoromit Seed Secondary School (Phase II)</p> <p>Construction of two stance drainable pit latrine at Alito Primary School</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There were no documentary evidences provided for land ownership of the sites where the sampled education project are located.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence in the form of monthly monitoring reports. The LG was not providing funds for monitoring of projects by DCDO and SEO</p>	0

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

There were no Environment and Social compliance certificates signed by the DCDO and SEO. The DCDO was not signing on the payment Certificates. Only the SEO/ Ag. DNRO was signing on the contractor payment certificate.

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 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). Kapelebyong HCIV:</p> <p>FY 2020/2021 deliveries = 1003 cases,  FY 2021/2022 deliveries: 952 cases  increase in utilization = -51  % decrease <math>51/1003 \times 100 = -5\%</math></p> <p>2). Achowa HC III</p> <p>FY 2020/2021 deliveries = 775 cases,  FY 2021/2022 : 773 cases increase in utilization = 2  % decrease <math>2/775 \times 100 = -0,25\%</math></p> <p>3).Obalanga HC III</p> <p>FY 2020/2021 Deliveries = 660 cases,  FY 2021/2022 deliveries: 521 causes decrease in utilization = -139  % decrease <math>139/660 \times 100 = -2.1\%</math>  average decrease = <math>5 + 0.25 + 2.1/3</math>  gives -2.45% which was below the threshold</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted for UGX 759,500,000 and spent all the health development grant as indicated below;</p> <p>Upgrade of Okoritok HCII -HCIII budgeted for UGX 617,000,000 and spent all the budgeted amount on the project.</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Alyakamer HCIII, budgeted for UGX 142,500,000 and spent the same.</p>	2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Verification of the following sampled vouchers reveled that the Environment officer and CDO did not sign the payment certificates as indicated below</p> <p>Voucher N0 43885850 dated 18th June 2022 paid to Sovia Engineering services Ltd amounting to UGX 13,868,290 for construction of staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on final payment certificate</p> <p>Voucher N0 44584186 dated 29th June 2022 paid to Cab (U) Ltd amounting to UGX 173,500,500 for upgrade of Aeket HCII-HCIII, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on 1st payment certificate</p> <p>Voucher N0 44584137 dated 29th June 2022 paid to Ange and Cathy Enterprises amounting to UGX 32,326,216 for rennovation of staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV, CDO and Environment officer did not sign on final payment certificate</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled Health sector projects were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of staff house at Kapelebyong HC IV budgeted at UGX 39,459,000, actual was UGX 38,138,898 with a variation of UGX 1,320,102 represented by 3.3%</li> <li>• Construction of a 2 stance pit latrine at Airabet HCII budgeted at UGX 12,000,000, actual was UGX 11,675,964 with a variation of UGX 324,036 represented by – 2.7%</li> <li>• Completion of a fence at Kapelebyong HCIV budgeted at UGX 20,000,000, actual was UGX 18,436,320 with a variation of 1,563,680 represented by 7.8%.</li> </ul> <p>The variations for the reviewed projects were within the range of +/- 20%as per requirement</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the project status report compiled by the DE on 10th June 2022 that was reviewed by the assessor, the percentage of works completed was not indicated, therefore the assessment team was not able to establish status of works covered. however a review of payment certificate N0 1 issued by the Engineer On 16th June 2022, 30% of the works were completed</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>According to the approved staff structure of HCIII's and HCIV's it indicated 258 and 108 were filled at the time of assessment representing;</p> <p><math>108/258*100 = 41.86\%</math></p>	0
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health infrastructure construction projects met the approved MOH designs. A site visit to Koritok HCII - HCIII confirmed that, the doors were of size 1.5x2.1m as specified in the design, windows were of size 1.2x1.5m as per the design, sampled room sizes (Male ward) was 5x3.5m as specified in the design, and wall thickness met the specifications in the design</p>	2
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on filled health workers' positions at the district was found to be accurate and consistent with the staff found at the sampled health centers which included;</p> <p>At Obalanga HC III, the DHO's list had 14 and the same number was verified at the Health Facility</p> <p>At Achowa HC IV, the DHO's staff list indicated 14 staff and the same number was verified at the Health facility by checking into duty rosters and the list availed from the file.</p> <p>At Kapelebyong HC IV the list indicated DHO's with 26 staff and the same number of staff was accurate as evidenced from the duty roaster availed.</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The projects on HC upgrades was ongoing and not yet functional</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &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>The health facilities prepared and submitted their budgets and work plans past the deadline of 31st March 2021 as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1).Obalanga HCIII, prepared and submitted annual work plan and budget FY 2021/2022 by the Facility In charge on 5th November 2021,</li> <li>2).Kapelebyong HCIV ,prepared and submitted annual work plan and budget by facility in-charge on 15th November 2021</li> <li>3). Achowa HC III prepared and submitted Annual work plan and budget by facility in-charge on 17th November 2021</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). Kapelebyong HCIV, was prepared and submitted on 14th June 2021</li> <li>2). Achowa HC III was prepared and submitted on 10th June 2021</li> <li>3) Obalanga HC III was prepared and submitted on 16th June 2021</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 4th March 2021 for the health department, issues to address included, upgrade of health facilities, recruitment of health staff, sanitation improvement in health facilities, renovation of staff houses</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 implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence to show that health facilities submitted up to date monthly reports as illustrated below

Achowa HCIII submitted ;

Q1 on 7th October 2021

Q2 on 7th January 2022

Q3 on 6th April 2022

Q4 on 7th July 2022

Obalanga HCIII submitted

Q1 on 6th October 2021

Q2 on 6th January 2022

Q3 on 3rd April 2022

Q4 on 5th July 2022

Kapelebyong HCIV submitted

Q1 on the 5th October 2021

Q2 on 7th January 2022

Q3 on 5th April 2022

Q4 on 6th July 2022

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;  
· Achowa HCIII submitted ;

Q1 on 10th October 2021

Q2 on 13th January 2022

Q3 on 9th April 2022

Q4 on 14th June 2022

Obalanga HCIII submitted

Q1 on 9th October 2021

Q2 on 12th January 2022

Q3 on 7th April 2022

Q4 on 4th July 2022

Kapelebyong HCIV submitted

Q1 on the 7th October 2021

Q2 on 9th January 2022

Q3 on 6th April 2022

Q4 on 4th July 2022

Therefore, there was evidence that Health facilities submitted Invoices timely

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 LG timely submitted quarterly RBF invoices indicated below;

