



LGMSD 2022/23

Amolatar District

(Vote Code: 564)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	66%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	65%
Educational Performance Measures	53%
Health Performance Measures	60%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	71%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	59%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The evidence provided indicated the district only had one projects implemented using DDEG funding and it was completed and being utilised.</p> <p>1. Completion of District Store at Ugx 35,000,000 as per approved Budget page 9 and the annual budget performance report on page 38.</p>	4
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"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>A copy of the result assessment presented by the Planner during the assessment indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 78% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 78%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 0%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>= (0.78 - 0/0)*100%= 78%</p> <p>The LLG performance assessment for the current year increased by 78% from the previous year's performance.</p>	3
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"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 was completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>1. Completion of District Store at Ugx 35,000,000 as per approved Budget page 9 and the annual budget performance report on page 38.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence that the LG budgeted Ugx 35,000,000 and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines as indicated below; 1. Completion of District Store at Ugx 35,000,000.	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The variation in the contract price for sampled DDEG funded infrastructure investment for the previous FY, was -0.82% within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers' estimates, which was within acceptable variation. Project: Completion of District store under administration Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00019 Estimated cost: Ugx 35,000,000/= Contract Cost: Ugx 35,288,000/= Variation: Ugx -288,000/= %age variation (-288,000/35,000,000) x 100%= -0.82%	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 information positions filled in the LGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance the following staff were found at Agwingiri and Namasale sub counties;; SAS, Senior Accountants Assistant, Parish Chief, Community Development Officer At Namasale Town Council, the re was an Ag. Senior Assistant Town Clerk, a CDO, Senior Assistant Town Clerk, Town Agent and An Extension Worker.	2
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	No completion report was provided specifically showing the completion of Store from the District Engineer at the time of assessment.	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 LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was; DLG IVA Agwingiri S/C 78 72 Namasale S/C 93 83 Arwoteck S/C 93 80 Namasale T/C 99 99 The performance of the Arwoteck S/C was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.	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	There was evidence the Amolatar District Local Government had performance improvement plan for at least 30% of the lowest performing lower local government. The activity was conducted between 25th to 29th September 2023, a collaborative effort between CAO's Office, Planning Unit and the members of assessment team.	2
---	---	--	---	----------

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

There was evidence that the LG implemented the PIP for all the lower local government in the district. Some of the lower local government that were mentored in respective performance measures were as follows;

1. Functionality of parish Administrative Structures. Some of the non functional PDCs in some parishes/WARDS included Abeja S/c, Akwon S/c, Arwotcek S/c, Etam T/c, Agikdak S/c and Agwingiri S/c. The proposed activity was to functionalization of the PDCs/WDCs and this was to be conducted through a meetings and training committees. Responsible personnel's were SAS/Town Clerk and CDO.

Some of the challenges raised included but not limited to;

- Poor documentation in Most Lower Local Government.

- Non commitment by officers in the lower local Government.

General recommendations were;

- Need for the district to prioritize this activity and ensure adequate transport facilities are provided to the teams.

- LLG leads persons (SAS/TCs) need to be prepared early to ease interface with the assessors.

- Commitment and availability of officers at lower local government during process of assessment.

The report was signed and acknowledged by the CAO Mr Nawoya Bruno and the Team leader of the assessment Mr Anach Jerome.

Human Resource Management and Development

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

The LG HR department did not provide evidence to show that the LG had 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.

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 that the LG had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI) as seen in the monthly attendance reports. For instance in the month of December 2022, the best performers were; Obote Moses- Senior Accounts assistant and Okori Tom-accountant with 100% attendance. The worst performers were; Okwang James-Driver who was present on only 3 days and Enyaku David- Surveyor who was present on 6 days in the months.	2
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	The HR department provided 1 out of 9 appraisals for HODs at the time of assessment as below; 1. Acen Josephine Akullu, District Education Officer was appraised on 12th July 2023 by Namwooya Bruno, CAO	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. For instance on 16th April 2023 the committee sat and sanctioned Ayo Cecilia, Education Assistant who was cautioned for failing to follow the procedures of study leave which led to her absenteeism; and Olupot Ronald, Driver who was forwarded to the District Service Commission for further action regarding his absenteeism.	1
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The HR department did not provide any evidence to show that the LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	The LG did not recruit any staff in the previous FY.	1

9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	The LG Human Resource department neither provided the list of the staff who retired the previous FY nor did they provide the pension payroll for review to enable assessment of this indicator.	0
---	---	--	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence of communication letters for the transfer of DDEG funds to LLG were presented at the time of assessment. It was noted by the Assistant Senior Accountant that person who was in custody of the letters was sick and out of office.	0
----	--	--	--	---

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED). Score: 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG did not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows: Quarter 1: LG didn't receive DDEG Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 18th October, 2022, warrant was made in 14 days. Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January, 2023 and warranted on 13th January, 2023 which was 11 days. Quarter 4: LG did not receive DDEG.	0
----	--	---	---	---

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter: Score 2 or else score 0	No communication letters were presented at the time of assessment so it was hard to determine whether the LG communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in reach quarter.	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 LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023. However, Quarter four report was not presented.</p> <p>Q 1 – monitoring report was presented. However, the report didn’t have a date when the activity was conducted. The activity was done to ascertain the progress on the ground and also to find out whether the output reflects the monetary value.</p> <p>Q 2- A monitoring report indicated that the activity was conducted from 1st to 10th November 2023 to determine the project completion against the funding and to check on the level of compliance to DEG guidelines by Sub counties.</p> <p>Q 3 Supervision report indicated that the activity was conducted between 3rd March 2023 and 15th March 2023 to check on the project status and to identify the gaps and challenges faced during the implementation..</p> <p>Q 4 monitoring reported was not presented at the time of assessment. The senior noted that they were out of fund to facilitate the team.</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 LG availed TPC minutes which showed that supervision and monitoring reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. However, the TPC minute for the quarter four report was not presented.</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter one report was discussed on 4th August 2022 - TPC- MIN.05/8/2022: Update on project status from monitoring reports. 2. Quarter two report was discussed on 21st December 2022- MIN.04/12/2022: Discussion of Monitoring reports 3. Quarter three report was discussed on 20th March 2023- TPC- MIN.05/03/2023: Update on the monitoring reports. 4. No evidence was provided. 	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>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The IFMS hard copy of the assets register presented at the time of assessment was complete capturing all the assets such as building, Motor vehicles, land and other categories of assets. Some the assets included Upgrade-hospitals with assets number M1166, tag number 805-BUL-0015 costing 798,854,960. The assets register was as per the format in the accounting manual. It was noted by the Assistant Senior Account they didn't have any new assets in the previous FY.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had in place a board of survey report for the FY 2021-2022, produced and dully signed on 20th August 2022. The report carried recommendations to management which included engraving and disposal of obsolete assets. However, the LG didn't provide evidence whether the recommendations of the BoS was implemented.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref HRM/156/1 dated 21st June 2021.</p> <p>The committee held all the quarterly meetings as per the minutes of the meetings availed to the Assessment team;</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting was held on 30th September 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting was held on 15th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting was held on 7th May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting was held on 22nd June 2023.</p> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows</p> <p>Quarter 1 minutes were submitted on 03rd October 2022, Quarter 2 minutes were submitted on 16th December 2022, Quarter 3 was submitted on 09th March 2023 and Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to Ministry on 23rd June 2023.</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>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. The DDEG project was desk appraised on 6th June 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP and availability of funds in the Approved budget.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of District Store at 35,000,000 and the project was recommended for field appraisal. 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects The project field appraisal was conducted on 16th June 2022 for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of District Store at 35,000,000 and the project was recommended for funding and implementation. 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that project profiles with costing for the current FY were discussed by TPC.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Screening for environmental and social risks/impact and monitoring using checklists were not done for the following projects below yet they were approved in the LG Annual Budget estimates for FY 2023/4;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Plants – Construction at Arwot Village at UGX. 24,000,000 2. Water Plants – Construction at Adole Village at UGX. 24,000,000 3. 5 Boreholes rehabilitation at UGX. 39,000,000 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure project for the current FY, to be implemented using the DDEG was, incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan that was signed by the CAO, Mbiwa Paul Samuel, on 12th July, 2023. This was phase III partial completion of maternity ward at Amolator HCIV at Ugx 90M.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure project to be implemented in the current FY, using DDEG had been approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done when the Contracts Committee sat on 21st September, 2023 when they approved the evaluation report and contract award for the construction of maternity ward at Amolator HCIV.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG had properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG, followed the standard technical design provided by the LG Engineer. This was observed at the constructed district store, where it was observed that the windows fixed were glazed steel casement windows of size 1.2 x 1.5m, and the door was of size 2.4 x 2.4m also made from solid steel metal fixed off with gloss paint as per design.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that, the LG had provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for the completion of the district store in a report dated 3rd November, 2023 prepared by the project supervisor.	2
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 evidence that the LG had verified works, certified them and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes. This was observed in a payment claim raised by the contractor Alfayo General Company on 23rd May, 2023 of Ugx 43,805,800/= was reviewed. It was certified by the District Engineer on 1st June, 2023 as Ugx 41,615,510/=, paid on 28th June, 2023 Ugx 39,118,579/= under voucher 6427950, which was within the time frame.	1
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 a complete procurement file in place for the contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The file reviewed was for the completion of the district store. Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00019, that these documents; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Singed works contract dated 21st December, 2022 with Ms. Omia Holdings limited • Evaluation report dated 1st December, 2022 • Contracts committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022 • PP1 form, issue and receipt of bid records, acceptance and award letters, supervision reports among others 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0	The District i) designated Ms. Ayo Juliet Okwir the Principal Assistant Secretary with an appointment letter issued on 19th September, 2020 to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprising of members from different co-opted departments such as Mr. Ongora Leonard the AEO, Mr. Omara Apollo the District Natural Resources Officer, Mr. Otike Patrik the District community Development Officer, Mr. Gad Okello the Human Resources Officer, Dr. Aliga Simon the District Health Officer and Ms. Acen Josephine Okullo the District Education Officer.	2
----	--	--	--	---

