



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Arua city

(Vote Code: 851)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	60%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	22%
Educational Performance Measures	39%
Health Performance Measures	29%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG didn't have DDEG investments, However the city implimented USMID investments which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of Go Down Road with procurement reference number: Arua-Gulu-Kitgum/USMID/21-22/00001 at a contract price of UGX 13,506,952,197.</li> <li>2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with a procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010 at a contract price of UGX 66,570,350.</li> <li>3. Construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of 2-classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with an addendum added on 30th May 2023, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006 at a contract price of UGX 433,829,747.</li> </ol> <p>The investments were not all complete since the Rehabilitation of Go Down Road was still a work in progress.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>• 1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>• If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>From the Analysis of the Lower Local Government Performance assessment report, the LG had an overall performance of 65% in 2022 and 89% in 2023 thus increasing by 24% which was more than 5%. This was from the LG performance assessment results that were uploaded on to the OPAMS and were cleared by the National Task force and presented in the matrix; COMPARING LLG SCORES FOR 2022 &amp; 2023. The comparison was provided in the Analysis - LLG PA 2023 Synthesis Report dated 20th October 2023 as extracted from OPAMS.</p>	<b>3</b>

2	<p>N23_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>The prioritized investments were not stated in the LG annual performance report and there was no any correspondent reports and plans provided thus the calculation of projects planned versus projects implimented could not be done. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marchéal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
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 City spent the DDEG on eligible projects which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of Go Down Road with procurement reference number: Arua-Gulu-Kitgum/USMID/21-22/00001 at a contract price of Ugx 13,506,952,197.</li> <li>2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with a procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010 at a contract price of Ugx 66,570,350.</li> <li>3. Construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of a 2-classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with an addendum added on 30th May 2023, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006 at a contract price of Ugx 433,829,747.</li> </ol>	2

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG/SMID funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the LG Engineers' estimates. For instance;  1. Rehabilitation of Go Down Road with procurement reference number: Arua-Gulu-Kitgum/USMID/21-22/00001 at a contract price of UGX 13,506,952,197 against engineer's estimate of UGX 13,506 952,197. The contract price variation was calculated as 0.0%.  2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with a procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010 at a contract price of UGX 66,570,350 against engineer's estimate of UGX 70,730,000. The contract price variation was calculated as 5.9%.  3. Construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of 2-classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with an addendum added on 30th May 2023, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006 at a contract price of UGX 433,829,747 against engineer's estimate of UGX 443,782,582. The contract price variation was calculated as 2.2%.	2
---	--	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	The assessment never accessed information on the staffing at the City Divisions because the officers were not present.	0
---	--	--	--	---

4

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:

• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.

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

The LG didn't have DDEG investments, However the city implimented USMID investments which included;

1. Rehabilitation of Go Down Road with procurement reference number: Arua-Gulu-Kitgum/USMID/21-22/00001 at a contract price of UGX 13,506,952,197.

2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with a procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010 at a contract price of UGX 66,570,350.

3. Construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of 2-classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with an addendum added on 30th May 2023, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006 at a contract price of UGX 433,829,747.

The investments were all available but not all complete since the Rehabilitation of Go Down Road was still a work in progress. That notwithstanding, there were no reports produced to assess the actual level of completion.

0

5

N23\_Reporting and Performance Improvement

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;

If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs

score 4 or else 0

**NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.**

The comparison of the results the two Divisions (LLGs) from the City internal performance assessment and the LLGs IVA for Arua City revealed that the performance range was outside the scorable range of -/+10% as presented below;

	City	IVA
Ayivu Div	88	47
Central Div	89	74

0

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	No information was accessed in regard to development of improvement plans because the City was assessed under USMID the previous FY.	0
---	---	--	--	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	No information was accessed in regard to implementation of improvement plans because the City was assessed under USMID the previous FY.	0
---	---	--	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	Information on the whether the City consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY was not presented to the assessment	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence produced by the LG of tracking and analysing of staff attendance as per guidelines by MoPS Circular Standing Instruction (CSI). In the analysis of 4th Quarter F/Y 2022/2023 dated 30th June 2023 : Three staff had 100% attendance in April 2023.  In the analysis of May 2023 one staff scored 100% in attendance and in the analysis of June 2023 it was noted that 20% of the staff scored between 80- 100% in attendance and this was the highest attendance reported.	2
---	--	--	--	---

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

The LG had no evidence that all the Heads of Department were appraised for the previous FY against their performance agreements as follows:

1. City Production Officer, City Engineer, City Planner were newly appointed on 8th May 2023.

While the following HoDs were not appraised during the previous FY City Education Officer and , City Community Development Officer.

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

There was evidence that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented.

The administrative rewards and sanctions committee was appointed on 2nd August 2021 running for three Financial Years and the appointment were as follows:

1. Ombere R Raymond (CEO) Chairperson
2. Jobile Cornelius Ag Deputy Town Clerk Member
3. Dr Chandi Opele Fred (SMO) Member
4. Draku Moses Treasurer Assistant Member
5. Draru Lillian HRO Member
6. Amviko Mercy SHRO Secretary
7. Okuonzi Feni Patrick (SOS) Member
8. Omale Jimmy (SP) Member

The rewards and sanction committee was found functional in that the meeting held on 13th December 2022, ref: Cr/ACC/157/2 and Discussion on best performers for each department.

Min 4/Dec/2022/ Reactions. Discussed where the function of awarding best performers of the district to engineering compound.

The department that did not submit names of the best performers for the committee would decide on their behalf.

Min 5/Dec/2022/Selection of best departmental performers.

1. Administration – Eratiru Irene Angucia
2. Finance and Planning – Alitibua Yuda
3. Community Based Services – Badaru Florence
4. Education- Asimasia Juliet
5. Production – Draja Robinson
6. Natural Resources – Dawaru Mary
7. Physical Planning- Ociti Felix
8. Trade and Industry- Ayiko Jobel

The overall best department was voted to be Education.

The meeting was adjourned with prayers at 3:20PM.



7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not establish a Consultative Committee for staff grievance redress.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that showed 506 staff recruited in the month of May 2023 and all accessed payroll within the two month as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ogutara Milcent Education Assistant assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and Accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>2. Maturu Santina Education Assistant Assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>3. Bileyo Charles Education Assistant Who Assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>4. Eyoru Scovia who assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>5. Alezuyo Viola Education Assistant who assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>6. Efiko Molly Pool Stenographer who assumed duty on 30th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>7. Amviko Winne Personal Secretary who assumed duty on 15th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>8. Edeti Favourate Environment Officer who assumed duty on 31st May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>9. Amandu Alfred Senior Health Inspector who assumed duty on 15th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> <li>10. Amaga Benard who assumed duty on 15th May 2023 and accessed payroll in June 2023.</li> </ol>	1
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The City did not adduce evidence that the retirees of FY 2022/2023 accessed the pension payroll within two months.</p>	0

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

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</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>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</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><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></b></p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

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 attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

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>Evidence was adduced to show that the city had a functional physical planning committee in place. A review of the appointment letters for the physical planning committee found the following members;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jubile Cornelus – Chairperson</li> <li>2. Asedri Fred - Senior Environments Officer</li> <li>3. Findru Alo Moses – Secretary</li> <li>4. Droma Jimmy - Land Supervisor</li> <li>5. Ociti Felix - Physical planner</li> <li>6. Dradria Anthony - Engineering officer</li> <li>7. Apangu Godfrey - Health Inspector</li> <li>8. Abima Benerd - Building Control officer</li> <li>9. Dawaru Mary - Environments officer</li> </ol> <p>The physical planning committee has also submitted four sets of minutes to the MoLHUD on 14th October 2022, 17th January 2023, 25th April 2023, 19th July 2023 for all the four quarters respectively.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statistician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Rehabilitation of Go-down Road in Bazaar and Tanganyika Ward. Environment and social screening form endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and City Engineer on 11th July, 2022</p> <p>Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the Proposed Rehabilitation of 4 Gravel Roads (17.9 Km) in Arua District to First Class Murram. The ESIA was undertaken by UB CONSULTING ENGINEERS LTD, UGANDA in JV with AIR WATER EARTH (AWE) LTD and submitted on 8th December, 2022.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Go-down Road in Bazaar and Tanganyika Ward. ESMP costed at 136,000,000 Ugsh endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and City Engineer on 11th July, 2022</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of DDEG/USMID funded infrastructure projects being incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan as it was not availed at the time of assessment. Effort to try and get it was futile as the head of procurement office was alleged to be doing her examinations.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no information from the procurement office captured about infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG/USMID being approved by the contracts committee at the time of assessment, because the head of procurement was alleged to be doing her examinations.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG established the Project Implementation Team as specified in the sector guidelines at the time of assessment. This was because the head of procurement was not available as she was alleged to be doing her examinations.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG/USMID followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG at the time of assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was one USMID road project which was supervised by M/s Seguma Consults Ltd in Sub Consultancy with M/s Hersum Consults Ltd. Evidence that the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers prior to verification and certification of works in the previous FY was not availed at the time of assessment.	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	There was no evidence that the LG verified works(certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames for the road project as it was supervised by the consultants of the the central government.  Certification was handled by the consultants , therefore, no documents were available with the procurement office at the time of assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had complete procurement files for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For instance;  1. For rehabilitation of Go down Road, with procurement reference number: construction of kitchen shade at Opia HC III, procurement reference number : Arua-Gulu- Kitgum/USMID/21-22/00001, the file had project evaluation report dated 8th November 2021 and approved by the contracts committee on 15th November 2021 under Min No. CC24/11/2021. The contract was awarded to China Railway Seventh Group Co. Limited at a contract sum of UGX 13,506,952,197. Solicitor General's clearance was dated 14th December 2021 and the contract between the parties was signed on 8th December 2021.  2. Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00003, the file had a project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 and the report was approved by the contracts committee on 28th March 2023 under Min. No. CC08/03/2023. The contract was awarded to Maracha Loading and Offloading Association Limited at a contract sum of UGX 85,249,500 as per contract between parties dated 17th April 2023.  3. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010, the file had a project evaluation report dated 11th April 2023 and the report was approved by the contracts committee on 11th April 2023 under Min. No. CC32/04/2023. The contract was awarded to Uguja Investments Limited at a contract sum of UGX 66,570,350 as per contract between the parties dated 28th April 2023.	1