Q1 on 20th October 2021

Q2 on 19th January 2022

Q3 on 21st April 2022

Q4 on 14th June 2022

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 8th October 2021</p> <p>Q2 was submitted on the 14th January 2022</p> <p>Q3 was submitted on the 10th April 2022</p> <p>Q4 was submitted on the 15th 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>There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team to confirm that LG developed PIP for the weakest performing facilities</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team at the time of the assessment</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>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 UGX 1,282,862,000 for the Health workers and, work plan for the financial year 2021-2022 Kapelebyong Local Government prepared by DHO 7th May 2021 and approved by the by CAO on 22nd December 2021, page 1 of the approved budget</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 Kapelebyong DLG staff audit, for the health department, the approved structure was 258 staff, the filled positions were 108, therefore the percentage deployment; 108/258x100 representing 42% which was below 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Achowa HCIII, duty roaster dated 1st November 2022, 14 staff were deployed</li> <li>· Obalanga HCIII, duty roaster dated 1ST October 2022, 14 staff were deployed</li> <li>· Kapelebyong HCIV, duty roaster dated 1th November 2022, 26 staff were deployed</li> </ul> <p>As per the duty roasters 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> <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 of Achowa HC III, Obalanga HC III and Kapelebyong HCIV) was in tandem with the deployment list from the DHO's office, dated 1st July 2022.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

There was evidence that annual performance appraisal of all healthy facility in charges against the agreed performance plan was carried out as follows;

1. Ms. Anyume Jacent of Kapelebyong Health Center VI was appraised on 15/8/2022 by Mr. David Lubuuka the CAO

2. Ms. Acanit Jessica the in charge of Alito Health Center was appraised on 20 July 2022 by Ms. Magret Walakira DHO.

3. Ms. Apio Jesca Enrolled Nurse and in charge for Angerepo Health Center II was appraised by Ms. Walakira Margaret DHO.

4. Mr. Cherupo Peter Enrolled Nurse for Okoboi HC II was appraised by Onyanga James and signed Ms. Walakira Margret On 20th July 2022.

5. Mr. Ebau Pius the Senior Clinical Officer was appraised by Walakira Margret on 26/July/2022.

Omagor lazaro was appraised by walakira Margret on 30/6/2021.

All the presented appraisal reports indicated that the staff were appraised past the due date of 30th June thus not complaint.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

The District had 44 health facility workers. Out of the 44, 10 personal files were sampled and there was evidence that these 10 had been fully appraised by their respective health facility in charges. These were as follows;

1. Mr. Eweru Richard, a Clinical Officer was appraised by Dr. Ewedu James on 20th/July/2022.
2. Mr. Omooja Jonah Lab technician was appraised by Mr. Omuju Richard in charge 6/July/2022.
3. Ms. Arionget Christine enrolled Midwife Obalanga HC III appraised by Omuju Richard 15/June/2022
4. Mr. Ibiara Faith the Lab Assistant was appraised by Mr. Ebau Pius on 7/July/2022.
5. Ms. Aleso Caroline the Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Mr. Ebau Pius in charge 6/July/2022
6. Mr. Esemu Stephen potter appraised by Mr. Cherup Peter on 17/July/2022
7. Mr. Okale Michael Nursing Assistant was appraised by Mr. Apiso Jesca 30/June/ 2022
8. Mr Obama Moses Esenu the office attendant was appraised by M.s Akeka Doreen on 29/June/2022.
9. Health inspector from Kapelebyong HC VI Ms. Alinga Jessica was appraised by Ewedu James on 29/June/ 2022.
10. Mr. Onyanga James Nursing Officer was appraised by Ewedu James on 27/June/ 2022.

1

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

The was no evidence of corrective measures or actions taken based on the appraisal reports recommendations.

0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted trainings as indicated below;</p> <p>A report on the training of midwives and clinicians on essential maternity and newborn clinical care guidelines dated 29th July 2021</p> <p>A report on training of recorders during polio mass campaigns dated 11th April 2022</p> <p>A report on training of VHTs regarding home based care on covid 19 dated 12th October 2021</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Documented in the training logbook opened on 1st January 22, some of the trainings included; essential maternity and newborn clinical care guidelines for clinicians and midwives, clinical records /data management , home based care for covid 19 patients</p>	1