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.	The LG specified a system for handling grievances which includes a centralized complaints log and a Grievances Redress committee with members co-opted from different departments to handle grievances without bias. For example, a complaint recorded on 21st July, 2022 arising out of a project for the upgrade of the Arwotcek HCIII for non-payment of arrears by the contractor and a promise was made by the contractor to clear the arrears in a weeks' time.	2
	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.	There were no records availed at the time of assessment on publicized grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, on page 14, under the Human Capital Development , programme number 5 was allocated for Natural Resources, Environment, Climate Change, Land and Water Management, and also on Page 17 under Table 1: Challenges from implementation of the previous plan based on programme areas and on page 73, Table 3. 1: LGDP Goal, Overall Objectives, programmes and page 74 Table 3. 3: Adopted NDP III Programs and LGDP Program Objectives	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines. A meeting held on 20th March 2023 under MIN no. 05/03/2023; update on dissemination of Enhanced DDEG guidelines and it was done by the senior planner.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	There were no DDEG projects in the previous FY since none had been screened and neither were ESMPs prepared.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There were no records of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change that were budgeted for in the previous FY.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There were no DDEG projects for the previous FY and therefore no records to verify land ownership.	1
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	The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the following projects below; 1. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with a urinal at Aromi primary school prepared on 18th July, 2022 2. Sitting, drilling and installation of 5 boreholes prepared on 20th July, 2022 3. Construction of staff house at Biko HCIII prepared on 15th August, 2022 4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 9th March, 2023	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	Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example; 1. Certificate form number amol805/works/2022-2023/00013 issued on 15th June, 2023 for the opening of Amolator-Abeja road 2. Certificate form number Amol805/works/2022-2023/00014 issued on 14th August, 2023 for sitting, drilling and installation of 5 boreholes 3. Certificate form number Amol805/works/2022-2023/000013 issued on 23rd August, 2023 for the completion of district stores	1
----	--	---	---	---

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and was up to-date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank account availed to Assessment Team as detailed below; A/c name: AMOLATAR GENERAL FUND ACCOUNT A/c No: 01983501002785 Reconciled up to 24th September 2023 Amount; Ugx 18,065,072. It was noted by the Assistant Senior Accountant that other bank accounts were frozen and the LG is currently operating with one Bank account.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below; 1st quarter report was produced on 24th October, 2022. 2nd quarter report was produced on 25th July, 2023. 3rd quarter report was produced on 25th April, 2023. 4th quarter report was produced on 24th January, 2023.	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of the implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. As per the delivery book for the Internal Auditor, it indicated that the reports were all submitted on 20th September 2023 and received by the Secretary LG PAC.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that LG PAC discussed the internal audit reports for previous FY.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	----------

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 676,169,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 35) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 323,258,225 which gave a variance of Ushs (352,910,775) this indicate that District local Government collected less revenue compared to what they had budgeted for.</p> <p>$(352,910,775)/676,169,000 \times 100\% = (52\%)$</p> <p>The LG managed to correct 48% of its budgeted revenue in the Previous FY.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 36 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 199,537,649</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 323,258,225</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 323,258,225 - Ushs 199,537,649 = Ushs 123,720,576</p> <p>= 123,720,576/199,537,649) x 100= 62%</p> <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 increased by 62% compared to the last year collection.</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---

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

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder</p> <p>Procurement Reference: Amol564/WRKS/2022-2023/00008</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: Rehabilitation of seven deep boreholes in Amolatar</p> <p>Method of Procurement: Selective bidding</p> <p>Best Evaluated Bidder: Radiant8 General Supply and Construction limited</p> <p>Price: Ugx 46,798,800/= VAT Exclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 7th December, 2022</p> <p>Date of removal: 20th December, 2023</p>	2
----	--	---	---	---

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A copy of LG performance assessment results dated 6th July 2023, acknowledged by CAO and well publicized on the district notice board.</p> <p>Crosscutting Minimum condition scored 41%</p> <p>Education Minimum Conditions score 100%</p> <p>Health Minimum Conditions score 60%</p> <p>Crosscutting Performance Measures 54%</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that the LG conducted a baraza or a radio talk show in the previous FY.</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>No evidence was provided that LG in the previous FY made public available information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures to appeal.</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>It was noted by the clerk to Council that no IGG issue was reported in the Previous FY.</p>	1

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was 2647</p> <p>Total absentees were 15</p> <p>Total that sat were (2647 - 15) = 2632</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 97+1009+607 = 1713</p> <p>Pass rate = (1713)x 100 = 65%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2632</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 3139</p> <p>Total absentees were =42</p> <p>Total that sat were (3139 - 42) = 3097</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 147+1003+620 = 1770</p> <p>% pass rate= (1770) x 100 = 57.1%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3097</p> <p>% Change = 57.61- 65 = - 7.9 %</p>	0

1

Learning Outcomes:
The LG has improved
PLE and USE pass
rates.

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered was =
577

Total absentees were =01

Total that sat were = 576

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 6+78+176 = 260

Pass rate = $260 \times 100 = 45.1\%$

576

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was =
740

Total absentees were = 11

Total that sat were (740 - 11) =729

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 19 +122+ 213
=354

% pass rate= $354 \times 100 = 48.5\%$

729

% change = $48.5 - 45.1 = 3.4\%$

2

2

N23_Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

- By more than 5%, score 2
- Between 1 and 5%, score 1
- No Improvement, score 0

NB: If the previous average
score was 95% and above,
Score 2 for any increase.

The average score of education LLG
performance increased by 84% compared
to the last year as per the computation
below;

The average score for the current year
was 84%.

The average score for the previous
financial year was 0%

Percentage change = Current percentage
less previous percentage over old
percentage.

= $(0.84 - 0/0) \times 100\% = 84\%$

The Education LLG performance
assessment for the current year
increased by 84% from the previous
year's performance.

2

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

a) If the education
development grant has been
used on eligible activities as
defined in the sector
guidelines: score 2; Else
score 0

DLG did receive a Sector Development
Grant of Ushs 1,981,617,000 for FY
2022/2023. was used towards;

1. Construction of a 1 block of 2 classrooms at Arwot Primary School at Ushs 79,864,760.
2. Construction of a 5-stance drainable latrine with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Aguludia Primary School at Ushs 25,599,000.
3. Construction of a 5-stance drainable latrine with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Akol Primary School at Ushs 23,924,500.
4. Construction of a 5-stance drainable latrine with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Aromi Primary School at Ushs 23,178,000.
5. Construction of a 1 classroom at Burkwoyo Primary School at Ushs 39,543,000.
6. Construction of a 5-stance drainable latrine with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Muntu Township Primary School at Ushs 23,915,000.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DEO and District Engineer only certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY in absence of District Environment Officer and the DCDO before the LG made payments to the contractors.