## Environment and Social Safeguards



14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	Letter appointing focal person was not availed and the no minutes from meetings were provided for the FY 2022/2023.  Appointment of the grievance handling committee. The letter dated 18th January, 2018 appointed seven members; The Principal town clerk as the Chairman, the land supervisor as the secretary, the human resource officer, principal education officer, the secretary MDF, principal community development officer and the records officer.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	This was not availed however, the responding officer reported that the CDO who was not around at the time of assessment had it.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	The grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress was not publicised	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 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	The enhanced DDEG guidelines, evidence acknowledging receipt of the guidelines by the LLGs and report of dissemination were not availed 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	LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets were not availed during the time of assessment	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>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</p>	The contract documents could not be availed to ascertain whether Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) had been integrated into designs, BoQs, bidding for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous. The Principal Environmental Officer reported that all documents had been taken for External auditing.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	No project had additional costing of addressing climate change adaptation.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	Proof of land ownership was not availed	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	Upgrading of school road, Adroa road and, old Joago road. Environment and social management implementation plan; dated 5th October, 2022// 3rd March, 2023 endorsed by the Principal Environment Officer and City CDO. Recommended contractor to develop and implement ESMPs on their sites.  Campsite for M/s China Railway Seventh group Arua Prison and road construction works on Go-down Road. Environment and social management implementation plan; dated 5th October, 2022 and 3rd March, 2023 endorsed by the Principal Environment Officer and City CDO. Recommended contractor to develop and implement ESMPs on their sites	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	E&S compliance Certification forms were not availed.	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 attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</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>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed all the four quarterly internal audits reports as Required. The audit reports were produced on different dates as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter One internal audit report was produced on 20th October 2022</li> <li>2. Quarter Two internal audit report was produced on 24th January 2023</li> <li>3. Quarter Three internal audit report was produced on 18th April 2023</li> <li>4. Quarter Four internal audit report was produced on 31st July 2023</li> </ol> <p>The quarter one report was prepared by Mr. Alian Martin the former senior internal auditor and the rest of the reports were prepared by Mr. Stephen Abizu the current senior internal auditor.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City provided information to the Council and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY. This was observed through the report titled "The implementation status of internal audit findings for the FY2022/2023" document reference number CR/158/1 that was prepared on 27th October 2022 by the internal auditor Mr. Stephen Abizu.</p>	1

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer and the LG PAC on 6th November 2023 and were received by Mr. Omar Abdullay who is a member of the PAC. However, the LG PAC had not yet reviewed and had not yet followed up. The internal auditor indicated that the PAC had scheduled for a meeting to review the reports on 30th November 2023 and 1st December 2023.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The attempts to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</li> </ul>	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 attempts to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	0

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	The attempts to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he was not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.			

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	LG shares information with citizens	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts for projects in FY 2022/2023 were published. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of Go down Road, the project evaluation report dated 8th November 2021 and the best evaluated bidder notice dated 16th November, 2021 with the best evaluated bidder as M/s China Railway Seventh Group Co. Ltd was displayed on 16th November 2021 and at a contract price of Ugx 13,506,952,197</li> <li>2. Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III, the project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 and best evaluated bidder notice dated 28th March, 2023 with the best evaluated bidder as M/s Maracha Loading and Offloading Association Limited at a contract price of Ugx 85,249,500.</li> <li>3. For maintenance of two storey classroom block at Arua Public Primary School, the project evaluation report dated 23rd May, 2023 and best evaluated bidder notice dated 24th May, 2023 with the best evaluated bidder as M/s QUKS ENTERPRISES LTD and at a contract price of Ugx 22,975,400.</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure			
21	LG shares information with citizens	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	The performance assessments results were not public on the notice boards at the time of the assessment. This was attributed to the fact that the City was assessed under USMID.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure			

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence obtained and the attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no information publicized on the City Notice boards. A review of the website (aruacity.go.ug) was done and there was no information publicized.</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>There was no any information obtained, the clerk to council who was the custodian of the information was not present at the time of the assessment.</p>	0

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>For the year 2022, the total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X was 7271</p> <p>Total passes = for division 1-3 (6359)</p> <p>Percentage was <math>6359/7271 * 100=87\%</math></p> <p>For the year 2020, the total number of candidates excluding Division X who sat was 6154</p> <p>Total passes = for division 1-3 (5735)</p> <p>The percentage pass was <math>5735/6154 * 100 = 93\%</math></p> <p>Percentage change was <math>87\%-93\% = -6\%</math></p> <p>Hence percentage decreased by 6%</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>For the year 2022, the total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X was 1626</p> <p>Total passes = for division 1-3 (1567)</p> <p>The percentage was <math>1567/1626 * 100=96\%</math></p> <p>For the year 2020, the total candidates excluding Division X who sat was 1388</p> <p>Total passes = for division 1-3 (1330)</p> <p>The percentage pass was <math>1330/1388*100 = 96\%</math></p> <p>Percentage change was <math>96\% - 96\% = 0\%</math></p> <p>Hence there was no change 0%</p>	<b>0</b>



2	<p>N23_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>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>The City scored 50% in 2022 LLG performance assessment</p> <p>The City scored 100% in 2023 LLG performance assessment</p> <p>The performance therefore increased by 50%</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>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>Based on the Education and Sports Sector: Local Government Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines page 11 of 80, the LG Education department received UGX 476,835,000/= as a sector development grant on page 28 of 57 of the Approved Budget estimates report.</p> <p>The funds were used on only two projects as follows:</p> <p>a) Construction of a 5-classroom block and Office and staff at Anyara Cope Primary School in Ayivu Division at UGX 384,329,747/- as indicated on the contract agreement.</p> <p>b) Fencing of Anyafio Primary school in Central Division at UGX 66,570,350/= as indicated on the contract agreement.</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>Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	<p>The contract price variations for the sampled works projects were within +/- 20% for the FY 2022/2023. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For construction of administration, 3 classroom block and two units of two classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School at a contract price of UGX 433,829,747 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 443,782,582. The contract price variation was calculated as 2.2%.</li> <li>2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School at a contract price of UGX 66,570,350 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 70,730,000. The contract price variation was calculated as 5.9%.</li> <li>3. For maintenance of two storey classroom block at Arua Public Primary School at a contract price of UGX 22,975,400 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 22,521,915. The contract variation was estimated at -2.0%. Therefore, all contract price variations for the education projects implemented in FY 2022/2023 was within +/-20%.</li> </ol>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	<p>There was no construction of seed secondary school in Arua City, however, there were other education projects. These included the following all of which were 100% complete.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of two classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School.</li> <li>2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School.</li> <li>3. Maintenance of two storey classroom block at Arua Public Primary School.</li> </ol>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<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>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	<p>The staff ceiling for Arua City was 1786 per the IPFs from MoFPED. The actual staff in positions was 1400.</p> <p>Therefore, <math>1400/1786 \times 100 = 78\%</math></p>	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>		