**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 Kapelebyong forwarded a list of HCs which benefited from PHC grants to the MOH on 25th October 2021. This was beyond the timeline of 30th September 2021.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Total PHC grant was UGX 367,839,000</p> <p>allocation to monitoring was UGX 46,310,000</p> <p>Percentage allocation to monitoring was <math>(46,310,000/367,839,000) \times 100</math></p> <p>giving 13% which was below the requirement</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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> <p>Q1 date of release was 2 9th July 2021 and date of warranting was 29th July 2021</p> <p>Q2 date of release was 3rd October 2021 and date of warranting was 3rd October 2021</p> <p>Q3 date of release was 19th January 2022 and date of warranting was 19th January 2022</p> <p>Q4 date of release was 4th May 2022 and date of warranting 4th May 2022</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>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 provided evidence of timely warranting as per the schedule prepared by the district accountant</p> <p>Q1 date of release was 2 9th July 2021 and date of warranting was 29th July 2021</p> <p>Q2 date of release was 3rd October 2021 and date of warranting was 3rd October 2021</p> <p>Q3 date of release was 19th January 2022 and date of warranting was 19th January 2022</p> <p>Q4 date of release was 4th May 2022 and date of warranting 4th May 2022</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>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>LG provided documentary evidence as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 date of receipt of the expenditure limits was 29th July 2021 and publicized on 30th July 2021</p> <p>Q2 date of receipt of the expenditure limits was 3rd November 2021 and publicized on 3rd November 2021</p> <p>Q3 date of receipt of the expenditure limits was 19th January 2022 and publicized on 20th January 2022</p> <p>Q4 date of receipt of the expenditure limits was 4th May 2022 and was publicized on 5th May 2022</p>	1
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>LG provided evidence that recommendations of DHMT were implemented</p> <p>there was a warning letter written to Okiring Corcus guard for Acwa HCIII for abscondment of duty dated 21th June 2022</p> <p>There was a letter of disciplinary action against Aisu Justine enrolled nurse dated 7th December 2021</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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 30th December 2021 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, Teso Cultural union, DPC</p> <p>Q3minutes dated 24th March 2022 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, Teso Cultral union</p> <p>Q4 minutes dated 15th June 2022 at District Council Hall, all incharges attended, RDC, CDO, RHITES, Teso Cultural union</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the lower Health facilities examples included;</p> <p>Q1 support supervision report on quality improvement facilities in health facilities compiled by DHO on 8th August 2021</p> <p>Q2, report on covid 19 support supervision and vaccine uptake monitoring dated 14th January 2022 compiled by DHO</p> <p>Q3 Report on Technical support supervision visits to Health units dated 24th April 2022</p> <p>Q4 Integrated support supervision of Health facilities dated 25th June 2022</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There 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 Kapelebyong HCIV HSD</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>It was evidenced by a report on the integrated support supervision to lower-level health centers in Kapelebyong HSD dated 15th May 2022 prepared by in-charge Kapelebyong HCIV HSD.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided proof of use of results from recommendations as illustrated through ,sanctioning some of the staff members who were indiscipline who were reporting late for duty, absenteeism and abscondment</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>This was evidenced by EMHS SPARS report dated 30th March 2022 by the District medicines management supervisor , DHT review meeting on medicines management dated 15th September 2021 by the sector Biostat</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the budget release for health department of 2021/2022 , non-wage was 460,310,000  a) allocations to health promotion was 268,680,000  percentage allocation = <math>(260,680000/460,310,000) \times 100 = 56\%</math>  which was above the 30% requirement</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence presented regarding health promotion and prevention ,  A report on integrated child health days dated 25th November 2021,  A report on covid 19 second round support supervision dated 14th January 2022	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There were minutes of meeting held on 11th August 2021 by DHT discussing support supervision report, general report on community sensitisation by District leaders dated 10th November 2021	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 and machinery updated 14th September 2022, RHITES and 2 motor cycles donated by TASO	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;  Sanitation improvement in Health facilities  Upgrade of Aeret HCII-HCIII  Recruitment of health staff  Renovation of staff houses  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 evidence to show that LG carried out field appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021. An example of the projects appraised was upgrade of Aeret HCII - HCIII</p>	1
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>All projects were screened for Environment and Social risks however, one of the projects, that is, the upgrading of Aeket HCII to HCIII required developing an Environmental Project Brief according to Schedule 4 part 1 of the National Environment Act of 2019. Instead an ESMP was prepared.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>DHO submitted the Health sector procurement plan to PDU on 25th July 2022 which was beyond the 30th April deadline</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>-Construction of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Alito HCII was submitted on 27th July 2021, which was within the required timeframe</li> <li>- Upgrade of Aeket HCII to HCIII was submitted on 30th July 2021</li> <li>-Completion of a fence at Kapelebyong HCIV was submitted on 30th July 2021</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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>• Construction of a 2 stance drainable pit latrine at Alito HCIII, was approved by contracts committee on 18th January 2022 under minute ; CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36</li> <li>• Upgrade of Aeket HCII-HCIII was approved on 4th April 2022 under meeting minute N0: SIRO/552/012/CC/FY/2021-2022 and Solicitor General's clearance ref 1/52/8 dated 6th May 2022</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>LG had proof of the PIT for Education sector projects properly established as per letter of appointment by CAO dated 21st January 2022 and 21st July 2022. list of members included</p> <p>Apio Jesca- DCDO</p> <p>Egelu Paul - NRO</p> <p>Oule Charles-DE ( project Manager)</p> <p>DrEdeu James- DHO (contract Manager, Health sector)</p> <p>Oluka Ismail-Clerk of works</p> <p>Eteru Moses- Labour officer</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health infrastructure construction projects met the approved MOH designs. A site visit to Koritok HCII-HCIII confirmed that, the doors were of size 1.5x2.1m as specified in the design, windows were of size 1.2x1.5m as per the design, sampled room sizes (Male ward) was 5x 3.5m as specified in the design, and wall thickness met the specifications in the design</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>LG did not provide documentary evidence to the assessment to that clerk of works maintained daily records that were consolidated into weekly reports</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>LG did not provide documentary evidence that monthly site meetings were held.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>LG did not provide evidence of joint technical supervision of works by relevant officers</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Completion of staff house by Sovia Engineering services was certified by District Engineer for payment (13,868,290/=) issued on 4th May 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and effected on 18th June 2022 under voucher N0 43885850, payment done after 44 days</li> <li>2.Upgrade of Aeket HCII-HCIII by CAB(U) Ltd was certified by District Engineer 1st payment (173,500,500/=) issued on 16th June 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and effected on 29th June 2022 under voucher N0 44584186</li> <li>3.Renovation of staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV by Ange and Cathy Enterprises Ltd was certified by District Engineer 1st payment (32,326,216/=) issued on 6th June 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 29th June 2022, payment effected after 23 days</li> </ol>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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. Upgrade of Aeket HCII-HCIII, evaluation report dated 1st April 2022, minutes of contracts committee decision ref SIRO/552/012/cc/FY/2021-2022 dated 4th April 2022, and contract agreement signed on 6th June 2022</li> <li>2. Completion of fence at Kapelebyong HCIV had, minutes of contracts committee decision ref CC/Nov/2021-2022/appr/19dated 18th January 2022, Evaluation report dated 3rd January 2022 and contract agreement signed on 3rd February 2022</li> <li>3.. Renovation of staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV had, minutes of contracts committee decision ref CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36 dated 18th January 2022, Evaluation report dated 5th January 2022 and contract agreement signed on 23rd March 2022</li> </ol>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</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>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 complaint/ grievance from implementation of health projects.</p> <p>There was no complaint recorded in the grievance log book.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Uganda National Infection Prevention and Control Guidelines 2013 availed by the DHO and Environment Health Officer by assessment time.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence provided from follow-up on the implementation of the medical/Health care waste Guidelines.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	There was a separate budget for Medical waste management budgeted under Implementation of Environment Health Activities and health care waste management.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure		There was no documentary evidence of the existence of a registered company for management of medical waste. From the Health facilities visited;	
			At Kapelebyong HCIV, there was a waste storage house from which all the medical waste is transferred to an open pit and burnt. According to the Ag. In-Charge Anyumel Jacenta (Registered Nurse) they had been burning medical was for a long time and no waste collection company comes to pick medical waste. She instead recommended for construction of an incinerator and fencing of the placenta pit area, completion of the Health facility fence and construction of more staff houses.	
			At Acowa Health Centre 3, all medical waste is burnt in an open pit as seen during the visit to the facility by assessment team.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence in form of training reports provided by the DHO and Environment Health Officer though they claimed to have carried out trainings on medical waste management.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There was evidence of costed ESMPs for the Health projects Sampled however, they were not incorporated in BOQs.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			



16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There were no land ownership documents provided during assessment time.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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.	There were no monthly monitoring and supervision reports provided by assessment time.  The monitoring reports provided were done quarterly.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There were no Environment and Social compliance certificates provided by the SEO and DCDO.  More so, only the SEO was signing on the contractor payment certificates. The DCDO had no space on the payment certificates for signing.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the sector MIS report for access, functionality and population density for 2021/2022, the functionality of water facilities for Kapelebyong District was 97%, which was between 90 and 100%.	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the District Software MIS report for 2021/22, Kapelebyong District had a functionality of water user committees of 85%.	1
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.  If LG average scores is  a. Above 80% score 2  b. 60 -80%: 1  c. Below 60: 0  (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Awaiting the LLGs Assessment Results	0

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

Kapelebyong district had a safe water coverage of 86%. The sub counties below this were Akoromit at 85%, Kapelebyong at 82%, and Okungur at 70%.