1. Voucher no 3726187 dated 20th February 2023 for Ushs 37,740,029; Certificate No 1, dated 3rd January 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00006, Project; Construction of a 1 block of 2 classrooms at Arwot Primary School was certified by DEO on 4th January 2023, District Engineer on 3rd January 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work.
2. Voucher no 6439337 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 16,074,000; Certificate No 1, dated 10th May 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00014, Project; Completion of a 4 class room block at Abeja Primary School was certified by only District Engineer on 01st June 2023, DEO, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work.
3. Voucher no 4690885 dated 30th March 2023 for Ushs 10,535,120; Certificate No 1, dated 22nd February 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00009, Project; Construction of a 1 class room block at Burkwoyo Primary School was certified by DEO on 28th February 2023, District Engineer on 23rd February 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Of the three sampled projects two were +1.67% within +/-20% acceptable variation, while the third was -220.48% outside the acceptable variation and did not comply.

The projects reviewed were;

Project 1: Construction of Etamu Seed Secondary School

Procurement ref: MoES/UGFIT/wrks/2021-2022/00003

Project 2 : Construction of one classroom block at Burkwoyo Primary School

Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00009

Project 3 : Renovations at Abeja primary school

Procurement ref: Amol563/wrks/2022-2023/00014

Project 1:

Estimated cost: Ugx 844,681,956/=

Contract cost: Ugx 2,707,069,270/=

Variation Ugx -1,862,387,314/=

%age $(-1,862,387,314/844,681,956) \times 100\% = -220.48\%$

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 40,189,156/=

Contract cost: Ugx 39,543,000/=

Variation Ugx 646,156/=

%age variation $(646,156/40,189,156) \times 100\% = 1.67\%$

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 18,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 18,000,000/=

Variation: Ugx 0/=

%age variation 0%

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	There was no evidence to show that education project Etamu Seed Secondary School had been completed as per the work plan in the previous FY, in the quarter 4 report or the supervision reports, during the assessment. The quarter 4 report just indicated amount budgeted as Ugx 1,650,097,000/= and showed spent as Ugx 541,414,000/=, on page 59 of 146, without specifying amount for the Seed School.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	Amolator LG indicated a total of 634 teachers posted in the 51 UPE schools. This figure served as an average indicator in accordance with the prescribed Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) staffing guidelines. However, it fell short of the budgeted teacher's structure, which was set at 802.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	The calculation for the percentage of the actual staffing level compared to the budgeted structure is as follows: $634/802 \times 100 \approx 79\%$	
			This implies that the LG was 21% short of the required UPE teachers based on the budgeted teacher's structure.	

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG Consolidated Assets Register for Amolator LG for the fiscal year 2022/2023, encompassing assets for the 51 registered primary schools and 8 secondary schools, was successfully compiled. The register included the following:

For the primary section:

- 771 classrooms
- 1,145 latrine stances
- 15,291 desks
- 801 teachers' houses

For the secondary schools:

- 151 classrooms
- 203 latrine stances
- 2,669 desks
- 192 teachers' houses

This comprehensive register was prepared by the DLG education office. The data indicated that all 59 schools met the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) basic requirements and minimum standards for compiling the assets register in the recommended format.

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The deployment list of DLG teachers from the DEO's office, dated 14th June, 2023, was meticulously cross-referenced with the information obtained during school assessments. The coherence between the two sets of data was evident in the exemplary matching observed at the sampled schools.

For instance, at Arwotcek Primary School, designated as a rural institution, the list prominently displayed 14 teachers inside the head teacher's office. Notably, Mr. Edmond Nyanga served as the head teacher, aligning seamlessly with the corresponding information in the DEO's records.

Similarly, at Omaraebek memorial Primary School, categorized as a semi-urban establishment, the deployment list exhibited 14 teachers, with Mr. Ogwang Justine identified as the head teacher. This information harmonized perfectly with the details provided by the DEO's office.

Furthermore, the assessment at Amolator Primary School, classified as an urban setting, revealed a comprehensive list featuring 25 teachers, led by Ms. Adong Sarah as the head teacher. Once again, this data concurred accurately with the DEO's deployment list.

The culmination of these findings indicated an impeccable alignment between the teacher deployment details at the sampled schools and the DEO's records. The accuracy rate was calculated, resulting in a remarkable 100% alignment.

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>The evidence gathered pointed to the DLG maintaining school assets registers that offered a comprehensive overview of the infrastructure across all 51 UPE schools. The details below were extracted from the sampled schools to validate accuracy.</p> <p>Amolator Primary School, identified as an urban institution, reported 16 classrooms, 220 desks, 14 latrine stances to cater for 1900 pupils and 11 teacher houses.</p> <p>Omaraebek Primary School, categorized as semi-urban, had 15 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, 184 desks to cater for 1359 pupils and 4 teacher houses.</p> <p>Arwotcek Primary School, designated as rural, possessed the following assets: 16 classrooms, 121 desks, 23 latrine stances to cater for 1435 pupils and 14 teachers' houses</p> <p>Despite the thorough verification process, it was evident that the recorded assets, infrastructure, and equipment did not align with the information provided in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register supplied by the DEO.</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"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was no evidence, either from the Education Department or the DLG, indicating that head teachers in 51 UPE schools adhered to the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. The required practice involves submitting these reports to the DEO's office on an annual basis, a mandate with a deadline set for January 30th. The absence of such documentation implies a lack of compliance with the stipulated guidelines by the head teachers in the UPE schools.</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"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>No evidence was found to substantiate the claim that the Local Government (LG) had provided support to schools in the preparation and execution of School Improvement Plans (SIPs). The absence of tangible reports became evident during visits to various schools, where there was a lack of documentation indicating the implementation of SIPs. Specific instances from the sampled schools are outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Arwotcek Primary School, the head teacher failed to provide clear evidence of a SIP, and no written report regarding its implementation was available. 2. Omaraebek memorial Primary School's head teacher did not present any report indicating the execution of any activities in line with the SIP. 3. Amolatar Primary School, categorized as urban, did not present a SIP for the fiscal year 2022/2023. <p>In summary, the absence of reports was clear evidence towards a deficiency in LG support for schools in the preparation and execution of School Improvement Plans.</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"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The Local Government (LG) demonstrated diligence in collecting and compiling EMIS (Education Management Information System) return forms for all 51 registered primary schools and 8 secondary schools from the previous fiscal year. According to the communication referenced as EPD/191/141/01 from the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education and Sports on the 18th of December, 2023, the LG successfully enrolled 58,274 learners for the primary section and 3,081 students for the secondary section.</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 Local Government (LG) had allocated funds in its budget for head teachers and a minimum of 7 teachers per school. This information was extracted from the District Education Officer's (DEO) declaration regarding the LG's receipt of education financial grants for the fiscal year 2023/2024. The declaration is dated 3rd July 2023, and it specifically acknowledges that a sum of UGX 4,835,181,657 was earmarked for primary school staff salaries. The acknowledgment comes from DEO.</p> <p>This budgetary allocation indicates the LG's commitment to providing financial support for staffing in primary schools, ensuring that each school has, at a minimum, 7 teachers and appropriate compensation for head teachers.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>The Amolator DLG (District Local Government) demonstrated adherence to education sector guidelines by deploying a total of 634 primary school teachers across the 51UPE (Universal Primary Education) schools. This deployment, while in alignment with the guidelines, was noted to be below the ideal number.</p> <p>Specifically, based on the staff lists observed during the assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amolator Primary School, categorized as urban, had a teaching staff of 25 teachers serving 1900 pupils. 2. Omaraebek Memorial Primary School, identified as semi-urban, was staffed with 14 teachers responsible for 1359 learners. 3. Arwotcek Primary School, designated as rural, had 14 teachers serving a student population of 1435 pupils. <p>Despite the alignment with guidelines, the recognition that the number of deployed teachers was below the ideal suggests potential challenges in achieving an optimal student-teacher ratio for effective education delivery.</p>	3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0

The LG staff list for the year 2023, comprising 634 primary school teachers, was officially posted on the LG Education notice board on 14th February 2023. Furthermore, the head teachers at the sampled schools independently exhibited their respective staff lists for the calendar year 2023 in their offices. Notably, these lists concurred with the information on the LG notice board. Specific examples include:

1. Amolator Primary School, where the list of 25 teachers was displayed as of 6th February , 2023.

2. Omaraebek Primary School, which showcased a list of 14 teachers as of 6th February, 2023.

3. Arwotcek Primary School, where the staff list of 14 teachers was dated February 7, 2023.

The consistency observed between the LG notice board and the head teachers' displayed staff lists reinforces the accuracy and reliability of the information regarding the deployment of 634 primary school teachers in the LG for the year 2023.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Egwang David, Abwockwar PS was appraised on 14th December 2022 by Ongom Maximillian, SAS 2. Ebuku Vincent, Agikdak PS was appraised on 24th November 2022 by Adeng Abel, SAS 3. Ogwal Sam Muntu Township PS was appraised on 13th December 2022 by Obote Stephen, SAS 4. Apok Molly, Agwenonywal PS was appraised on 12th December 2022 by Ojok Daniel, SAS 5. Obura Alex. Aromi PS was appraised on 20th December 2022 by Echeu Job, SAS 6. Okot Calvin, Burukwana PS was appraised on 26th November 2022 by Akite Dorcus, SAS 7. Apok Silvia, Adwala PS was appraised on 31st December 2021 by Susana Eyura, SAS 8. Odoc Robert, Kitaleba PS was appraised on 11th November 2022 by Obote Stephen, SAS 9. Ogwal Alfred , Burkwoyo PS was appraised on 4th December 2023 by Ongom Maximillian, SAS 10. Ogal Ben Bosco, Aweiwot PS was appraised on 20th December 2023 by Adeng Abel, SAS 	2
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Human Resource department did not provide any evidence to show that secondary school head teachers had been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The staff in the LG Education department had been appraised against their performance plans as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ogwen Sam Ronald, Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 12th July 2023 by Acen Josephine Okullu, DEO 2. Okwir Ambrose, Inspector of Schools was appraised on 12th July 2023 by Ogwen Sam Ronald, Senior Inspector of Schools 3. Obote Peter, Education Officer Guidance and Counselling was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Acen Josephine, DEO <p>The senior Education Officer role was vacant, while one appraisal for the other Education Officer was not provided.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level. The plan was prepared by Ogwen Sam Ronald, Inspector of Schools and was approved by Acen Josephine Akullo, DEO on 30th June 2022. The planned training activities included; teacher's preparation, time management (Use of TELA machine), roles of SMC in schools and Bi-monthly teacher preparations.</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>The assessment team noted, based on information from the District Education Officer (DEO) that the Local Government (LG) was in compliance. The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) had written to the Permanent Secretary on November 16th, 2022, providing an update on the enrolment figures. According to the communication, the LG had enrolled 58,436 learners for the 51 primary schools and 8 secondary schools. This communication signifies the LG's commitment to keeping the relevant authorities informed on the updated enrolment figures in accordance with established procedures.</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>According to the evidence observed in an acknowledgment letter addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) by the District Education Officer (DEO), Ms. Josephine Acen, it was noted that Amolator LG had allocated UGX 24,000,000 for inspection for the fiscal year 2022/2023.</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>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1st Quarter was released on 17th July, 2022 and warranted on 2nd August, 2022 after 5 days. 2. 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 14th October, 2022 after 11 days. 3. 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 11st January, 2023 after 9 days. 4. 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 24th April, 2023 after 13 days. 	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>No evidence of communication letters were presented at the time of assessment, so it was hard to determine whether the LG invoiced and the DEO has communicated/publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</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"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>The LG inspection plan for the fiscal year 2022/2023, as observed during the assessment, included the following information:</p> <p>Term III 2022:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Inspection minutes for this term were never presented at the time of assessment. . Term I 2023: . Inspection was carried out between 17th April, 2023 to 19th April, 2023 it was done by 10 inspectors. . Term II 2023: • No inspection plan was provided at the time of assessment. <p>The calculation of compliance was made by assessing the planned inspections against the total number of terms. Based on the available information, the LG was found to be 33.3% compliant with inspection planning, as inspection plans were provided for only one out of the three terms.</p> <p>$1/3 \times 100 = 33.3\%$ compliant.</p> <p>This indicates that inspection plans were lacking for two out of the three terms during the fiscal year 2022/2023.</p>	0
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"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the previous financial year unveiled the following findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Term 3, 2022, No report was presented at the time of assessment. 2. The report for Term I, dated 21st April 2023, showed that 56 schools had been inspected. <p>Term 2 , 2022</p> <p>Unfortunately, there was no evidence presented for any inspections conducted during Term II.</p> <p>In summary, the inspection report seen was for only term one 2023.</p>	0

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>The assessment team made the following findings regarding inspection reports:</p> <p>Inspection reports for Term 1, 2023, No records were presented for post inspection for that term.</p> <p>Term 2, 2023, at the time of assessment there were no reports or minutes presented for inspections conducted .</p> <p>Term 3, 2022, at the time of assessment no inspection reports were presented at the time of assessment.</p> <p>In summary, there was no discussion and documentation of inspection reports for Term 1, 2023, Term 2, 2023, and Term 3, 2022.</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>The head teacher of each visited school unanimously accepted that the District Inspectorate did not fulfill the requirement of presenting findings from inspections and monitoring results to them. Further still there was no evidence to show that the inspection reports had been presented to DES as mandated.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 6th May 2023 where at least 8 members were present. Under Min no MIN 04/05/2023. Some of the key issues discussed under education included;</p> <p>In the FY 2022/2023 the following achievements were made among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of two classroom block at Arwot primary school. - Renovation of four classroom block at Abeja primary school. - Construction of VIP latrines among others. - The ongoing projects were, construction of Etam seed secondary school and five stance pit latrine at Akol primary school. <p>Challenges included among others; lack of efficient transport means, foundation body influence in staff reorganization, inadequate structures e.t.c.</p> <p>All issues addressed above were issues of service delivery that were done in the previous FY and discussed in council committee.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to indicate that the Local Government (LG) education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract, and retain children in school through a "Go back to school" campaign, as per the information available from the District Local Government (DLG) education office , this was done on 10th March, 2023 in the annual general meeting of Muntu Township primary school by Mr. OBote peter the senior education officer, in attendance were 86 elders, among the key issues discussed were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - He encouraged parents to support the school by paying their PTA obligation funds. - He promised the parents that the feeding programme was to start in term 2 2023for the learners while at school for lunch. - Further he encouraged the parents to change their attitude towards education 	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed inaccurate reporting on the assets of 51 primary schools and 8 secondary schools. The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:</p> <p>Amolator Primary School, identified as an urban institution, reported 16 classrooms, 220 desks, 14 latrine stances to cater for 1900 pupils and 11 teacher houses.</p> <p>Omaraebek Primary School, categorized as semi-urban, had 15 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, 184 desks to cater for 1359 pupils and 4 teacher houses.</p> <p>Arwotcek Primary School, designated as rural, possessed the following assets: 16 classrooms, 121 desks, 23 latrine stances to cater for 1435 pupils and 14 teachers' houses</p> <p>Despite thorough verification, all the confirmed assets, infrastructures, and equipment did not align with those indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register provided by the LG education office.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs for eligible projects under education and all projects were derived from DDP III page 91 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 1 block of 2 classrooms at Arwot Primary School at Ushs 79,864,760 was desk appraised on 20th June 2022 and was recommended for field appraisal. 2. Construction of a 5 Stance drainable latrines with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Aguludia Primary School at Ushs 25,599,000 was desk appraised on 20th June 2022 and was recommended for field appraisal. 3. Construction of a 5 Stance drainable latrines with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Akol Primary School at Ushs 23,924,500 was desk appraised on 20th June 2022 and was recommended for field appraisal. <p>The Desk Appraisal report was endorsed by the District Planner and other technical staff.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 1 block of 2 classrooms at Arwot Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 26th June 2022.</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 5 Stance drainable latrines with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Aguludia Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 26th June 2022.</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 5 Stance drainable latrines with 1 urinal and hand wash facility at Akol Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 26th June 2022.</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by District Planner, District Engineer, DCDO, DEO and District Environment Officer.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education department had budgeted for and ensured that, planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan that was signed by the CAO, Mbiwa Paul Samuel, on the 12th July, 2023. The infrastructure planned included construction of Akwon Seed Secondary School at Ugx 1.2BN, construction of 7-classroom block with office at Akuriluba primary school at Ugx 420M and construction of a 4-classroom block with office at Agikdak Seed Secondary school at Ugx 240M</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee before the commencement of construction. This was done at two sittings on 1st March, 2022 and 7th December, 2022. The committee approved the evaluation report and contract award for construction of Etam Seed secondary school in Minute 116/Amol564/cc-14/2021-2022. Then the approval of evaluation report and contract award for renovation of Abeja primary school in Minute 61/Amol567/cc-8/2022-2023.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG did not established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines. This was in a letter dated 4th July, 2022 were the following persons were named onto the team;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Acen Josephine-DEO-as Project Manager • Orech Edward -Ag. DE -as Contract Manager • Bua Jasper- Clerk of works • Otile Patrick-DCDO • Omara Apollo-Senior Environment officer <p>The letter left out the Labour as required by the guidelines.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES. This was observed at Etamu Seed Secondary School where it was established that the external dimensions of the ICT block was 8.6 x 34.2m and the height from the floor level to wall plate was 3.4m as per design.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence seen indicate that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>There was no evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineer, environment officer, CDO had been conducted</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were not within specified timeframes. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no 3726187 dated 20th February 2023 for Ushs 37,740,029; Certificate No 1, dated 3rd January 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00006, Project; Construction of a 1 block of 2 classrooms at Arwot Primary School was certified by DEO on 4th January 2023, District Engineer on 3rd January 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work, payment was initiated on 3rd January 2023 and payments were made on 20th February 2023 which was not within the time flame. 2. Voucher no 6439337 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 16,074,000; Certificate No 1, dated 10th May 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00014, Project; Completion of a 4 classroom block at Abeja Primary School was certified by only the District Engineer on 01st June 2023, DEO, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work, payment was initiated on 8th May 2023 and payments were made on 28th April 2023 which was not within the timeframe. 3. Voucher no 4690885 dated 30th March 2023 for Ushs 10,535,120; Certificate No 1, dated 22nd February 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00009, Project; Construction of a 1 classroom block at Burkwoyo Primary School was certified by DEO on 28th February 2023, District Engineer on 23rd February 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work, payment was initiated on 22nd February 2023 and payments were made on 30th March 2023. 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, as the submitted plan did not have a date when it was done and therefore not possible to determine compliance with the deadline.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract</p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a</p>	<p>The LG had complete procurement files in</p>	1