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had 70 UPE schools and 9 USE schools. According to the consolidated assets register, 79 schools in the LG had basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines especially classrooms, desks, and latrines.</p> <p>For FY 2021/2022 all the 79 schools had the basic requirements and minimum standards. This was the same for FY 2021/2022 with all the 79 schools had the basic requirements and minimum standards.</p> <p>To calibrate the school, <math>79/79 * 100 = 100\%</math>.</p>	3
---	---	---	--	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG reported accurately on teachers and where they were deployed, in the schools. The DEO's deployment list was compared with the lists at the visited schools (Arua Hill Primary School, Arua Demonstration Primary School, and Alua Primary School). The following were found:</p> <p>a) At Arua Hill Primary School the DEO list and that found at the school were similar in both number and names, that is 34 teachers.</p> <p>b) At Arua Demonstration Primary School, the list from the DEO's office had 19 teachers, while those on the ground were the same number and with similar names.</p> <p>At Alua Primary School both the DEO's list and that of the school had 19 teachers.</p> <p>The attendance books and deployment list provided by the head teachers in the three schools visited provided an alternative point of view:</p> <p>At Arua Hill Primary School had 30 teachers.</p> <p>At Arua Demonstration Primary School had 31 teachers and at Alua Primary School had 16 Teachers.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

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 education department compiled an asset register for 2022/23 FY that accurately reported on infrastructure in all registered schools. For example:</p> <p>a) Arua Hill Primary School was reported in the assets register to have 23 classrooms, 15 latrines, 537 desks and 13 units of staff houses. This information was found to be true on verification by the assessor.</p> <p>b) At Arua Demonstration Primary School the DEO's asset register was in harmony with the information on the ground as they both indicated 15 classrooms, 9 latrines latrine, 241 desks and 9 units of staff houses.</p> <p>c) At Alua Primary School there were 11 classrooms, 12 latrine, 189 desks and 8 units of staff houses. This information did not correspond with the information at the school and in some cases the school Lacked an asset register. For instance:</p> <p>Arua Hill Primary School was reported in the assets register to have 28 classrooms, 15 latrines, 506 desks and 13 units of staff houses.</p> <p>Arua Demonstration Primary School was reported in the assets register to have 14 classrooms, 10 latrines, 243 desks and 9 units of staff houses.</p> <p>Alua Primary School there were 8 classrooms, 10 latrine, unknown desks and 9 units of staff houses.</p>	0
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>Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment. However, the DEO also conceded that there are no annual reports.</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>At the LG level the inspection reports during the previous year indicated the following:</p> <p>Term 1, 2023: 37/70 were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations page 28 of the inspection report.</p> <p>Term 2, 2023: Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Term 3, 2022 :16/70 were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations page 16 of the inspection report.</p> <p>At school level, supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment to show that they were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations as per the inspection reports.</p> <p>Hence percentage of schools sampled was <math>0/3 * 100 = 0\%</math>.</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 registered schools for FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <p>70 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 92,471 pupils while 9 USE schools with enrolment of 4479 students.</p> <p>To calculate compliance;  <math>70/70 * 100 = 100\%</math>.</p> <p>It was submitted on 24th October 2022 and received by the office of the Commissioner Education Planning on 26th October 2022.</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>The LG budgeted for recruitment of primary schools in the FY 2023/2024 a total of 70 schools at Ugx. 10,240,701,000/= according to the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024.</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>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p>	<p>The LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines (at least a teacher per class) in the current FY 2023-2024. According to staff lists sampled, teachers were deployed as follows;</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>1. Arua Hill Primary School had 16 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Acidiri Lazarus Ozua, Agotre Juma and Amandu Nixon.</p> <p>2. Arua Demonstration Primary School had 16 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Bayo David, Bayo Francis and Nyadria Saverio.</p> <p>3. Alua Primary School had 18 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Amadu Wilfred, Econi Wilfred and Yakani Abirigason.</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>	<p>At the district, the deployment list was displayed on the notice board of the department.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Lists of deployment were displayed in headteachers' offices of the schools that were sampled and visited.</p> <p>a) Arua Hill Primary School had 16 teachers</p> <p>b) Arua Demonstration Primary School had 16 teachers and a headteacher.</p> <p>c) Alua Primary School had 18 teachers and a headteacher.</p> <p>The details displayed included; name, date of birth, qualifications, and title among others.</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG had 70 primary schools Head Teachers whom all had been appraised outside MoPS deadlines for calendar year for 2022 and the following were sampled:

1. Orodriyo Sunday Head Teacher Nunu Primary school was appraised on 24th June 2023.
2. Inzikuru Ann Janet Head Teacher of Odravu Primary School was appraised on 22nd August 2023.
3. Ajidiru Loice Head Teacher of Budrabe Primary School was appraised on 23rd August 2023.
4. Iga Ezale Head Teacher Riki Primary School was appraised on 22nd August 2023.
5. Eyoru Natalia Head Teacher of Nyio Primary School was appraised on 21st August 2023.
6. Adrotiru Grace Dema Head Teacher of Endru Primary School was appraised on 21st August 2023.
7. Asibazuku Salama Head Teacher of Ouba Islamic was appraised on 21st August 2023.
8. Driciru Grace Raboki Teacher of Abira Primary School was appraised on 21st August 2023.
9. Opiru Grace Head Teacher of Micu Primary School was appraised on 22nd August 2023.
10. Ahdebo Tolbert Tiberius Head Teacher of Alivu Primary School was appraised on 7th September 2023.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG had 6 Secondary Schools and there was no evidence to show that secondary Schools Head Teachers were appraised by Chair BoG / DCAO for the previous calendar year.

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 score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did appraise all staff in Education department as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Asiku Geoffrey Senior Education Officer was newly appointed on 1st June 2023.</li> <li>2. Buza Zilly Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June 2023.</li> </ol>	2
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG education department prepared a training plan for previous FY 2022/2023 dated 19th December 2022.</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.  If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Arua City LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System for the previous FY 2022/2023. The letter was written on 24th October 2022 and received by MoES on 26th October 2022.</p> <p>It indicated that 70 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 92,471 pupils while 9 USE schools with enrolment of 4479 students.</p> <p>To calculate compliance; <math>70/70*100=100\%</math></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. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions during the previous FY 2022-2023 of UGX 43,236,000/= . as per sector guidelines page 9 of 61. Therefore, the LG complied with the sector guidelines whence a score of 100%.</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 If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>Warrant reports were not provided for assessment. The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	0
	<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. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment.</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>The department prepared an inspection plan dated 5th July 2022 and meetings for terms 1, 2 (2023) and 3 of 2022 as follows:</p> <p>a) Supporting documents for Term 1 was not availed at the time of assessment.</p> <p>b) Term 2 dated 17th April 2023 highlighting the following areas e.g. Review of previous Inspection (Term 1, 2023) Discussion on the Inspection tool and proposed dates of Inspection.</p> <p>c) Term 3 dated 16th August 2022 chaired by the senior inspector of schools – Buza Zilly, Agenda Number 5 Plan for the next Inspection for the term.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>UPE schools were inspected and monitored as follows:</p> <p>Supporting documents for Term 1, 2023 were not availed at the time of assessment. Hence <math>0/70 \times 100 = 0\%</math></p> <p>In the term I1, 2023 inspection report dated 12th August 2023 indicated that 59 UPE schools, with 17 private primary schools inspected. Hence <math>59/70 \times 100 = 84\%</math></p> <p>In the term III, 2022 inspection report dated 13th December 2022 indicated that 70 UPE schools, with 13 private primary schools inspected. Hence <math>70/70 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>Therefore, the average percentage of compliance was <math>(0 + 84 + 100) / 3 = 60\%</math>.</p>	<b>0</b>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was some evidence that inspection reports had been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions and that those actions had subsequently been followed up during the previous FY. For instance, there were:</p> <p>Departmental meetings are held as follows:</p> <p>Supporting documents for Term 1, 2023 (Quarter 3) were not availed at the time of assessment. There were no minutes.</p> <p>Term 2 2023 (Quarter 4) was held on 19th July 2023. Agenda 4: Minute 4/7/2023: Report on School Inspection.</p> <p>Term 3, 2022, issues discussed included low morale of teachers affecting was held on 16th August 2022 . Agenda Item 5: Minute 5/8/2022: Plan for the next Inspection for the term.</p> <p>At the schools visited the following were found the following:</p> <p>a) There was no supporting document at all the schools sampled to show that the Inspector of schools had followed up on inspection recommendations.</p> <p>b) At Arua Hill Primary School there was no visitors book seen.</p> <p>c) At Arua Demonstration Primary School, feedback from inspection for Term 1, 2023 and Term 3, 2022 was also missing.</p> <p>d) In the say way, there was no supporting documents at Alua Primary School.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Inspection reports were compiled and submitted to DES as follows:</p> <p>Term 1: submitted and received on 26th May 2023</p> <p>Term 2: supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment for Q4 - Term 2 of 2023.</p> <p>Term 3: submitted and received on 13th December 2022.</p> <p>However, at the schools visited no supporting documents were availed at the time of assessment.</p>	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	Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment to show that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, etc.	0
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>	The Education department carried out mobilization to attract learners and retain them during radio talk shows for this year not FY 2022/2023:  a) Radio talk show on parental support to children in schools held on 21st October, 2023 on Voice of Life radio station.  b) Radio talk show on sensitization on Special need education held on 31st October, 2023 on Voice of Life radio station.  c) Awareness campaign and parents mobilization on education services Radio talk show on parental support to children in schools held on 11th November, 2023 on Voice of Life radio station.	2

## Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards,  <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was some evidence that the LG has an assets register setting out facilities and equipment in schools for the previous year 2022. For example the register indicated that:  Arua Hill Primary School and Arua Demonstration Primary School had an up to-date asset register. However, supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment for verification at Alua Primary School.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	Information relating to the City having conducted a desk appraisal for all Education sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment were, derived from the LGDP III and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source was not presented for assessment.	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>Information relating to the City having conducted a field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs was not presented for assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the education department budgeted and ensured that the planned sector infrastructure projects were incorporated in the approved procurement plan at the time of assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the contracts committee and cleared by the Solicitor General for projects above threshold;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of administration, 3-classroom block and two units of two classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006, was approved by the contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and awarded to Hope Engineering and Construction Works at a contract price of UGX 433,829,747. Solicitor General's clearance was dated 17th January 2023. Agreement between the two parties was signed on 3rd February 2023.</li> <li>• Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010, was approved by the contracts committee on 11th April 2023 under Min. No. CC32/04/2023 and awarded to Uguja Investments Limited at a contract price of UGX 66,570,350. Agreement between the parties was signed on 28th April 2023.</li> <li>• Maintenance of two storey classroom block at Arua Public Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00016, was approved by the contracts committee on 24th May 2023 under Min. No. CC41/05/2023(3) and awarded to QUKS ENTERPRISES LTD at a contract price of UGX 22,975,400. Agreement between the parties was signed on 8th June 2023.</li> </ul>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that the LG established a PIT for school construction projects constructed within FY 2022/2023 that was availed at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES  <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	From the site visit to Anyara Cope Primary School, the following observation was taken;  Classroom doors were of size 900x,2400mm,  Windows were of size1200x1200mm,  Maroon pre-painted iron sheets gauge 28 were used for roofing,  200mm thick bricks were used for walls supported with reinforced beams at a height of 2400mm as per the design.  All the floor was made of terrazzo.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no seed secondary school in Arua City. However, for the construction of administration block, 3-classroom block and two units of 2-classroom block at Anyara Primary School, progress reports by Abima Bernard the civil engineer, on 24th March 2023 indicated 24.75 progress, on 8th June 2023 indicated 55.45 progress and on 31st July 2023 indicated 84.25 progress. Therefore, that was evidence to show that monthly site meetings for other projects were conducted.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence at the time of assessment that during critical stages of construction of the planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, a monthly technical supervision was done jointly by the relevant technical officers. Document access was not easy as the head of procurement was believed to be doing examinations. For construction of 4 classroom block.	<b>0</b>

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>	The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	<b>0</b>
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>	There was no evidence that the LG Education department timely submitted its sector procurement plan of FY 2022/2023 to the procurement unit for incorporation into DLG procurement plan as per the PPDA requirements.	<b>0</b>

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

Contracts File There was no seed secondary school. But there was evidence that the LG had other school infrastructure complete procurement files as required by PPDA given below;

1. . Construction of Administration block, a 3-classroom block and two units of a 2-classroom block at Anyara Cope Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00006, the project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 which was approved by contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and the contract was awarded to M/s Hope E engineering and Construction Works at a contract price of Ugx 433,829,747. Solicitor General's clearance was dated 17th January, 2023 and agreement between the parties was signed on 3rd February 2023.

2. Fencing of Anyafio Primary School, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00010, the project evaluation report dated 11th April 2023 which was approved by contracts committee under Min. No. CC32/04/2023 and the contract was awarded to M/s Uguja Investments Limited at a contract price of Ugx 66,570,000. Agreement between the parties was signed on 28th April, 2023.

3. Maintenance of two storey classroom block at Arua Public Primary School, with procurement reference number; Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00016, the project evaluation report dated 23rd May, 2023 which was approved by contracts committee on 24th May, 2023 under Min. No. CC41/05/2023(3) and the contract was awarded to M/s QUKS ENTERPRISES LIMITED at a contract price of Ugx 22,975,400. Agreement between the parties was signed on 8th June, 2023.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

No grievances were recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework for the FY in review



15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	Supporting documents were not availed at the time of assessment to show that the 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.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	The contract/bidding documents under Education to ascertain whether the ESMP were integrated into BoQs were not availed during assessment citing that the documents had been taken for external auditing.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	The documents to ascertain that school construction projects were implemented where there is proof of land ownership were not availed during the time of assessment	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	Project reports on monitoring and supervision activities conducted over the previous FY were not availed during time of assessment.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	Construction of a four-block classroom, office and staffroom at Anyara Primary School. The E & S certification endorsed by the Principal Environment officer on 12th October, 2023  Fencing of Anyafio School land. the E & S certification endorsed by the Principal Environment officer on 12th October, 2023	1

**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>Using the HMIS 107 annual reports, data on deliveries for FY 2021/22 and 2022/23 were extracted and used to calculate the percentage increase in deliveries for three sampled health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII as shown below;</p> <p>River Oli HCIV:</p> <p>In FY 2021/22, total deliveries was 2,063.</p> <p>In FY 2022/23, total deliveries was 1,795.</p> <p>There was a decrease of <math>1,795 - 2,063 = -268</math>. percentage decrease was therefore <math>268/2,063 \times 100 = 13\%</math></p> <p>Pajulu HCIII:</p> <p>In FY 2021/22, total deliveries was 480.</p> <p>In FY 2022/23, total deliveries was 356.</p> <p>There was a decrease of <math>356 - 480 = -124</math>. The percentage decrease was therefore, <math>124/480 \times 100 = 25.8\%</math>.</p> <p>Orivu HCIII:</p> <p>In FY 2021/22, total deliveries was 332.</p> <p>In FY 2022/23, total deliveries was 229.</p> <p>There was a decrease of <math>229 - 332 = -103</math>. The percentage decrease was therefore <math>103/332 \times 100 = 31\%</math>.</p> <p>Average percentage decrease was <math>13\% + 25.8\% + -31\% = 46.8/3 = 23.3\%</math></p> <p>Arua City had a percentage decrease of 23.3% in total annual deliveries in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The City average score in Health for LLG performance was 80%</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The indicator was dropped from the LGPA 2023. This was agreed upon during the OPM training conducted from 23rd -24th October 2023 at Imperial Royale Hotel. RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23.</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>The City budgeted and spent the development grant last FY on the following eligible activities;</p> <p>Construction of semi-detached staff house at Riki HC III at a contract price of UGX 142,666,266</p> <p>Renovation of house and store at Oli HC IV at a contract price of UGX 38,417,500</p> <p>Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III at a contract price of UGX 85,249,500.</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>Information relating to certification of work and the subsequent payment was not availed to the assessment team.</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The contract price variations for the sampled health infrastructure works projects were within +/-20% of the MoWT. For instance;	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For construction of semi-detached staff house at Riki HC III at a contract price of UGX 142,666,266 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 140,000,000. The contract price variation was calculated as -1.9%.</li> <li>2. For renovation of house and store at Oli HC IV at a contract price of UGX 38,417,500 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 26,000,000. The contract price variation was calculated as -47.8%.</li> <li>3. Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III at a contract price of UGX 85,249,500 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 42,182,175. The contract price variation was calculated as -102.1%.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, as seen from above, only one item is within the range of +/-20%, the other two are abnormally high.</p>	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There were no Health Centre upgrades from HC II to HC III in the procurement plan for FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<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>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	Information was not presented for assessment during the two days.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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>		

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 were no Health Centre upgrades from HC II to HC III in the procurement plan for FY 2022/2023. Therefore, evidence to show whether the health infrastructure projects constructed met the MoH designs was not there at the time of assessment.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the Human Resource office (HRO), the assessment team obtained the staff list for FY 2023/24. Three health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII were sampled and their facility staff lists for FY 2023/24 were compared with the list from the Human Resource Office.</p> <p>River Oli HCIV had 46 health workers from the HRO staff list. The facility staff list also had 46 health workers.</p> <p>Pajulu HCIII had 17 health workers from the HRO staff list. The facility staff list also had 17 health workers.</p> <p>Orivu HCIII had 18 health workers from the HRO staff list. The facility staff list also had 18 health workers.</p> <p>There was evidence that information on positions of health workers filled was accurate.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

From CHO, the list of constructed health facilities for the FY 2022/23 was obtained. The document was dated 8th August 2023 and signed by Ofuti William Baker, Principal Health Officer. The following construction works were listed;

1 Construction of Staff house at Riki HCIII. This was reported to be completed but not yet commissioned..

2 Renovation of Kitchen to be used as a medicines stores at River Oli HCIV. This was completed and functional.

3 Fencing of Aroi HCIII. This was reported as not yet completed.

4 Construction of Mortuary at Adumi HCIV. This was reported as completed but not yet commissioned.

In the PBS, the fencing of Aroi HCIII and Construction of Mortuary at Adumi HCIV were reported on page 18 of 147. However construction of Staff house at Riki HCIII and renovation of Kitchen to be used as medicines stores at Adumi HCIV were not reported.