For the financial year 2021/22, the LG successfully implemented 9 boreholes out of the planned 10. These were;

1. Akulonyo community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county, DWD 64818

2. Ateleng community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county (DWD 64819

3. Ceele community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county (DWD 64817)

4. Apopong community borehole in Acowa sub county (DWD 64815)

5. Apungure community borehole in Acowa sub county (DWD 64816)

6. Okerai A community borehole in Okungur sub county (DWD 64821)

7. Aeket community borehole in Okungur sub county

8. Akum community borehole in Kapelebyong sub county

9. and Akorimit seed secondary school borehole in Akoromit sub county (DWD 64820)

4 of the 9 implemented boreholes were in the above 3 sub counties.

$4/9 \times 100 = 44.4\%$

This was less than 80%

It was also noted that there was need for the DWO to follow up on the inclusion of the newly created administrative units in the MIS database which included; Acinga sub county from Acowa sub county, Alito sub county from Obalanga sub county, Akore town council from Akoromit sub county, Obalanga town council from Obalanga sub county, and Acowa town council from Acowa sub county.

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>Kapelebyong water department had two WSS investments and these had estimates and contract prices as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 10 boreholes was estimated at UGX 230,000,000 and contracted at UGX 221,663,000 with a variation of 3.62%</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of 4 boreholes was estimated at UGX 40,000,000 and contracted at UGX 39,895,800 with a variation of 0.26%</li> </ol> <p>All the variations were within +/- 20% of the engineer's 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>In 2021/22, Kapelebyong LG planned to construct 10 boreholes but managed to construct 9. It also planned to and rehabilitated 4 boreholes.</p> <p>13 out of the planned 14 works were completed before the end of the financial year;</p> <p><math>(12/14)*100 = 92.9\%</math>.</p>	1
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 sources was 97% in 2020/21 and also 97% 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The functionality of water and sanitation committees was 85% in 2020/21 and also 85% 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>Three (3) boreholes constructed in 2021/22 were visited and these were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Akum community borehole in Kapelebyong sub county</li> <li>2. Apungure community borehole in Acowa sub county</li> <li>3. Akoromit seed secondary school borehole in Akoromit sub county</li> </ol> <p>All these boreholes were found in place and were functioning as had been reported in the annual progress report.</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>Kapelebyong LG monitored water sources and made monitoring reports for all the four quarters as follows:</p> <p>14th September 2021 for quarter one, 31st December 2021 for quarter two, 7th April 2022 for quarter three and 30th June 2022 for quarter four.</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>The LG water office submitted water source monitoring reports for quarter two on 20th January 2022 and for quarter four on 6th September 2022. It also submitted form 1 reports on the newly constructed boreholes on 6th September 2022.</p> <p>There was no evidence that the LG had submitted monitoring reports for quarter one and quarter three to the Ministry of Water and Environment for updating of the MIS database.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Awaiting the LLGs results in January 2023.</p>	0

## Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	No information was availed to the assessor.	0
6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2	No information was availed to the assessor.	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	The District Water Officer did not appraise the water staff against the agreed performance plans.	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3	No capacity gaps were identified since staff appraisal was not conducted in the 2021/22 financial year.	0

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

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

At the time of planning for financial year 2022/2023, Kapelebyong District had a safe water coverage of 87%. The sub counties with safe water coverage below this were; Akoromit at 84%, Kapelebyong at 83%, and Okungurat 74%.

The Local Government planned to drill 4 boreholes in the sub counties of Okungur (1), Acowa (2) and Kapelebyong (1) each estimated at UGX 25,000,000. It also planned to construct 2 production wells in the sub counties of Okungur and Acowa each estimated at UGX 35,000,000.

Two of the planned boreholes and one production well were allocated to the above sub counties amounting to UGX 85,000,000 out of the entire development budget of UGX 199,515,708.

$$(85,000,000/199,515,708) * 100$$

$$= 42.6\%$$

This was less than 60%

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

Communication was made to the sub counties of Acinga, Acowa, Kapelebyong and Okungur on 8th September, informing them on their water source allocations. Acinga had been allocated one borehole estimated at UGX 25,000,000, Acowa one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and a production well at UGX 35,000,000, Kapelebyong one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and Okungur one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and a production well at UGX 35,000,000

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>	<p>The LG had a total of 441 water facilities according to the information maintained at the District Water Office.</p>	4
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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>In the quarter one monitoring report dated 14th September 2021, all the 441 water facilities had been visited.</p>	
			<p>In the quarter two monitoring report dated 31st December 2021, all the 441 water facilities had been visited.</p>	
			<p>In the quarter three monitoring report dated 7th April 2022, all the 441 water facilities had been visited.</p>	
			<p>And in the quarter four monitoring report dated 30th June 2022, all the 441 water facilities had been visited.</p>	
			<p>There was evidence therefore that more than 95% of all the water facilities were monitored for all the quarters of 2021/22</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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 DWO did not conduct DWSCC meetings in the financial year 2021/22</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>Allocations of water sources per sub county had been displayed on the notice boards at the finance department at the time of assessment, dated 8th July 2022. The sub counties displayed were Acinga, Acowa, Kapelebyong and Okungur.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Acinga had been allocated one borehole estimated at UGX 25,000,000, Acowa one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and a production well at UGX 35,000,000, Kapelebyong one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and Okungur one borehole at UGX 25,000,000 and a production well at UGX 35,000,000</p>	