<p>management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>place for the contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project: Construction of Etamu Seed Secondary School</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoES-Ugfit/wrks/2021-2022/0003, had the following documents on file</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 22nd September, 2022 with Bygon Enterprises Limited • Contracts Committee minutes dated 1st March, 2022 • Evaluation report dated 2nd February, 2022 • Solicitor General letter dated 23rd August, 2022 signed by Betty Adwono • PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, acceptance and offer letters <p>Project: Construction of one-classroom block at Burkwoyo primary school</p> <p>Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00009, had these documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 21st December, 2022 with Ms. Lengkoo SMC-limited • Evaluation report dated 1st December, 2022 • Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022 • PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record, supervision reports among documents therein. <p>Project: Renovation of Abeja primary school</p> <p>Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00014, had these documents on file</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 21st December, 2022 with M/s. Kocongom General Services limited • Evaluation report dated 1st December, 2022 • Contracts Committee minutes 7th December, 2022 • PP1 form, issue and receipt of bids record, supervision reports among the documents therein
--	--	--

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances reported and arising out of project works in the education sector throughout the implementation cycle for the previous FY.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of a letter dated 12th July, 2022 titled "Dissemination of Environmental Management Guidelines to Primary Schools in the District and signed by the District Environment Officer Mr. Apollo M. Omara.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the construction of a 5-stance latrine with urinal at Akol primary school was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents at a total cost of UGX. 23,924,500 with Element No. 6; Items F and G for social and environmental mitigation costed at UGX. 400,000.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>There were no records availed at the time of assessment on land ownership for school construction projects.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>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 for the following projects below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring report dated 27th April, 2023 for the construction of a 5-stance latrine with urinals at Aromi primary school 2. Monitoring report dated 29th March, 2023 for the construction of a block of 2 classrooms at Arwot primary school 3. Monitoring report dated 25th May, 2023 for the construction of a classroom at Etam Seed secondary school 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>Certification forms were approved and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certificate form number Amol805/edn/2022-2023/0006 issued on 14th June, 2023 for the completion of 2 classroom block at Burkwoyo primary school 2. Certificate form number Amol805/edn/2022-2023/0005 issued on 20th June, 2023 for the completion of 2 classroom block at Arwot primary school 	1

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>From the annual HMIS reports 107, the annual deliveries for the 3 Health facilities: Namasale HCIII, Etam HCIII and Amolatar HCIV respectively for FY 2021/22 were : 652,773 and 1295. The total annual deliveries of the same Health facilities for for FY 2021/22 was 2720</p> <p>The annual deliveries of the same Health Facilities respectively for the FY 2022/23 were 642,622 and 1072. The total annual deliveries of the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 was 2336</p> <p>From calculation ,it shows there was a percentage decrease in utilization of Health care services (focus on deliveries) by 14.1 % when you compare the deliveries of 2 two years 2021/22 and 2022/23</p> <p>There was no evident report to explain the cause for Drop in Deliveries.</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"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 79% as per the OPAMS.</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"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC as per a letter from MOH dated 7th December 2022 .</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 1,451,781,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of twin staff house at Awonangiro HC III at Ushs 157,503,450. 2. Construction of twin staff house at Biko HC III at Ushs 159,482,720. 3. Upgrading of Biko and Awonangiro HC II to HC III at Ushs 798,854,960. 4. Upgrading of Arwotcek HC II to HC III at Ushs 617,424,255. 	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer and District Engineer only certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. However, the District Environment Officer and the DCDO didn't certify the work. For example;	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no 3725972 dated 20th February 2023 for Ushs 54,059,553 Certificate No 1, dated 3rd January 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00004, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Biko HC III was certified by the District Health Officer on 5th January 2023, District Engineer on 3rd January 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work. 2. Voucher no 4746327 dated 05th April 2023 for Ushs 53,073,384 Certificate No 1, dated 20th February 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00003, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Awonangiro HC III was certified by the District Health Officer on 21st February 2023, District Engineer on 21st February 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work. 	

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

All the projects sampled were +2.47% within +/- 20% of the acceptable variation

The projects were,

Project 1: Upgrade of Arwoteck HCII to HCIII

Procurement ref: MoH-UGFIT/wrks/2021-2022/00019-lot1

Project 2: Construction of twin staff house at Awanangiro HCIII

Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00003

Project 3: Construction of staff house Biko HCIII

Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Project 1:

Estimated cost: Ugx 617,500,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 617,424,255/=

Variation: Ugx 75,745/=

%age variation $(75,745/617,500,000) \times 100\% = 0.12\%$

Project 2:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 161,500,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 157,503,450/=

Variation: Ugx 3,996,550/=

%age variation $(3,996,550/161,500,000) \times 100\% = 2.47\%$

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 161,500,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 159,482,720/=

Variation: Ugx 2,017,280/=

%age variation $(2,017,280/161,500,000) \times 100\% = 1.24\%$

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 was no evidence to show that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023, were completed as per work plan by end of the FY 2022/2023. According to quarter 4 report page 55 of 146, the amount budgeted was Ugx 1,451,781,000/= and the amount spent was indicated as Ugx 1,383,157,000/=. However, there was no indication of the percentage for the facility upgrade work done and neither an indication of the exact amount planned for the facility upgrade. Therefore it was not possible to determine the percentage of work done for the facility upgrade in the district.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		
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	The LG approved staff structure provided for 178 health workers and 165 were filled at the time of assessment = 92 %.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH. This was confirmed during the project inspection at Arwotech HCII upgrade where it was established that the roof was made of Z-purlins of 75mm, steel trusses of 50 x 50 x 5mm and roof covering was of IT-4 G.28 coloured iron sheets.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