Information on construction works were not accurately reported in the PBS FY 2022/23.

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>From the CHO copies of health facilities Annual work plans and budgets were obtained and submissions of three health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII were sampled to check whether they were submitted by 31st March 2022 and whether they conform to the prescribed format in the Local Government Planning Guidelines for the health Sector.</p> <p>1 River Oli HCIV Annual Work plan and Budget for FY 2022/23 was submitted on 2nd September 2022. It did not conform to the prescribed format.</p> <p>2 Pajulu HCIII Annual Work plan and Budget for FY 2022/23 was submitted on 13th September 2022. It did not conform to the prescribed format.</p> <p>3 Orivu HCIII Annual Budget and Work plan for FY 2022/23 was submitted on 24th August 2022. It did not conform to the prescribed format.</p> <p>The 3 sampled Annual Work plans and Budgets for FY 2022/23 were submitted beyond the deadline of 31st March 2022 and did not conform to the prescribed formats in the Local Government Planning Guidelines for the Health Sector.</p>	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 no evidence of submission of health facility Annual Budget performance Reports for FY 2022/23 to the City Health Officer ( CHO).</p>	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 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>There was no evidence of submission of health facility Improvement Plans for FY 2023/24 to the CHO.</p>	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 Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the CHO, the assessment team checked for the record of submissions of monthly and quarterly HMIS reports to establish timelines of submissions. Three health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII were sampled and all the 12 monthly and 4 quarterly submissions were reviewed.</p> <p>Submission of monthly reports (HMIS 105).</p> <p>River Oli HCIV submitted all 12 reports timely.</p> <p>July 2022- on 4th August 2022.</p> <p>August 2022- on 5th September 2022.</p> <p>September 2022- on 6th October 2022.</p> <p>October 2022- on 6th November 2022.</p> <p>November 2022- on 7th December 2022.</p> <p>December 2022- on 6th January 2023.</p> <p>January 2023- on 7th February 2023.</p> <p>February 2023- on 5th March 2023.</p> <p>March 2023- on 6th April 2023.</p> <p>April 2023- on 7th May 2023.</p> <p>May 2023- on 6th June 2023.</p> <p>June 2023- on 7th July 2023.</p> <p>Pajulu HCIII submitted all 12 reports timely.</p> <p>July 2022- on 7th August 2022.</p> <p>August 2022- on 6th September 2022.</p> <p>September 2022- on 6th October 2022.</p> <p>October 2022- on 5th November 2022.</p> <p>November 2022- on 6th December 2022.</p>	2



December 2022- on 6th January 2023.

January 2023- on 6th February 2023.

February 2023- on 6th March 2023.

March 2023- on 6th April 2023.

April 2023- on 5th May 2023.

May 2023- on 6th June 2023.

June 2023- on 5th July 2023.

Orivu HCIII submitted all 12 reports timely.

July 2022- on 4th August 2022.

September 2022- on 5th October 2022.

October 2022- on 5th November 2022.

November 2022- on 5th December 2022.

December 2022- on 7th January 2023.

January 2023- on 6th February 2023.

February 2023- on 7th March 2023.

March 2023- on 6th April 2023.

April 2023- on 5th May 2023.

May 2023- on 5th June 2023.

June 2023- on 6th July 2023.

Submission of quarterly reports (HMIS 106A).

River Oli HCIV submitted all the 4 reports timely.

Quarter one report was submitted on 6th October 2022.

Quarter two report was submitted on 6th January 2023.

Quarter three report was submitted on 6th April 2023.

Quarter four report was submitted on 7th July 2023.

Pajulu HCIII:

Quarter one report was submitted on 6th October 2022.

Quarter two report was submitted on 6th January 2023.

Quarter three report was submitted on 6th April 2023.

Quarter four report was submitted on 6th July 2023.

Orivu HCIII: submitted all the 4 reports timely.

Quarter one report was submitted on 5th October 2022.

Quarter two report was submitted on 5th January 2023.

Quarter three report was submitted on 6th April 2023.

Quarter four report was

Submitted on 6th July 2023

There was evidence that the 3 sampled health facilities of River Oll HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu UCIII submitted all the 12 monthly and the 4 Quarterly reports timely as required.

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

The indicator was dropped from the LGPA 2023. This was agreed upon during the OPM training conducted from 23rd -24th October 2023 at Imperial Royale Hotel. RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23.

0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

The indicator was dropped from the LGPA 2023. This was agreed upon during the OPM training conducted from 23rd -24th October 2023 at Imperial Royale Hotel. RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23.

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no information to the effect that the City timely compiled and submitted all the four quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the City Health Office, there was no evidence of an approved Performance Improvement plan developed for weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the City Health Office, there was no evidence of implementation of an approved Performance Improvement plan as no such Plan was developed.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).	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	From the City Health Office, the assessment team was not availed the LG performance contract, at the time of assessment, to enable them determine whether the LG budgeted for health workers.	0
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).	a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0	The assessment team reviewed the health staff list for FY 2023/24 signed by Ofuti William Baker, the Principal Health Officer, on 23rd November 2023 to check whether the LG deployed the health workers as per guidelines (all health facilities to have at least 75% staff required). The findings are indicated below;	0
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure		Some health facilities did not have the 75% of the staff as required for example;  Ayivuni HCIII had 13 out of the required 19 staff. The percentage post filled in this facility was $13/19 \times 100 = 68.4\%$ .  Riki HCIII had 13 health workers out of the required 19. The percentage post filled in this facility was $13/19 \times 100 = 68.4\%$ .  There was evidence that not all health facilities in Arua City had 75% of the required staff.	
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).	b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0	From the CHO, the health workers deployment list was obtained and 3 health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII were visited. At each of these health facility, the facility Attendance book was reviewed to determine that health workers whose names appear in the deployment list and the health facility list are working where they are deployed.	3
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure		The following sampled health workers in the facility staff list and deployment list were found to have signed in the Attendance Book on 24th November 2023;  River Oli HCIV  Adiga Geoffrey Medical Laboratory Technician.  Abindu A Modest Senior Clinical Officer.  Oburu Gabriel Clinical Officer.  Okiria Simon Anaesthetic Officer.	

Arijole Charles Senior Clinical Officer.

Onoma Charles Medical Officer

Oyeru Zulaika Nursing Officer.

Amviko Florence Enrolled Midwife

Onzia Jacqueline Health Information  
Assistant.

Adoma Joseph Clinical Officer.

Drijaru A Jane Health Educator.

Amia Susan Nursing Assistant

Pajulu HCIII

Buleru Sabina Enrolled Midwife.

Amviko Juliet Porter

Draru Fanny Clinical Officer

Bileru Florence Enrolled Nurse

Ajio Irene Assistant Nursing Officer.

Amaderu Joyce Assistant Nursing Officer.

Afayoa Charles Laboratory Technician.

Acidri Gordon Laboratory Technician.

Orivu HCIII

Lenia Christine Health Information  
Assistant.

Aleku Alone Askari

Adriko Pontious Health Assistant.

Oyoku Mathew Enrolled Nurse.

Cakucabo Charles Laboratory Technician.

Anena Lucy Senior Clinical Officer.

Andezu Kezzy Enrolled midwife

Ondoga Judith Enrolled midwife

Drani Robert Porter

There was evidence that the health workers whose names appear in the deployment list for the above sampled health facilities were working in those facilities.

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>From CHO, the health workers deployment list for FY 2023/24 was obtained. Three health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII were sampled and visited to check whether the list of health workers for FY 2023/24 was displayed on health facility notice boards.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>River Oli HCIV: The staff list dated 14th July 2023 and signed by Dr. Onoma Charles, the in charge, was displayed on the facility notice board.</p>	
			<p>Pajulu HCIII: The staff list dated 27th July 2023 and signed by Adiga Geoffrey, the in charge,, was displayed River on the facility notice board.</p>	
			<p>Orivu HCIII: The staff list dated 30th July 2023 and signed by Anena Lucy, the in charge, was displayed on the facility notice board.</p>	
			<p>There was evidence that lists of health workers for FY 2023/24 for the 3 sampled health facilities were displayed on facility notice boards.</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no records to prove that the City conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no records to prove that the Health facility in-charges had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility workers.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	The City never presented records regarding corrective actions taken since there was no appraisal conducted.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	From the CHO, the assessment team obtained and reviewed training reports for the FY 2022/23. Some of the reports are listed below;  1 On site mentorship of Private Health Providers on Malaria case management and Infection Prevention and Control (IPC). The report was signed by Abiriga Robert, Senior Clinical officer. It was not dated. Mentorship was conducted from 21st - 27th February 2023.  2 Training of health workers on implementation of the Oral Polio Vaccine (nOPV) round two The report was dated 3rd November 2022 and was signed by Andrua Joyce, Health Inspector. The training dates were not indicated in the report.  There was evidence that the Local Government Health department conducted training of health workers Continuous Professional Development (CPD) in the FY 2022/23.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	From the CHO, the assessment team did not obtain evidence of Training Database that was used to document trainings (CPD) conducted in FY 2022/23.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

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

9	<p>N23_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>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 assessment team was not availed, at the time of assessment, the copy of the letter the Town Clerk Arua City wrote notifying the Ministry of Health confirming the list of health facilities accessing PHC Non-Wage grants in FY 2023/24.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that 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>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			



9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no information publicized on the noticeboard.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>From the CHO, there was no evidence that the City Health Management team (CHMT) held Quarterly review meetings in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the CHO, there was no evidence that the City Health Management team (CHMT) held Quarterly Performance review meetings in FY 2022/23 and therefore it was not possible to establish the attendance.</p>	0

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0

If not applicable, provide the score

From the CHO, the assessment team obtained and reviewed the CHT support supervision reports for FY2022/23 to establish whether Adumi HCIV and River Oli HCIV were supervised in each of the four Quarters.