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 office in 2021/22 was UGX 51,635,083. Of this, UGX 5,275,000 was allocated to stakeholder coordination and UGX 12,981,050 allocated to software activities which included conducting advocacy meetings at the district and sub county level, establishing and training water user committees and conducting sanitation week promotion activities among others. This amounted to UGX 18,256,050  $(18,256,050/51,635,083)*100 = 35.4\%$  This was less than 40%	0
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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.	There was a training report for water user committees that was done on 29th June 2022. Among the issues trained on were the roles and responsibilities of the water user committees, the need to keep good hygiene and sanitation, financial management and accountability among others.  For the visited water facilities of Okum community borehole, Apungure community borehole and Akoromit seed SS borehole, the members of the water user committee interviewed recalled being trained on the said items.	3
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### 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	Kapelebyong LG had a file of form 1 data collection forms for all its water sources for its assets register. This also had facilities that had been implemented in the financial year 2021/22 among which included;  1. Akulonyo community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county, DWD 64818  2. Ateleng community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county (DWD 64819)  3. Ceele community borehole in Acowa sub county, now Acinga sub county (DWD 64817)  4. Apopong community borehole in Acowa sub county (DWD 64815)  5. Apungure community borehole in Acowa sub county (DWD 64816)	4
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG carried out desk appraisals for all projects in the budget as per a report on field and desk appraisal for capital investments for FY 2021/2022 dated 22nd February 2021 and the projects included;</p> <p>10 deep new bore holes were drilled</p> <p>7 bore holes were rehabilitated</p> <p>These WSS investment projects were derived from page 77 and page 184 of the LGDP III ( 2020/2021- 2024/2025)</p>	4
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 LG had community applications for all the boreholes planned for the 2022/23 financial year. These were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The community of Adepur village in Acinga sub county applied for a borehole on 11th July 2022</li> <li>2. The community of Amint village in Okungur Sub County applied for a borehole on 10th August 2018, and was being considered for construction in the Financial Year 2022/2023.</li> <li>3. That of Mambasa village in Kabelebyong sub county applied for a borehole on 21st February 2022</li> </ol>	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>No evidence was provided to show that field appraisal had been conducted for water projects planned for the financial year 2022/23</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There were no screening reports provided for current FY 2022/2023 WSS projects 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 25th August 2021;</p>	2
			<p>Sampled projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Siting,drilling and Construction of 8 deep bore holes at Kapelebyong , page 1</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of 7 boreholes at Kapelebyong, page 1</li> </ul>	
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 water sector projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee under minutes and dates as shown below;</p>	2
			<p>Siting, drilling casting of deep holes was approved by Contracts Committee on 31st August 2021 under meeting minute CC/Aug/2021-2022/appr/09</p> <p>Rehabilitation of boreholes was approved by Contracts committee on 18th January 2022 under minute CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>LG had proof of the PIT for water sector projects properly established as per letter of appointment by CAO dated 21st January 2022 and 21st July 2022. list of members included</p>	2
			<p>Apio Jesca- DCDO</p> <p>Egelu Paul - NRO</p> <p>Oule Charles-DE ( project Manager)</p> <p>Odima Isaac- DWO (contract Manager,Water sector)</p> <p>Oluka Ismail-Clerk of works</p> <p>Eteru Moses- Labour officer</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>All the sampled three (3) boreholes of Akum community, Apungure community and Akoromit seed secondary school were found to have been constructed as by the bills of quantities.</p>	2
	<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>LG did not provide evidence to show that joint monthly monitoring of WSS sector infrastructure projects was carried out as per the reviewed monitoring reports below;</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Monitoring and supervision reports dated 17th March 2022, CDO and Environment Officers were not involved.</p>	
			<p>Monitoring and supervision reports dated 30th June 2022, CDO and Environment Officers were not involved.</p>	
			<p>Monitoring and supervision reports dated 13rd February 2022, CDO and Environment Officers were not involved.</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p>	<p>From the sampled projects below, payment to contractors were initiated and made within specified 2 months' timeline,;</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p>	<p>1. Rehabilitation of deep bore holes. at Kapelebyong District by Ebowa Investment Ltd was verified by DWO for payment(39,829,130/=)issued on 17th June 2022 and subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 29th June 2022 under voucher NO 44584140</p>	
		<p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>2. Siting,Drilling and Installation of bore holes in Kapelebyong District by East Africa Boreholes Ltd was verified by DWO for 1st payment (139,401,955/=)issued on 16th June 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 29th June 2022 under voucher NO 44584140</p>	

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>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> <p>Sampled contracts</p> <p>1. Contract for drilling and construction of deep bore holes in Kapelebyongo District</p> <p>, Minutes of contracts committee ref; CC/Aug/2021-2022/Appr/09 dated 31st August 2021, evaluation report dated 6th September 2021, contract agreement signed on 15th November 2021</p> <p>3.Contract for Rehabilitation of bore holes in Kapelebyong District</p> <p>, Minutes of contracts committee ref; CC/Jan/2021-2022/appr/36 dated 18th January 2022, evaluation report dated 05th January 2022 contract agreement signed on 3rd February 2022</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**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>The LG never had a centralized grievance log book however it had initially a labor book as seen from the top book cover which was just canceled and replaced with grievance log book name.</p> <p>The complaints log book had no clear and systematic information and complaints referral path, with columns of date, case and action taken only.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of minutes from disseminating Guidelines to CDO's by DWO and Senior Environment officer during assessment time.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided by the Environment Officer and CDO of developed / prepared water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in FY 2021/2022.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water facilities for 2021/2022 were implemented on land where Kapelebyong LG had proof of consent. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Elobat Lawrence gave part of his land measuring 10 by 10m for construction of the Apungure community borehole on 2nd March 2022</li> <li>2. Mr. Ogaram Martin gave part of his land measuring 15 by 15m for construction of Okerai A community borehole on 5th March 2022</li> <li>3. Ms. Alupo Paulina also gave 15 by 15m of her land for construction of Apopong community borehole on 4th March 2022</li> <li>4. And finally Mr. Okum Godfrey gave part of his land for construction of Akulonyo community borehole on 1st March 2022 among others.</li> </ol>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&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>LG did not provide evidence that Environment and CDO completed and signed the E &amp; S certificates</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no monthly monitoring reports of the WSS projects. There were no funds allocated for monitoring and supervision by DCDO and SEO.</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>The LG did not provide any reports with data on irrigated land. The Acting District Production Officer, admitted the absence of a report on irrigated land</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>The LG did not provide any report on the acreage of irrigated land for FY 2021/22 and FY 2022/23. It was not possible to compute the change in the acreage of irrigated land.</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 work plan for the Production and Marketing Department had no activities related to micro-scale irrigation planned for FY 2021/22.</p> <p>The approved work plan and budget for FY 2022/23 indicated that the implementation of the micro scale irrigation project was planned for the FY 2022/23</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed. The project had not reached that stage, and thus no payment was made.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable 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  • If 100% score 2  • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80% score 0	Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment for both demonstration and farmers were neither procured nor installed yet. The district was in the second phase of the project and the preparatory activities such as awareness creation, was just planned for the FY 2022/23	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2  • If 75 – 99% score 1  • If below 75% score 0	The LG approved staff structure indicated eleven (11) positions of extension workers of which only eight (8) were recruited representing;  $8/111 \times 100 = 72.7\%$	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  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed. Kapelebyong District Local Government was in the second phase of the project, whose implementation was planned to begin 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 because the district was in the second phase, and the project implementation was just planned for FY 2022/23	0

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement



5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	According to the sampled Sub Counties and Town Council there was no proof that the information on the position of extension workers filled was accurate, the assessment team did not have access to the information at some Sub County as indicated below,	0
	Maximum score 4		Acowa Town Council had three extension workers according to the staff structure and all were filled for instance: Mr. Eceru Peter Assistant Agriculture Officer, Mr. Ongole Charles Assistant Agriculture Officer and Ms. Alupo Suzan Veterinary officer.	
			Acinga Sub county had two extension workers, Mr Omayo Charles Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Mr Eceru John Peter Assistant Agriculture Officer.	
			Acowa Sub County the Performance Assessment Team did not have access to the information as the Sub County Offices were found locked at the time of Assessment.	
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was no installation at either the demonstration or the farmers' sites because the District was in the second phase of the project, whose implementation was planned for FY 2022/23	0
	Maximum score 4			
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	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	No Quarterly supervision and monitoring report was availed during the assessment. The district was in the second phase of the project, and all the rigorous activities of supervision were just planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23.	0
	Maximum score 6			
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	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 District Focal Person for Micro Scale Irrigation (The acting District Production Officer – John William Ejiet) was reportedly being trained on the use of Irritrack system but no evidence was provided as proof of training.	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the district prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	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 in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and had not implemented the project at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable since the district was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and had not implemented the project at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum score 6			