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>Amolatar HCIV had 46 staff (DHO facility staff list) while the DHO health facility list had 42 staff. The disharmony was caused by rescent tranfers of health facility staff made by the district. The DHO list was not updated.</p> <p>Namasale HCIII had 14 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the facility noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p>Etam HCIII had 16 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p>Therefore the existing evidence showed that the information on positions of health workers filled specifically for Amolatar HCIV was inaccurate</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Biko HCII and Awonangiro HCII were upgraded to HCIII.</p> <p>There were construction of maternity wards, Latrine, waste bins and placenta pits in these Health facilities. These facilities were all functional.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & 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"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence to show that the 3 sampled health facilities NAmasale HCIII, Etam HCIII and Amolatar HC IV prepared and submitted their workplans and budget according to the planning Guidelines for Health sector. Their submission dates were indicated below:</p> <p>Namasale HCIII submitted on 28th March, 2022</p> <p>Etamu HCIII submitted on 29th March,2022</p> <p>Amolatar HC IV submitted on 28th March, 2022</p>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>None of the sampled Health Facilities NAmasale HCIII, Etam HCIII and Amolatar, prepared and submitted their Annual budget performance reports.</p> <p>No budget performance reports was found in the DHO's office at the time of assessment.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Of the 3 sampled health facilities NAmasale HCIII, Etam HCIII and Amolatar HC IV , Only 2 Health Facility , prepared and submitted its Facility improvement plan;</p> <p>Namasale submitted its improvement plan on 22nd March,2023.</p> <p>Amolatar HCIV submitted on28th March, 2023.</p> <p>The plans for Namasale HCIII incorporated issues like increasing regular supply of Medicine and supplies . this was an implementation of the recommendation of Quarter 2 HSD support supervision in response to stock out of Especial medicines in the Facility .</p> <p>There was was no evidence to show implementation of this plan.</p> <p>There was no Facility progress report seen in the DHO's office at the time the assessment was done.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence to show that the three sampled health facilities submitted their HMIS reports 105,106a timely as shown below.</p> <p>HMIS 105</p> <p>July 2022</p> <p>Namasale HCIII submitted on 7th August 2022</p> <p>Etam HCIII submitted on6th August ,2022</p> <p>Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th August 2022</p> <p>August 2022</p>	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

Namasale HCIII submitted on 3rd
September 2022

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th September
2022

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 5th September
2022

September 2022

Namasale HCIII submitted on 7th October
2022

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th October ,2022

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th October
2022

October 2022

Namasale HCIII submitted on 6th November
2022

Etam HCIII submitted on 7th
November,2022

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th Nov 2022

November 2022

Namasale HCIII submitted on 7th December
2022

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th
December,2022

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 5th December
2022

December 2022

Namasale HCIII submitted on 7th January
2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th January,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 4th January
2023S

January 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th February,
2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th February,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 4th February
,2023

February 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th March,
2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th March 2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 5th March
2023

March 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th April 2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th April,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th April,2023

April 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th May, 2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th May, 2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 5th May, 2023

May 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th June,2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 6th June , 2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th June 2023

June 2023

Namasale HCIII submitted on 2nd July ,
2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 4th July,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th July 2023

Quarterly Report 106 a

Quarter 1

Namasale HCIII submitted on 6th October
2022

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th October,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 7th October
2022

Quarter 2

Namasale HCIII submitted on 5th January
2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th, January.

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 7th
January,2023

Quarter 3

Namasale HCIII submitted on 2nd April
,2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th April,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 7th April 2023

Quarter 4

Namasale HCIII submitted on 4th July ,2023

Etam HCIII submitted on 5th July,2023

Amolatar HCIV submitted on 6th July 2023

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022</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>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022</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>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. He noted the new system doesn't send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</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>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The was no evidence to show that the District developed and approved the plan for the weakest performing Health facilities.</p> <p>No plan was seen at the DHO's office at the time of assessment.</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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show any implementation done on weak Health facilities.</p> <p>There was no Report to show this, at the DHO's office at the time of assessment.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Amolatar district LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 3,266,516,000 (Approved budget estimates for Amolatar LG 2023/24 page 28 of 71, vote 805). This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 where the provided wage rate was Ugx 3,266,515,997 as indicated on page 94 vote 805 .</p> <p>Therefore, Amolatar LG budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

- a) Evidence that the LG has:
- 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

Amolatar HCIV had 46 out of 48 required health workers for HCIV, giving 95.8% of the required staffing norm for HCIV (Confirmed Staff list at Amolatar HCIV noticeboard).

Namasale HCIII had 14 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 73.7% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Namasale HCIII noticeboard)

Etam HCIII had 16 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 84.2% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Etam HCIII noticeboard).

Therefore, not all the 3 sampled health facilities had at least 75% of staff required. Namasale HCIII had 73.7% which is less than 75% of required staff. Hence Amolatar district LG didn't deploy health workers in all the health facilities in accordance with the staffing norms.

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

- b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0

There was evidence that the health workers were working in the health facilities they were deployed (as per health staff deployment lists, attendance registers and Monthly staff attendance analysis for personnel).

Amolatar HCIV: 22 out of 46 health workers deployed to Amolatar HCIV were present on duty on the day of assessment. However 1 Enrolled Midwife was for sick leave. Assistant Nursing Officer was for annual leave while another was for study leave. The rest of the health workers were either off duty or absent.

Examples of health workers found working at amolatar HCIV on the day of assessment included;

1. Dr. Ekwanga Moses Agech; Medical Officer was present on duty on 19th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 23 days and off duty for 8 days the month of November 2023.

2. Okello Haggai; Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 19th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 25 days and off duty for 6 days in the month of November 2023

3. Tugum Marina; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 19th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 26 days and off duty for 5 days in the month of November 2023

(Amolatar HCIV staff attendance book 19th December 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for November 2023).

Namasale HCIII: 9 out of 14 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. However 2 health workers (Medical Laboratory Technicians and Enrolled Nurse) were for annual leave. Another enrolled Nurse was for study leave while other 2 staff were off duty on the day of assessment.

Examples of health workers found working at Namasale health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Debongo David; Senior Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 18th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 8 days, on leave for 14 days and absent for 6 days in the month of November 2023

2. Apio Mary, Health Information Assistant was present on duty on 18th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 22 days and off duty for 8 days in the month of November 2023

3. Acayo Paska; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 18th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 10 days and on leave for 20 days in the month of November 2023

(Namasale HCIII staff attendance book 18th December 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel for November 2023).

Etam HCIII. 8 out of 16 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. However 2 staff were for study leave, 1 staff was for sick leave and the other 5 staff were off duty.

Examples of health workers found working at Etam health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Akao Janneth Florence; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 18th December 2023.

2. Akuma Simpo ; Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 18th December 2023

3. Awany Jimmy ; health Assistant was present on duty on 18th December 2023.

(Etam HCIII staff attendance book 18th December 2023)

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).	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	There was evidence that Amolatar District LG publicized health worker deployment. Lists of health workers were found displayed on the noticeboards and walls at the three facilities visited. The displayed lists of staff at Amolatar HCIV, Namasale HCIII and Etam HCIII Noticeboards had a total of 46, 14 and 16 staff respectively. (Amolatar HCIV, Namasale HCIII and Etam HCIII Noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 and were stamped.	2
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	The DHO had conducted performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. However they were done beyond the deadline as below;	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Odur Alex was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy Ag. DHO 2. Apio Grace was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy Ag. DHO 3. Owetta Joshua was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy Ag. DHO 4. Ekwang Moses was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy Ag. DHO 5. Obua John Bosco was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy, Ag. DHO 6. Omara Ambrose was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Oweta Josuah, Senior Clinical Officer 7. Debongo David was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Akite Dorcus, SACAO 8. Okori Deborah was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Obote Steven Loius, SACAO 9. Adong Joan was appraised on 1st July 2023 by Odongo Jimmy, Ag. DHO 10. Okwir James was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Alulu Frank, SACAO 	

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO to HRO during the previous FY.

However the appraisals were done past the deadline. For instance;

1. Ochomo Robina, Laboratory Assistant was appraised on 4th July 2023 by Okello Francis, Medical Laboratory Technician
2. Auma Eunice, Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Omara Ambrose, Medical Clinical Officer
3. Obwogi Patrick, Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Odur Alex, Senior Clinical Officer
4. Okello Denis, Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 2nd July 2023 by Adong Joan, Assistant Nursing Officer
5. Akao Janeth Florence, Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Omara Ambrose, Medical Clinical Officer
6. Okada Francis, Nursing Assistant was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Okwir James, Enrolled Nurse
7. Alum Teddy, Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Acio Roseline, Senior Medical Officer
8. Akidi Konny, Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Apio Grace, Assistant Nursing Officer
9. Francis Ocen, Clinical Officer was appraised on 2nd July 2023 by Adong Joan, Assistant Nursing Officer
10. Oruk Jimmy, Laboratory Technician was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Oweta Joshua, Senior Clinical Officer

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had taken corrective actions from the appraisals which included; training on how to use the stock book, comprehensive delivery, management of ART patients, second line ARVs, nursing skills, cancer treatment, financial management, human resource management, and laboratory waste management.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was evidence to show that the district did training for its workers . There was a training database and training plans to show the training schedule for the staff	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There were several trainings reports seen in DHO's Office. There was a training for district health team members on eIDSR ,on 27th January,2023. Four (4) staff attended. There was a training on comprehensive condom dissemination strategies. It took place on 5th -6th October 2022 .Ten (10) staff attended	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	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.	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	There was a letter was letter from CAO to MOH dated 6th September 2023, Confirming and revising names of facilities to receive PHC funds. It confirmed a total of 13 Health Facilities to receive PHC, 6 Of which were revised from HC II to HC III	2
Maximum 9 points on this performance measure				
9	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.	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.	A review of the approved budget showed that on page 34 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 457,801,000 and on (page 28) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 705,391,000. As per the computation $457,801,000 / 705,391,000 \times 100 = 65\%$ As per the computation the allocation of supervision and monitoring was more than 15% of PHC non-wage.	2
Maximum 9 points on this performance measure				

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 District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1st Quarter was released on 17th July, 2022 and warranted on 2nd August, 2022 after 5 days. 2. 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 14th October, 2022 after 11 days. 3. 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 11st January, 2023 after 9 days. 4. 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 24th April, 2023 after 13 days. 	
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>No evidence of communication letters were presented at the time of assessment, so it was hard to determine whether the LG invoiced and the DEO has communicated/publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</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>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 evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that The DHT conducted quarterly Performance review meetings.