1 Quarter one supervision report was not dated. It was signed by Drijaru Aida Jane, Public health Nurse. Supervision was conducted between 4th July 2022 and 13th September 2022. River OLI HCIV was supervised on 13th September 2022. Adumi HCIV was not supervised in this Quarter.

Quarter two supervision report was dated 20th December 2022 and was signed by Dr. Apangu Pontious, City Health Officer. Supervision was conducted from 17th - 23rd October 2022. Adumi HCIV and River Oli HCIV were supervised in this Quarter but the dates when the facilities were visited were not indicated in the report.

Quarter three supervision report was dated 29th April 2023 and signed by Andezu Sally, Senior Nursing Officer. Supervision was conducted from 25th- 29th April 2023. Adumi HCIV and River Oli HCIV were supervised in this Quarter but the dates when these facilities were visited were not indicated in the report.

Quarter four supervision report was dated 28th July 2023 and signed by Andezu Sally, Senior Nursing Officer. The report did not indicate when the supervision was conducted but Adumi HCIV and River Oli HCIV were reported to have been visited during this Quarter.

The assessment team noted that report writing was poor and the City Health team needs an orientation on this.

Though the City Health Office carried out support supervision in all the four quarters of FY 2022/23, Adumi HCIV was not supervised in Quarter One.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

• If not applicable, provide the score

From the CHO, the assessment team obtained health sub district support supervision reports from Arua Central Division health Sub district. Ayivu West health sub district had no supervision reports.

Arua Central health sub district supervision reports for FY 2022/23 were reviewed as shown below;

1 Quarter one report was dated 30th September 2022 and was signed by Drijaru Aida Jane, Public health Nurse,

River Oli HCIV. The following facilities were supervised;

Uganda Prisons HCIII on 4th July 2022

Uganda Police HCIII on 11th July 2022.

Arua Military HCIII on 2nd August 2022.

Marie Stopes Health center on 9th August 2022.

Uganda Reproductive Health Center on 5th September 2022.

Arua Radiology Medical Center on 12th September 2022.

2 Quarter two supervision report was dated 31st December 2022 and signed by Drijaru Aida Jane, Public health Nurse, River Oli HCIV. The following health facilities were supervised;

Uganda Prisons HCIII on 12th October 2022

Uganda Police HCIII on 2nd October 2022.

Arua Military HCIII on 3rd November 2022.

Marie Stopes Health center on 10th November 2022.

Uganda Reproductive Health Center on 5th December 2022.

Arua Radiology Medical Center on 12th December 2022.

3 Quarter three report was dated 30th March 2023 and signed by Drijaru Anna Jane, Public health Nurse, River Oli HCIV. The following health facilities were supervised;

Uganda Prisons HCIII on 9th January 2023.

Uganda Police HCIII on 2nd January 2023.

Arua Military HCIII on 6th February 2023.

Marie Stopes Health center on 13th February 2023.

Uganda Reproductive Health Center on 6th March 2023.

Arua Radiology Medical Center on 18th March 2023.

4 Quarter four supervision report was dated 30th June 2023 and signed by Drijaru Aida Jane, Public Health Nurse, River Oli HCIV. The following health facilities were supervised;

Uganda Prisons HCIII on 11th April 2023.

Uganda Police HCIII on 10th April 2023..

Arua Military HCIII on 2nd May 2023.

Marie Stopes Health center on 9th May 2023.

Uganda Reproductive Health Center on 5th June 2023.

Arua Radiology Medical Center on 12th June 2023.

There was evidence that the City Health Team ensured the Health sub district carried out support supervision of the lower health facilities within the FY 2022/23.

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0

The assessment team visited the sampled 3 health facilities of River Oli HCIV, Pajulu HCIII and Orivu HCIII. The team obtained and reviewed the support supervision books to determine whether the health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and that their implementation was followed up. The findings from selected supervisions conducted were as follows;

Orivu HCIII

1 During support supervision conducted on 21st September by the CHT, the following recommendations were made;

-Integrate Nutrition assessment in Immunization outreaches.

-The in charge should identify one health worker and assign him/her as Nutrition Focal person

- Outreach data for Family planning services should be reported.

2 During support supervision conducted by the CHT on 5th December 2022, the following recommendations were made;

-In charge should make duty roster for the Outpatient and maternity units of the facility.

-Dispensers must update the dispensing log books.

3 during the support supervision conducted on 23rd march 2023 by the CHT, the following recommendations were made;

-The in charge should follow up on the Cupboard keys that are with the Former in charge.

-The in charge should write to the City health Officers about the inadequate number of Enrolled nurses in the facility.

4 During the CHT supervision conducted on 4th may 2023, the following recommendations were made;

0

- In charge should ensure that community dialogues are held to address the issue of lost to follow up HIV/TB clients.

- HIV clients should be initiated on TB preventive Therapy

From the supervision book, there was no evidence documented that implementation of the recommendations made were followed up.

#### Pajulu HCIII

1 During supervision conducted by the CHT on 20th September 2022, the following recommendations were made;

-The in charge should request from the City health Office the 2019 version of the family Planning Register.

-Stock status should be routinely monitored.

2 During supervision conducted on 19th December 2022, the CHT made the following recommendations;

-All facility user units should open stock cards for all medicines and health supplies.

-Dispensing logs must be used at every point where medicines are dispensed.

3 During supervision conducted on 27th February 2023, the CHT recommended 2023, the CHT recommended the following;

-In charge maternity should correct the order in which the four buckets are arranged.

-The in charge to hold Infection Prevention meetings every week.

During the CHT supervision conducted on 20th April 2023, the following recommendations were made;

-The in charge should mentor facility health workers on standard hand hygiene practices,

From the supervision book, there was no evidence documented that implementation of the recommendations made were followed up.

#### River Oli HCIV

1 During support supervision conducted by the CHT on 14th September 2022; the following recommendations were made;

-The facility in charge should request for the new versions of stock cards.

-Monitor ICCM commodity consumption to

avoid expiry in the stores.

2 During supervision conducted on 1st December 2022, the CHT made the following recommendations;

-Performance charts should be updated.

-Closely monitor the ongoing Quality improvement projects in the facility.

3 During the supervision conducted on 27th During the CHT support supervision conducted on March 2023. The following recommendations were made;

-Establish space to act as emergency room in the Outpatient (OPD).

-In the HMIS 105 report, the ART section should be verified by the ART in charge.

4 During the CHT supervision conducted on 14th June 2022, the following recommendations were made;

-The in charge should purchase data bundles for the Health Information Assistant to enable timely reporting.

-Other health facility staff should support the Health Information Assistant by summarizing data.

Though recommendations were made by the supervision team in the sampled health facilities, there was no documentation in the supervision books that the implementation of these recommendations was followed up.

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0

From the CHO, medicines and health supplies support supervision reports for FY 2022/23 were obtained and reviewed to check whether advice was given to health facility in charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicine and health supplies. Below are the findings from the reports obtained;

1 Supervision report that was dated 4th October 2022 and signed by Binega David Medicines management supervisor (MMS). Supervision was conducted in 2 facilities;

Orivu HCIII on 23rd September 2022.

Ayivuni HCIII on 24th September 2022.

The following advice was given to health facility in charges;

- Stock cards should be updated daily.

- Stores in charge should do physical count every month for effective medicines management.

1

2 Report that was not dated but signed by Binega David, MMS. Supervision was conducted at the following facilities;

River Oli HCIV on 25th October 2022

Riki HCIII on 18th October 2022

Pajulu HCIII on 25th October 2022.

Aroi HCIII on 27th October 2022

Orivu HCIII on 27th October 2022.

Ayivuni HCIII on 28th October 2022.

-The in charges were given the following advice;

-Average monthly consumption (AMC) and quantities to be ordered should be indicated on order forms.

-In charges should ensure that excess medicines and health supplies are redistributed to other needy facilities to avoid expiry in the stores.

3 Report that was dated 3rd April and signed by Binega David, the MMS. Supervision was conducted at the following health facilities;

Ayivuni HCIII on 15th March 2023.