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The information on budgeting for extension workers as per guidelines with the staffing norms was not provided by the DPO to the Assessment Team for verification.	0
	Maximum score 6			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the sampled LLGs, not all Sub Counties and Town Councils had their extension staff deployed as per guidelines for instance;</p> <p>Acowa Town Council had three extension workers deployed and they were; Mr. Eceru Peter AAO, Mr. Ongole Charles AAO and Ms. Alupo Suzan Veterinary Officer, the same number was verified at the DPO's staff list.</p> <p>Acinga Sub county there were two extension workers, Mr. Omayo Charles Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Mr. Eceru John Peter Assistant Agriculture Officer as was indicated on the DPO's list.</p> <p>Acowa Sub County the sub county was locked and the team could not have access to the information required</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the sampled Sub counties and a Town Council, not all LLGs provided proof of extension workers working where they had been deployed for instance;</p> <p>Acowa Town Council had three extension workers. Mr. Eceru Peter AAO, Mr. Ongole Charles AAO and Ms. Alupo Suzan Veterinary Officer, the same number was verified at the DPO's staff list.</p> <p>Acinga Sub county had two extension workers, Mr. Omayo Charles Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Mr. Eceru John Peter Assistant Agriculture Officer as was indicated on the DPO's list.</p> <p>Acowa Sub County the sub county was locked and the team could not have access to the information required</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence, that the SAS/ TC posted the list of extension workers at the notice boards.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>Only four (4) out of 8 required personal files were presented and it was noted that the DPO had conducted performance appraisal on some of the extension workers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Ongole James AAO was appraised by Alobat Peter SAS on 2/ July/ 2021</li> <li>2. Mr. Ekita Raymond AAHO-was appraised by Ejlet John William on 4/8/2022.</li> <li>3. Mr. Eceru John Peter AAO was appraised Agen Rhoda signed by Ejiet John William 22 July 2022</li> <li>4. Mr. Ekolu Emmanuel AAHO was appraised by Omoding Michael signed by Ejiet John William.</li> </ol> <p>However, it was noted that they were appraised past the due date of 30th June as required by the guidelines.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no corrective actions taken based on the recommendations made on the appraisal reports during the FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have a training plan and thus no evidence that the LG undertook training according to plans.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>A collection of training files presented included training reports for instance; The files indicated that Ongole James (An Agricultural Officer) was trained on Integrated Pest and Disease Management, &amp; Post harvest Handling. The training was undertaken by the College of Agricultural and Environmental Services (Makerere University) from 31st October – 4th November 2022. The file also had reports of a training of staff and Parish development committees on implementation of Parrish Development Model from 24/10/2022 – 31/10/2022</p> <p>However, these training were not conducted within the FY of assessment which was 2021/2022.</p>	0
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the district was in the Second Phase of the micro scale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned for FY 2022/23</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The approved work plan for the Production and Marketing Department for the FY 2021/2022 showed that no activities relating to micro scale irrigation were planned for in the FY 2021/22.</p> <p>The approved work plan for FY 2022/2023 had evidence that the aforementioned activities were planned and budgets allocated as in the sector guidelines</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>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 the co-funding stage, and therefore, it was not reflected in the LG approved work plan and Budget for FY 2021/2022 and 2022/23</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable as micro scale irrigation project had not reached the co-funding stage because its implementation was just planned for the FY 2022/2023</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the district was in the Second Phase of the micro scale irrigation project. The awareness creation activities were just planned to begin in FY 2022/2023</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not yet applicable since the micro-scale irrigation equipment was neither procured nor installed to warrant monitoring. The district was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/2023</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 because the micro-scale irrigation equipment for demonstration and the farmers' sites were neither yet procured nor installed. The District was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin 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 evidence was provided to show that the LLG extension workers received support except salaries and support for 800 farm field visits which were planned in the Department's work plan for FY 2021/22. Complimentary services under the Micro Scale irrigation were not yet implemented because the district was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin 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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Local Government had not yet established or reactivated any farmer field schools. The District was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>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 just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23</p>	0
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation under UGIFT was not planned in FY 2021/22. The aforementioned activities were planned to begin in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Investment Management**

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

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The District had a list of four people who had expressed interest in having a micro scale irrigation system installed within their farm. Of the four farmers who expressed interest</p> <p>Opedun Peter Oluka of Acowa Sub County and Opolot James of Akoromit Sub County were assessed further by Eceru John Peter for feasibility and a detailed report about their farms submitted to the Focal Person for Micro Scale Irrigation project on 11th April 2022. Oonynu Aquinas and Akoromit Seed Secondary School had also expressed interest.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project with most project activities just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of any publication of eligible farmers on the LLG notice board.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that MSI were incorporated in the LG procurement plan for current FY approved by CAO on 15th September 2022, page 6</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23. They had neither yet been supplied any equipment nor invited quotations from prequalified bidders	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District had neither yet been supplied any equipment nor invited quotations from prequalified bidders. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin 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	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the District had neither yet been supplied any equipment nor invited quotations from prequalified bidders. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin 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	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 had not yet installed any irrigation equipment either at demonstration or farmers' sites. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to be implemented 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	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 there were not yet any installed irrigation systems at either demonstration or farmers' sites to warrant supervision. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were just planned to begin 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 micro scale irrigation equipment was neither yet procured nor installed to warrant a functionality test. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the project activities were just planned to begin 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	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, there were no micro scale irrigation equipment or installations to be handed over. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the project activities were just planned to begin 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	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 micro scale irrigation equipment was neither yet procured nor installed to warrant payment. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the project activities were just planned to begin 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	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 yet applicable because the District had neither yet been supplied any equipment nor invited quotations from prequalified bidders. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.	0

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not seen on any notice boards. The avenues for grievance redress and the nature of grievances were not displayed on any noticeboards within the Production Department.	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</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 the previous FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.</p>	1

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the District had neither yet started siting nor installment of the micro scale irrigation systems. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the project activities were just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.	1
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 the previous FY 2021/2022.	1

Micro-scale Irrigation 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 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 did not have a Senior Agriculture Engineer	<b>0</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 project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.	<b>0</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<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 District did not have a substantively appointed Civil Engineer Water. However, Mr.Odima Isaac was assigned duty on 22/July/2019 as directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/19 signed by the CAO Mukiibi Nasser.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The District did not have a substantively appointed Assistant water Officer. However, Mr. Epaku Richard was assigned duty on 22/July/2019 as directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/7 signed by the CAO Mukiibi Nasser.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer was vacant at the time of assesment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The position of Natural Resources Officer was vacant at the time of assessment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Environment Officer was vacant at the time of assessment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Okao James Brown was appointed Forestry Officer on 22/July as was directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/24 signed by the CAO Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.	10