The dates on which the meetings were held were:

Quarter1 meeting was held on 12th October 2022

Quarter 2 meeting was held on 11th January,2023.

Quarter 3 meeting was held on 13th April 2023.

Quarter 4 meeting was held on 13th July, 2023.

There was evidence to show implementation of recommendations that of the Performance review meetings.

A follow up report dated 10th January 2022, on Performance review indicated the following activities implemented as they were recommended in Quarter 1 Performance review meeting:

- The DHO effected transportation of medical equipment to upgraded Health facilities.
- The DHO submitted the staffing requirements to Human resources manager to initiate recruitment process.
- All facility in charges displayed their Catchment Populations on the Notice boards.
- Health Inspectors and Health assistants were integrated in Immunization (A follow up report dated 10th January 2022, on Performance review)

A follow up report dated 13 April 2023, on quarter 2 support supervision indicated implementation of the following actions :

DTLS and JCRC to organize onsite mentorship and coaching on Paediatric T.B within two weeks. This was done on 28 January 2023

DTLS and facility TB focal persons to strengthen the use of Presumptive TB register at all entry points at

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Amolatar DLG quarterly review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners for example in the Quarter 1 performance review meeting which sat on 12th October 2022 the following people attended among others :</p> <p>Health facility incharges</p> <p>Adong Joan I/C Alyechmeda HCII</p> <p>Okwir James I/C Acii HC II</p> <p>Ango Catharine M I/C</p> <p>Opio Emmanuel for I/C Anmwany HC II</p> <p>DHT members</p> <p>Sis Victoria Atim ADHO MCH</p> <p>Amod Patrick SHE</p> <p>Atim Sarah A/MO</p> <p>Other Departments</p> <p>Orech Edward District Engineer</p> <p>Otile Patrick DCDO</p> <p>Achen Josephine DEO</p> <p>Development Partners</p> <p>Onyok Howard CDFU</p> <p>Henry Jackson Ogwal</p> <p>UHA</p> <p>Bridget Namubiru PMI MRA</p>
----	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Amolatar DLG supervised Amolatar Health Centre IV</p> <p>The dates of support supervision were indicated below:</p> <p>On 12th October, 2022</p> <p>On 23rd November, 2022</p> <p>On 25th November 2022</p> <p>6th March, 2023</p> <p>3rd April ,2023</p> <p>18th April, 2023</p> <p>23rd May 2023 on Amolatar and Amai Hospital</p>
----	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>There was evidence to show that there was support supervision done by HSD as shown below:</p> <p>On 5th December,2022 Amolatar HSD conducted a support supervision on and seven Health facilities. For example, on Aputi HC III , the Supervision team found the LAB register not upto date, consent forms were out of stock, child Registers were partially filled.</p> <p>HSD conducted Supervision on Namasales HCIII on 31 March, 2023 and found out that the facility was lacking HIV testing kits, no Hb done, Lack of consent form.</p> <p>HSD did Support supervision on Arwotcek HCII on 31 March, 2023 and found the facility was lacking HIV testing kits.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that, Amolatar used the HSD report to make recommendations.</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>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the Approved Budget report showed that DHO allocation was UGX 45,000,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 13,969,900 was spent on Health promotion on page 52 of the approved budget.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = $13,969,900 / 45,000,000 \times 100 = 31\%$.</p>	2

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	<p>There was evidence to show that the DHT conducted Health promotion.</p> <p>There was a report on Sanitation promotion done in Namasale Town Council, Amolatar Town Council integrated with Covid -19 vaccination.</p> <p>This took place on 15th -21st March 20223.</p> <p>Report submitted to DHO's Office by Oyuru Isaac HI on 27th March 2023</p>	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no feedback report on Health Promotion seen in DHO's Office at the time of assessment	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	<p>There was evidence to show that Amolatar District had an updated Assets register August 2023. This register included equipment for each Health facility.</p> <p>The medical equipment like BP machines, Microscopes weigh scales, Nursing equipment, laboratory equipment.</p> <p>Sterilization equipment like Autoclaves.</p> <p>It also included the Physical infrastructure, for example, the facility with OPD ward, General ward, Maternity Ward, Placenta pit, incinerator. Etc</p>	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p>	<p>The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under the Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived from DDP III page 91 and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of twin staff house at Awonangiro HC III at Ushs 157,503,450 and recommended for field appraisal. 2. Construction of twin staff house at Biko HC III at Ushs 159,482,720 and recommended for field appraisal. 	
		<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the projects were appraised on 20th June 2022 by the Senior Planner, District Engineer and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.</p>	
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field appraisal for Construction of twin staff house at Awonangiro HC III. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 26th June 2022 and signed by the Senior Planner, District Engineer, SCDO, and the Environment Officer. 2. Field appraisal for Construction of twin staff house at Biko HC III. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 26th June 2022 and signed by the Senior Planner, District Engineer, SCDO, and the Environment Officer. 	

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>The following health facility investments below were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction however, monitoring using the checklist was not adhered to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of staff house at Biko HCIII prepared on 15th August, 2022 2. Construction of staff house at Awonangiro HCIII prepared on 17th August, 2022 3. Construction of a maternity ward-phase 2 at Amolator HCVI prepared on 22nd August, 2022 4. Construction of a twin staff house at Awotcek HCIII prepared on 17th July, 2023 5. Completion of maternity ward at Amolator HCIV prepared 12th July, 2023 6. Construction of a pediatric ward at Amolator HCIV prepared on 10th July, 2023 7. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Nalubwoyo HCIII prepared on 4th August, 2022 8. Upgrade of Arwotcek HCII-III prepared on 13th August, 2022 	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 evidence that the LG health department did not timely submit by April 30 for the current FY, all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU, for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan which was signed on 13th October, 2023. They did so on 1st May, 2023 which was outside the deadline. The projects planned to be implemented were Construction of pediatric ward at Amolatar HCIV at Ugx 190M, construction of staff house at Arwotcek HCIII at Ugx 176M and completion of OPD structure at Nakatiti HCIII at Ugx 114M</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY, this was done on 1st May, 2023. These were for construction of staff house at Arwotcek HCIII, completion of pediatric ward at Amolatar HCIV and completion OPD ward at Nakatiti HCIII.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General before commencement of construction. This was done when the Contracts Committee sat on 8th June, 2022 ,approved the award of the contract for upgrade of Arwoteck HCII to HCIII in minute Oyam572/CC/2020/21/15/05 and also a letter from Solicitor General dated 26th September, 2022 signed by Doris Twesigomwe that cleared the contract</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG did not properly establish a Project Implementation team (PIT) for all health projects when the following persons were named to the team;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jimmy Odongo-DHO-as Project Manager • Orech Edward -Ag. DE -as Contract Manager • Omara Geoffrey- Clerk of works • Otile Patrick-DCDO • Omara Apollo-Senior Environment officer <p>The letter left out the Labour officer</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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH. This was confirmed during the project inspection at Arwotech HCII upgrade where it was established that the roof was made of Z-purlins of 75mm, steel trusses of 50 x 50 x 5mm and roof covering was of IT-4 G.28 coloured iron sheets.</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 was evidence that the Clerk of Works maintained daily records that were consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project. This was noted from reports dated 4th April, 2023, 6th May, 2023 and 26th July, 2023 to show that the clerk of works had consolidated them into reports to the DHO in copy to the DE</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 was evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO 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 officer. This was in minutes dated 14th September, 2022, 9th December, 2022 and 14th February, 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 was evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineer, Environment officer, CDO, at critical stages of construction. This was in reports dated 11th October, 2022 and 24th May, 2023 prepared by the team.</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 verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer and District Engineer only certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers. However, the DCDO and the District Environment Officer didn't certify the work. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no 3725972 dated 20th February 2023 for Ushs 54,059,553 Certificate No 1, dated 3rd January 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00004, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Biko HC III was certified by the District Health Officer on 5th January 2023, District Engineer on 3rd January 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work. The payment was initiated on 3rd January 2023 and paid on 20th February 2023 which was not within the time frame. 2. Voucher no 4746327 dated 05th April 2023 for Ushs 53,073,384 Certificate No 1, dated 20th February 2023; Contract No. Amol/564/wrks/2022-2023/00003, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Awonaningiro HC III was certified by the District Health Officer on 21st February 2023, District Engineer on 21st February 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't certify the work, payment was initiated on 20th February 2023 and paid on 5th April 2023 which was within the time flame. 	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>There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p>The files reviewed were</p> <p>Project: Upgrade of Arwoteck HCII to HCIII</p> <p>Procurement Ref: MoH-Ugfit/wrks/2021-2022/00019-lot1, had these documents therein</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 18th October, 2022 with Kats civil and Water works limited • Evaluation report dated 2nd June, 2022 • Contracts Committee minutes dated 8th June, 2022 • Solicitor General letter dated 26th September, 2022 signed by Doris Twesigomwe • PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt records, bid opening records, among the 	1