Adumi HCIV on 16th March 2023.

Aroi HCIII on 16th March 2023.

Arua Police HCIII on 20th March 2023.

Pajulu HCIII on 20th March 2023.

River Oli HCIV on 28th March 2023.

Ombidrionnerea HCIII on 28th March 2023.

The advice given to health facility in charges were as follows;

-In charges should mentor other facility staff on stock card use.

-In charges should use PHC funds to purchase pallets for safe storage of medicines and other health supplies.

-In charges should ensure that stock cards are updated on a daily basis.

4 Report was dated 3rd July 2023 and signed by Binega David, the MMS. Supervision was conducted in the following health facilities;

Ayivuni HCIII on 20th June 2023.

Aroi HCIII on 20th June 2023.

Pajulu HCIII on 18th April 2023.

Adumi HCIV on 18th April 2023.

The advice given to health facility in charges were as follows;

-temperature charting should be done in the stores to avoid extreme temperatures that may destroy medicines efficacy.

Place stock cards next to each item in the shelves in the stores.

There was evidence that the Local government provided support to health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies.

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	There was no records to prove that the City allocated at least 30% of the CHO budget to health promotion and prevention activities. The records on Planning, Budgeting and expenditure were said to be with the External auditors.	0
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure				
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	From the CHO, the assessment team obtained and reviewed Quarterly Health Promotion activity reports to establish whether the CHT implemented Health Promotion, Disease Prevention and Social Mobilization activities in the FY 2022/23.	1
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			Quarter one report was dated 12th September 2022 and signed by Andrua Joyce, Health inspector. The following activities were implemented;	
			1 School inspection carried out in the following schools;	
			Nunu Primary school.	
			Orugbo primary school.	
			Etori Primary School	
			Imamu Primary School	
			Pokea primary School	
			The inspection dates were not indicated in the report.	
			2 Routine health inspection of domestic and Public premises. The inspection was carried out from 23rd -25th August 2022 in the following places;	
			Pajulu trading center.	



Awindiri market.

Oluko trading center.

3 Health facility inspection at the following health facilities;

Pajulu HCIII

Ediofe HCIII (PNFP).

St. Assumpta HCIII (PNFP).

Quarter two report was dated 15th January 2023 and signed by Andrua Joyce, Health Inspector. The following activities were reported to have been conducted;

1 Holding meetings with Village health Teams (VHT) on community mobilization for Integrated Community Case Management of Malaria (ICCM). Meetings were held in the 8 health facilities from 25th November -5th December 2022.

2 Conducting Home improvement campaign from 10th -13th December in Ayivuni Nyaute cell.

Quarter three report was dated 20th April 2023 and signed by Andrua Joyce, Health Inspector. The following activities were carried out;

1 Inspection of water sources in the following places;

Luvu Ward in Ayivu East.

Odravu ward in Ayivu East.

Yapi Ward in Ayivu East.

The water sources were inspected from 15th -17th March 2023.

2 Community sensitisation on COVID 19 and Ebola prevention in Ayivuni Parish.

This was conducted from 29th-25th March 2023.

Quarter four report was dated 12th June 2023 and signed by Andrua Joyce, Health Inspector. The following activities were carried out;

1 Radio Talk show on waste management. The show was held on Voice of Life 100.9 FM. The date of the talk show was not indicated in the report.

2 Radio Talk show on City Five Gin which had killed some people in Arua City. The date of the Talk show was not indicated in the report.

There was evidence that the City Health Team (CHT) led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in Arua City in FY2022/23.

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the CHO, City Health Team (CHT) meeting minutes for FY 2022/23 were presented to the assessment team to review.</p> <p>There was no evidence in these meeting minutes that the CHT discussed follow up actions on health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization aspects.</p> <p>The department Quarterly reports were not presented to the assessment team for review at the time of assessment.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team was not availed the Health Facility Asset register for review at the time of assessment. The Officer who was delegated by the City Health Officer to provide information to the assessment team claimed that the register was with the City Planner.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no records were presented for assessment by the City.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no records were presented for assessment by the City.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no records were presented for assessment by the City.</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>There was no evidence of timely submission of the Current FY infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans. It was not availed at the time of assessment.</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>No evidence of submission of procurement request form PP1 to PDU by 1st quarter of the current FY was availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for previous FY was approved by the contracts committee and cleared by the Solicitor General for projects above threshold;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of semi-detached staff house at Riki HC III, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00002, was approved by the contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and awarded to True Stars Investments Limited at a contract price of UGX 142,666,266. Agreement between the parties was signed on 10th January 2023.</li> <li>2. Renovation of house as store at Oli HC IV, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00004, was approved by the contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and awarded to Tabu and Brothers Enterprises Limited at a contract price of UGX 38,417,500. Agreement between the parties was signed on 10th January 2023.</li> <li>3. Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00003, was approved by the contracts committee on 28th March 2023 under Min. No. CC28/03/2023 and awarded to Maracha Loading and Offloading Association Limited at a contract price of 85,249,500. Agreement between the parties was signed on 17th April 2023.</li> </ol>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	No evidence for establishment of PIT for health projects was availed at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 were no HC II upgrades to HC III in the FY 2022/2023. But there were other health projects constructed as indicated below;</p> <p>1. Construction of Semi-detached staff house at Riki HC III,</p> <p>2. Renovation of house as store at Oli HC IV.</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>There were no health Centre upgrades from HC II to HC III in the FY 2022/2023 hence no evidence for clerk of works submission of consolidated weekly records to the District engineer and DHO.</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>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>There were no health centre upgrades from HC II to HC III in the FY 2022/2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no health centre upgrades from HC II to HC III in the FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.</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>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>Based on the evidence provided, all health infrastructure contracts had a complete procurement file with all records as required by PPDA as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fencing of health facility at Aroi HC III, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Works/22-23/00003, the file had project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 which was approved by the contracts committee on 28th March 2023 under Min. No. CC28/02/2023 and awarded the contract to Maracha Loading and Offloading Association Limited at a contract sum of UGX 85,249,500. Agreement between the two parties was signed on 17th April 2023.</li> <li>• Renovation of house as store at Oli HC IV, with procurement reference number: Arua851/Wrks/22-23/00004, the project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 which was approved by contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and awarded to Tabu and Brothers Enterprises Limited at a contract price of UGX 38,417 500. Agreement between the parties was signed on 10th January 2023.</li> <li>• Construction of semi-detached staff house at Riki HC III, with procurement reference number: Arua851,Wrks/22-22/00002, the project evaluation report dated 12th December 2022 which was approved by contracts committee on 19th December 2022 under Min. No. CC16/12/2022 and awarded to True Stars Investments (U) Limited at a contract price of UGX 142,666,266. Agreement between the parties was signed on 10th January 2023.</li> </ul>	1

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0	No grievance was recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	The guidelines on medical waste management including guidelines on construction of medical waste facilities, where not availed at the time of assessment.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	15 facilities and only 4 don't have incinerators, Adumi HCIV, OLI HC IV, Arua Regional Referral where the Ministry signed on behalf of green label. The MOU was signed by the Town Clerk on behalf of Arua City on 1st October, 2022.  The collection schedule by green label for 2023 was provided	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	No training reports to establish whether training and awareness raising on waste management was conducted were availed	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	Bidding/contract documents containing the BOQs couldnot be vailed citing that they had been taken for external auditing exercise.	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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	Proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.) was not availed at the time of assessment	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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.	Reports on supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; were not availed	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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	E & S certification forms were not availed during the assessment.	0



**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>

2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates  o If within +/-20% score 2  o If not score 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.  o If 100% projects completed: score 2  o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1  o If projects completed are below 80%: 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning  o If there is an increase: score 2  o If no increase: score 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).  o If increase is more than 1% score 2  o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1  o If there is no increase : score 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
---	--	---	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 6 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>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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
	<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>		
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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	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.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0

### 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	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:  Score 4 or else score 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

**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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:  i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>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</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>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</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</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>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</p>	<p>Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
----	--	--	---	---

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

## 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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	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	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	0

**Crosscutting  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither had substantively appointed City Finance Officer nor secondment from Finance Ministry.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Moni Fred as City Planner vide letter dated 23rd May 2023. Under CSC minute : 30/2023, CR/156/1.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Engineer Charles Omona Kasongo as City Engineer vide letter dated 8th May 2023. Under CSC minute: 4/2023, CR/161/1.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither had substantively appointed City Natural Resource Officer nor secondment from MoWE.	<b>0</b>