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence of Environment and Social Screening reports of all the sampled boreholes/ water points.  Screening report for the drilling of deep borehole at Akoromit Seed Secondary School in Olekat cell, Olekat Parish in Akoromit Sub-County signed by SEO and DCDO on 04/01/2022  Screening report for the Drilling of deep borehole at Apungule Village, Angolebwal Parish in Acowa Sub-county signed on 4/01/2022 by SEO and DCDO.  Screening report for the drilling of deep borehole at Akum village, Amemia Parish in Kapelabyong Sub-county signed on 3/01/2022 by DCDO and SEO.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	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.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The LG constructed a total of 9 deep boreholes using the water sector grant and all did not require obtaining abstraction permits from the Directorate of Water Resource Management	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</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>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District did not have a substantively appointed District Health Officer. However, Mr. Edu James was appointed in Acting Capacity as DHO on 26 Sept 2022 under letter reference CR/161/5 signed by Mr. Lubuuka David the CAO</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Ms. Walakira N. Margret Emodu was appointed in Acting capacity Assistant District Health Officer Maternal under letter reference CR/156/2 dated 8 June 2012 as directed by the DSC Minute number 174/2012(a) signed by the CAO Mr. Alfred Malinga.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Assistant District Health Officer - Environmental Health was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0



- 1 New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. The position of Biostatistician was vacant at the time of assessment

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. Mr. Ocan Francis was appointed as A District Cold Chain Technician on 21/Dec /2007 under letter reference CR0/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 36/2007 signed by the CAO Mr. Kayise Chrizestom.

10

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## **Environment and Social Requirements**

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence of environmental and Social screening reports for all the three sampled health projects.

Screening report for the Upgrading of Aeket HCII to HCIII in Kumulu Sub-County signed by SEO and DCDO on 4/04/2022

Screening report for the completion of the fence at Kapelebyong HCIV in Kapelebyong Sub-County signed by SEO and DCDO on 22/01/2022

Screening report for the Renovation of a five roomed staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV signed by SEO and DCDO on 10/01/2022

15

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

Two of the health projects never required ESIA's that was the renovation of the five roomed staff house at Kapelebyong HCIV and the completion of the fence at Kapelebyong HCIV. These projects lie under Schedule 4 Part 2 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019 with minimal/ minor significant impacts which require development of ESMPs and timely implementation of the ESMPs.

However;

The upgrading of Aeket HCII to HCIII required an Environmental Project Brief (EPB) to be submitted to NEMA (Authority) for approval before commencement of civil works since the project lies under Schedule 4 part 1 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019. The EPB was not developed and no Certificate of Approval from NEMA was availed during assessment time

Only a costed ESMP was developed.

0

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.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	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. Okare Samson Olaki was appointed as DEO in Acting capacity under letter Ref: CR/101/4 on 3 /August/22 number signed by the CAO, Mr. Lubuuka David	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The District had substantively recruited Mr. Okakare Olaki Samson as Inspector of schools on 24/ April / 2019 under Ref; CR/159/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 14 /ADSC/2019 signed by the CAO Mr.Mukiibi Nasser.  Mr. Olinga Stephen was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools on 22/July/2019 as directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/14 signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.	40
<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)  The Maximum score is 30	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Only two of the three education projects in the procurement plan were screened for Environment and Social screening by the SEO and the DCDO.  Projects screened and screening reports were are;  Screening report for the construction of Akoromit Seed Secondary School (Phase II) signed by the SEO and DCDO on 7/11/2021. However, the project was not implemented but replaced with the fencing of the school by using supplementary funds from UGIFT. The fencing of the school was not in the procurement plan for the previous FY and had no screening report.  Screening report for the construction of 2 classroom block with office and store in Alito Primary School signed by the SEO and DCDO on 10/01/2022.  Project which was not screened;  The construction of two stance drainable pit latrine at Alito Primary School. However; the project was not implemented but replaced with the Re-roofing of the four classroom block at Alito Primary School where Office of the Prime Minister provided iron sheets and the school catered for labour costs according to the SEO. The re-roofing project was not in the procurement plan and was not screened and; it was implemented at the end of the financial year	0

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.

All the above mentioned Education 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

However;

Not all education projects had ESMPs developed for example;

The construction of two stance pit latrine at Alito Primary School and the replacement (Re-roofing of the four classroom block at Alito Primary School)

The Construction of Akoromit Seed Secondary School Phase II and its replacement (The fencing of Akoromit Seed Secondary School)

The Maximum score is 30

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The District did not have a substantively appointed Chief Finance Officer. However, Mr Emeru Simon was assigned duties of CFO on 15 /3/2022, under letter reference CR/161/2, signed by the CAO, Mr. Lubuuka David..</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The District did not have a substantively appointed District Planner. However, Mr. Ebuu Lawrence was appointed in acting capacity as DP on 22 /7/2019, as directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ ADSC /2019/9 signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Oule Charles was appointed in acting capacity as a District Engineer on 3 /August/ 2022 under letter reference CR /101/4 signed by Mr. Lubuuka David, the CAO</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Egule Paul was appointed in acting capacity as a District Natural Resource Officer on 26th/July/2021 under letter reference CR /101/4 signed by Mr. Ssebandeke Richard, the CAO.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Egule Paul was appointed in acting capacity as a District Natural Resource Officer on 26 /July/2021 under letter reference CR /101/4 signed by Mr. Ssebandeke Richard, the CAO</p>	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The District did not have a substantively appointed District Community Development Officer. However, Ms. Apio Jesca was in acting capacity as DCDO appointed on 26/July /2021 under letter reference CR/101/4, signed by Mr. Ssebandeke Richard, the 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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The district did not have a substantively appointed District Commercial Officer. However, Mr. Epiu James Collins was appointed in Acting capacity under letter reference CR/159/1 dated 1 June 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute number DSC/AMUR/05/05/2018(i) (a) signed by the CAO, Mr. Leru Andrew	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 appointed Ms. Anyango Betty as A Senior Procurement Officer on 31 Jan 2008 through letter reference CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 70/1/2008 signed by Mr. Kayise Chrizestom.	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	This position of a Procurement Officer was vacant at the time of assessment.	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. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The district did not have a substantively appointed Principal Human Resource. However, Ms. Nawegulo Bridget was appointed in Acting capacity on 22 July 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute number 52/ DSC/2019/15 signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.	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.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	This position of a Senior Environment Officer was vacant at the time of assessment.	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position of a Senior Land Management Officer was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position of a Senior Accountant was vacant at the time the assessment was carried out.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position of the Principal Internal Auditor was vacant at the time of the assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position of the Principal Human Resource Management was vacant at the time of 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 Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The District had 7 sub counties and 4 Town Councils, these included; Obalinga Sub County, Kapelebyong Sub County, Acowa Sub County, Okurngur Sub County, Akoromit Sub County, Acinga Sub County, Alito Sub County Kapelebyong Town Council, Acowa Town Council, Akore Town Council and Obalanga Town Council.</p> <p>Out of the 11 Sub Counties and Town Councils only 8 were substantively appointed as follows;</p> <p>1. Mr. Alobai Peter was substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretary of Obalinga Sub County on 24/July/2018 under letter reference CR/159/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (2) vii signed by Mr. Leru Andrew, the CAO.</p> <p>2. Ms. Acor Jessica was substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretary of Kapelebyong Sub County on 1/Sept/2005 under letter reference CR/156/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute 155 (A)2005 signed by Mr. Okolimo John, the CAO</p>	0

3. Mr. Aenu John Michael was substantively appointed Town Clerk of Acowa Town Council on 24/July/2018 under letter reference CR/159/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute DSC/AMUR04/06/2018 a (2) viv, signed by Leru Andrew the CAO'

4. Ms. Agono Betty was appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary of Alito Sub county on 22/7/2019 Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/17 Signed by the CAO Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.