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>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Ayo Ogwal George as City Production Officer vide letter dated 8th May 2023, under CSC minute 20/2023, CR/161/1.</p>	3
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>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had substantively appointed Drate Judith as City Community Development Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 22/2022, CR/161/1.</p>	3
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>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG neither had substantively appointed District Commercial Officer nor secondment from Ministry of Trade and Industry.</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>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Omale Jimmy as Senior Procurement Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute:77/2022, CR/161/1.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Afuru Irene as Procurement Officer/ Inventory Management Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute:59/2022, CR/161/1.</p>	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	There was no substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer Administration in the LG.	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	The LG substantively appointed Asedri Fred as Principle Environment Officer, vide letter dated 1st December 2022 under CSC minute: 28/2022, CR/161/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Findru Moses Alo as Senior Physical Planner vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 86/2022, CR/161/1.	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.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Adriko B Sam as Senior Accountant vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 80/2022, CR/161/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Abizu Stephen as Senior Internal Auditor vide letter dated 8th May 2023. Under CSC minute: 13/2023, CR/161/1.	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer DSC in the LG.</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 LG had 2 LLGs and Town Clerks had been appointed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Angudubo Emmanuel was appointed as Deputy Town Clerk vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 14/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>2. Drakuma Maliki was appointed as City Division Town Clerk vide letter dated 20th January 2023, LG/P.11101. Deployed at Central Division.</li> </ol>	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>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had 2 LLGs and appointed CDOs in all of the Divisions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Edema Geoffrey was appointed as Senior Community Development Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2002, under CSC minute No. 82/2022, CR/ 161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>2. Alesi A Babra was appointed as CDO vide letter dated 1st June 2023, under DSC minute No. 56/2023(2), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>3. Anguko Delma was appointed as CDO vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under CSC minute No. 56/2023(1), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>4. Driciru Centenary was appointed as CDO vide letter dated 1st December 2022 under CSC minute No. 83/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>5. Drazuru Polly Baipha was appointed CDO vide letter dated 1st June 2023. Under CSC minute:56/2023(4), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.</li> <li>6. Taliru Beatrice was appointed Senior Community Development Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute:23/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.</li> <li>7. Buatru Geoffrey was appointed CDO vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 45/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.</li> </ol>	5

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 LG had 2 LLGs and had substantively appointed SAAs in all the Sub Counties as listed below:

1. Akua Fred was appointed as Senior Revenue Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022 under CSC minute No. 19/2022(3), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.

2. Aliru Teopista Night was appointed as SAA vide letter dated 1st December 2022 under CSC minute No. 81/2022(1), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.

3. Draku Moses was appointed as Senior Accountant vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under CSC minute No. 57/2023, CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.

4. Naiga A Jane was appointed as Revenue Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022 under CSC minute No 39/2022(1), CR/161/1. Deployed at Ayivu Division.

5. Adia Charles was appointed Senior Revenue Officer vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute 19/2022(1), CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.

6. Onzima Isaac was appointed Senior Assistant Accountant vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 57/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.

7. Aletiru Z Drakua was appointed Accountant vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 34/2022, CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.

8. Jurua A K Samuel was appointed Senior Assistant Accountant dated vide letter 1st December 2022. Under minute 81/2022(2), CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division.

9. Ajobe Omar was appointed Principal Treasurer vide letter 8th May 2023. Under CSC minute 21/2023, CR/161/1. Deployed at Central Division

## 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:	LG Final Accounts for the previous FY were not provided and the attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0		
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:	LG Final Accounts for the previous FY were not provided and the attempt to find corresponding evidence and information was futile. The Head of Finance Mr. Adriko Sam expressed unavailability and cited parallel commitments like coordinating the state house anti-corruption unit which was alleged to be at the city conducting an investigation, coordinating of the external audit that was taking place at the same time the assessment was supposed to take place. Therefore, Head of Finance stated that he is not prepared for the information gathering exercise at the time the assessment was supposed to be conducted.	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for the projects implemented during FY 2022/2023 as per the examples below;  Rehabilitation of Go-down Road in Bazaar and Tanganyika Ward was screened on 11th July, 2022 as evidenced by the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the Proposed Rehabilitation of 4 Gravel Roads (17.9 Km) in Arua District to First Class Murram. The ESIA was undertaken by M/s. UB CONSULTING ENGINEERS LTD, UGANDA in JV with M/s AIR WATER EARTH (AWE) LTD and submitted on 8th December, 2022.</p>	<b>4</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

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>The project for Rehabilitation of Go-down Road in Bazaar and Tanganyika Ward had the ESMP costed at 136,000,000 Ugsh endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO was developed on 11th July, 2022.</p>	<b>4</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

**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>The LG obtained Unqualified audit opinion on its operations for the previous FY.</p>	<b>10</b>
---	--	--	---	-----------

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p>	<p>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>There was no evidence provided at the time of the assessment. A complete response to the Internal Auditor and Auditor General's report was not provided. The internal auditor Mr. Stephen Abizu indicated that he had not yet assumed office when the report was prepared and has no copy for submission to the assesment team.</p>	0
	<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>		
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>There was no evidence provided for the exercise and there was no preparation for the assessment. The monitoring and Evaluation officer Mr. Etukibo Moses was designated to coordinate for the assessment in the planning unit. However, he indicated that he was new in office and had no idea of where the required information was stored. The economic planner Mr. Anguyo Marcheal who was a custodian of most information sources in the unit was absent for two full days of the exercise. Mr. Lumu Musa the statician who arrived for the exercise a few minutes to the exit meeting indicated that the original perception of the exercise was that; it was meant for only divisions and no cross-cutting indicators were supposed to be assessed at the local Government and therefore asserted that Arua city was not prepared for the exercise at the Higher LG level.</p>	0
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>From the PBS generated Annual Performance Report, the local government had submitted the annual performance report on 31st July 2023 which was before the 31st August of the current FY.</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.

Only one PBS quarterly budget performance report was submitted for the assessment. This was the quarter four budget performance report which was submitted on on 15th August 2023. Therefore there were no justification for the rest of the quarterly budget performance reports.



**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has 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 LG had substantively appointed Obayi Ombere Raymond as CEO vide letter dated 1st December 2022. Under CSC minute: 20/2022, CR/161/1.	<b>30</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>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG approved staff structure provided for one (1) Inspector of Schools. and the Inspector of Schools was substantively recruited as shown below;  1. The LG substantively appointed Buza Zilly as Senior Inspector of Schools vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under CSC minute: 58/2023, CR/161/1	<b>40</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for the projects implemented during FY 2022/2023 as per the examples below;

The project for the construction of five stance toilets in Ambeko Primary School was screened on 11th July, 2022 according to the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO.

The project for the construction of five stances toilets in Riki Primary school was screened 11th July, 2022 according to the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO.

The project for the construction of two classroom blocks at Kubo Primary School on the 11th July, 2022 according to the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO..

The project for the fencing of Anyafio primary school was screened on 11th July, 2022 according to the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO.

The project for the construction of four blocks of classrooms, offices and staffroom in Anyara Primary School was screened on 5th July, 2022 according to the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO.

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, this is in reference to the National Environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section (d) which were small projects that required ESMPs after screening and had minimal impacts. The anticipated impacts and Mitigation measures for the education projects were identified in the ESMPs as indicated below

Construction of 5-stance toilets in Ambeko Primary School. The ESMP costed at 300,000 Ugshs endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was assessed.

Construction of five stances toilets in Riki Primary school. The ESMP costed at 300,000 Ugshs endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was assessed.

Fencing of Anyafio primary school. ESMP costed at 500,000 Ugshs endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was assessed.

Construction of four blocks of classrooms, offices and staffroom in Anyara Primary School. The ESMP costed at 800,000 Ugshs endorsed by Environment Officer and CDO on 5th July, 2022.

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

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

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The LG neither substantively appointed CHO nor was there a secondment from MoH.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Ofuti William Baker as Principal Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing vide letter dated 8th May 2023 under CSC minute 5/2023, CR/161/1.	<b>20</b>
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Amaga Benard as Senior Health Educator Vide letter dated 8th May 2023. Under CSC minute: 4/2023, CR/161/1	<b>20</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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.

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for the projects implemented during FY 2022/2023 as per the examples below;

The project for the construction of a Semi-detached staff house at Riki Health Centre III in Yabiavoko Ward, Central and Ayivu Division, Arua City was screened on 11th July, 2022 as revealed by the Environment and social screening form endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and City Engineer.

The project for the fencing of Aroi Health Centre III. Environment and social screening form endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022

The project for the construction of mortuary house at Adumi Health Centre IV. Environment and social screening form endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022

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.

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, this is in reference to the National Environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section (d) which were small projects that required ESMPs after screening and had minimal impacts. The anticipated impacts and Mitigation measures for the education projects were identified in the ESMPs as indicated below

Renovation of Pajulu Health Centre III. The ESMP costed at 1,000,000 Ugshs endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was presented.

Construction of mortuary house at Adumi Health Centre IV. The ESMP costed at 300,000 Ugshs endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was presented.

Fencing of Aroi Health Centre III. ESMP costed at 300,000 Ugshs endorsed by Senior Environment Officer and CDO on 11th July, 2022 was presented.

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	<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.	Arua City does not implement MSI projects and therefore was excluded from the LGPA.	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment 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.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>



1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	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.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Arua City Water sector is managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the LGPA.	0