5. Mr. Otwao Solomon was appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary of Akoromat Sub County on 22/7/2019 Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/16 signed by Mr. Mukiibi Nasser the CAO.

6. Mr. Okello Joseph of Acinga Sub county was appointed in acting capacity as Senior Assistant Secretary on 8 /6/2021 CR /161/4 signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukibi Nasser.

7. Mr. Egau Apiro Michael of Kapelebyong Town council was appointed as Town Clerk on 24 April 2019 CR /159/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 18/DSC/2019 signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukiibi Nasser

8. Mr. Aenu John Michael of Acowa Town council was appointed as Town Clerk on 24 July 2018 CR /159/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (2)viv, signed by the CAO Mr. Leru Andrew

9. Mr. Agonu Betty was in Acting capacity Town Clerk of Obalanga Town Council.



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

Maximum score is 15

b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

The District had 7 Sub County and 4 Town Councils of which only 3 LLG had substantive CDOs appointed .

1 Mr. Ibrahim Mohamed was substantively appointed Community Development Officer of Sub County on 1/ Nov/2016 under letter reference CR/156/1 as directed by the DSC Minute DSC/AMUR/07/2016 (4) signed by Mr.Leru Andrew the CAO.

2 Mr. Olupoto Benjamin was substantively appointed A Community Development Officer of Alito Sub County on 11/May/2020 under letter reference CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute 6/KDSC/2020 signed by Mr. Mukiibi Nasser, the CAO.

3 Ms. Aujo Philomina was substantively appointed A Community Development Officer of Obalama Sub County on 11/May/2020 under letter reference CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute 6 KDSC /2020 signed by Mr. Mukiibi Nasser the CAO.

4. Mr. Ediau Oyata Jonah was appointed on probation as Community Development Officer of Okungur Sub County on 11 May 2020 reference number CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 6/KDSC/2020 Signed by Mukiibi the CAO.

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

Maximum score is 15

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

The District had 11 Sub County and Town Council of which out of the 11 S/C only 7 S/C had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistant and Accounts assistant.

1.Mr.Olaki Stephen was substantively appointed Accounts Assistant of Acowa Sub County on 22/July/2019 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 52 ADSC/2019 /6 signed by Mr.Mukiibi Nasser the CAO.

2, Mr.Odongo James Peter was substantively appointed an Accounts Assistant of Kapelebyong Sub County on 24/July/2018 under letter reference CR/159/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 signed by Mr. Leru Andrew the CAO.

3..Mr.Emoku Moses was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant of kapelebyong Town Council on 25/July/2019 as directed by the DSC Minute number 52 /ADSC 2019 6/ signed by the CAO Mr.Mukiibi Nasser.'

4.Ms. Agutl Hellen Betty was appointed An Accounts Assistant of Obaranga and Lito Sub county on 22 July 2019 Minute number 52/ADSC/2019/6 Signed by the CAO, Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.

5.Mr. Odinga James Peter was appointed an Accounts Assistant of Okunfula Town Council on 11/May/2022 under letter reference CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 4 / KDSC /2020 signed by Mr. Mukiibi Nasser the CAO.

6.Ms. Akello Conslata Brenda of Akolwe Sub County was appointed a Senior Assistant Accountant on 11 May 2020 through letter reference CR/ 156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 4/KDSC/2020.

7. Ms. Amidiong Phiona Grace of Akore Town Council was appointed A Senior Accounts Assistant on 11 May 2020 through letter reference CR/156/2 as directed by the DSC Minute number 12/KDSC/2020, signed by the CAO Mr. Mukiibi Nasser.

## Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	Budget; UGX 137,852,123,page 8 warrant UGX 140,022,685, page 8 Actual; UGX 107,646,679 page8	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0	$\% \text{ Released} = (107,646,679/140,022,685) \times 100$ $= 76\%$ <p>The LG had released 76% of funds allocated for the implementation of environment and social safeguards</p>	
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	Budget; UGX 393,823,226page 8 warrant UGX393,823,226 ,page8 Actual; UGX 378,251,658 page8	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.	$\% \text{ Released} = (378,251,658/393,823,226) \times 100$ $= 96\%$ <p>The LG had released 96% of funds allocated for the implementation of Community Based Services</p>	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	<p>There was evidence of Environmental and Social screening reports for the projects funded by DDEG.</p> <p>Combined Screening report for the construction of the three-stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor-Junja Holdings (U) limited) and construction of the three stance pit latrine at the District Headquarters (contractor: FRAHAH Amuria enterprises Ltd) signed by Senior Environment Officer Mr. Egelu Paul on 22/01/2022.</p> <p>Screening report for the Fencing of the production block at the District Headquarters signed by SEO on 28/01/2022</p>	4
	Maximum score is 12			
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),  score 4 or 0	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	4
	Maximum score is 12			

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>There was evidence of Costed ESMPs developed by SEO and DCDO for the DDEG projects.</p> <p>A combined ESMP for Construction of 2 three stance drainable pit latrines at the District Headquarters each project at UGX. 300,000/-</p> <p>ESMP for the Fencing of production block at the District Headquarters costed at UGX. 500,000/-</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>Kapelebyong LG had a clean / unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2021/2022</p>	10
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>There was evidence that the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the Status of implementation of internal Auditor General findings on 29th December 2021 as per Acknowledgement date Stamp</p> <p>The LG had provided information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of Auditor General findings FY 2020/2021 on 25th March 2022 as per Acknowledgement date Stamp</p> <p>This was beyond the deadline of end of February 2022.</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had Submitted an annual performance contract to Ps/ST MOFPED on 31st July 2022.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had Submitted Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 on 31st August 2022 as per PBS generated date viewed.</p>	4

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 Quarter one Budget Performance Report was submitted on 13th November 2021

2nd Quarter Budget Performance Report was submitted on 28th January 2022

3rd Quarter Budget Performance Report was submitted on 16 the May 2022

4th Quarter Budget Performance Report was submitted on 31st August 2022