records therein

Project: Construction of twin staff house at Awanangiro HCIII

Procurement: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00003, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 28th October, 2022 with M/s Pavward Consults limited
- Evaluation report dated 4th October, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th October, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids record, issue and receipt of bids records, offer and acceptance letters, supervision reports among documents on file.

Project: Construction of twin staff house Biko HCIII

Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00004, had these document

- Signed works contract dated 28th October, 2022 with M/s Amuway Investments -SMC limited
- Evaluation report dated 4th October, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th October, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids record, issue and receipt of bids records, offer and acceptance letters, supervision reports among documents on file.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	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	Health sector grievances were handled in line with the grievances redress framework for example, a complaint recorded on 21st July, 2022 arising out of a project for the upgrade of the Arwotcek HCIII for non-payment of arrears to workers by the contractor and a promise was made by the contractor after a resolution was reached by the Grievances Redress Committee to clear the arrears in a weeks' time.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure		

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the Infectious Prevention and Control guideline (IPC) and the National Guidelines-Managing Healthcare Waste Generated from Safe Male circumcision procedures that were availed however, they were outdated. Also availed was a list dated 11th November, 2022 titled “Health Staff Trained on Waste Management Practices” but the training was conducted using the outdated IPC guidelines and there was no record showing that there was dissemination of the guidelines that was done.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a functional system for medical waste management such as an incinerator and placenta pits for health center IV, waste coded bins in all health units for segregating medical waste, and waste pits in all health units for burning generated non-wet waste.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a list dated 11th November, 2022 titled “Health Staff Trained on Waste Management Practices” that was availed at the time of assessment as proof of conducted training(s) and awareness creation in healthcare waste management.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the construction of staff house at Biko HCIII at a total contract cost of UGX. 159,481,720 with Element No. 1: Excavations and Earthworks: Item A, B, C and D for environmental mitigation costed at UGX. 936,000 was incorporated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY.</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The following health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of land ownership;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of staff house at Biko HCIII was located on land with a certificate of title issued on 22nd July, 2015 with Instrument No. 00013706 at Block(Road) Amolator Road, Plot 215-227 2. Construction of staff house at Awonangiro HCIII was located on land with a certificate of title issued on 8th December, 2021 with Instrument No. LIR-00006210 at Plot 22, Block 1 3. Upgrade of Arwotcek HCII-III was located on land with a certificate of title issued on 27th January, 2022 with instrument No. LIR-00006454 at Plo 28, Block 2 4. Completion of maternity ward and the Construction of a pediatric ward at Amolator HCIV were located on land with a certificate of title issued on 12th August, 2015 with instrument No. 00014399 at Block(Road) Kaguta Road, Plot 1-23 and 2-22 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring report dated 26th May, 2023 for the construction of a maternity ward-phase 2 at Amolator HCIV 2. Monitoring report dated 29th March, 2023 for the construction of a twin staff house at Biko HCII 3. Monitoring report dated 3rd February, 2023 for the construction of a twin staff house at Awonangiro HCII 	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Environment and Social Certification forms were not consistently 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 for example,

Certification form number Amol805/health/2022-2023/0007 issued on 12th June, 2023 for the construction of staff house at Awonangiro HCIII was signed by both whereas, Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 3rd April, 2023 for the construction of staff house at Biko HCIII was not signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & 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"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Amolatar DLG in the previous FY was 80%.</p>	1
1	<p>Water & 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 & 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"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Amolatar DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 92%.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current FY was 67% as for the results viewed in the OPAMs.</p>	1

N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 87% were:-

Drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump and construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine in Agwingiri S/C with a safe water coverage of 78%, rehabilitation of 1 borehole and drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump, in Amolatar T/C with a safe water coverage of 57%, drilling of 1 borehole in Namasale S/C with a safe water coverage of 87%, and rehabilitation of 1 boreholes in Arwotcek S/C with a safe water coverage of 80%.

The projects that were implemented during the year under review as captured in pages 3 of the annual report were:-

Drilling of 5 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, rehabilitation of 6 boreholes, construction of a piped water supply system in Etam T/C, and construction of a 2 stance drainable latrine at Kitwe landing site of Agwingiri S/C.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 8 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 13 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was $8/13 \times 100\% = 62\%$

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

The variation in the contract price of the sampled infrastructure investment implemented in the previous FY were within +/-20% of the Engineers' estimate as illustrated below:-

1). Drilling and installation of 5 boreholes in various Lower Local Governments:

Engineer's estimate = UGX
127,058,690

Contract Sum = UGX 110,240,025

Various = UGX 16,818,665

Percentage variance
= $16,818,665 / 127,058,690 \times 100\% = 13\%$

2). Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes in various LLGs.

Engineers estimate = UGX
40,020,000

Contract price = UGX 39,937,975

Variation = UGX 82,025

Percentage variation =
 $82,025 / 40,020,000 \times 100\% = 0.2\%$.

3). Construction of a piped water supply system in Etam HCIII in Etam T/C.

Engineer's estimate = UGX
115,248,904

Contract Sum = UGX 112,036,280

Various = UGX 3,212,624

Percentage variance =
 $3,212,624 / 115,248,904 \times 100\% = 2.8\%$.

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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 as captured on page 3 of the annual budget performance report included the following:-</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes in various sub-counties, drilling of 5 boreholes installed with hand pumps in various LLGs, construction of a 2 stance drainable VIP latrine in Kitwe landing site of Agwingiri sub-county and construction of a piped water supply system in Etam T/C. The total planned projects were 13. The completed projects were 13 in number, therefore the percentage of the completed projects as per the annual report was:</p> <p>$13/13 \times 100\% = 100\%$.</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 78% and FY 2022/2023 was 80% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage increase was $80\% - 78\% = 2\%$</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 91% and 92% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage increase therefore was $92\% - 91\% = 1\%$.</p>	1

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY as captured in page 3 of the annual budget performance report from where the following facilities were sampled from;

- 1). Drilling of a deep borehole in Arwotokwe cell in Amolatar T/C, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 79116 and completed on 6th March, 2023.
- 2). Construction of a piped water supply system in Awidyegi cell in Etam Town Council , funded under UGIFT, with a DWD number 38644 and completed on 27th May, 2023.
- 3). Drilling of a deep borehole in Nalubwoyo HCIII in Nalubwoyo sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 79118 and completed on 8th March, 2023.

These projects were completed as per the plan,

Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees were planted around, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs. The hygiene and sanitation around the water sources was visibly clean.

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>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 20th October, 2022, on page 21, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments in summary table. There was also form 4 which was submitted on the same day</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 20th January, 2023 on page 29; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties of the District this was submitted together with form 4 to the ministry.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 20th April, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on pages 21.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 29th June, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 13. This report was submitted together with form 4 to the ministry of water and environment.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 12th September, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form 4 which had summaries of the status of all the water facilities per sub-county.</p>	3

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment, the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 67%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the least performing LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO had budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician at Ugx 78,933,000/=.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer at Ugx 147,000,000/=</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

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>The LG Human Resource department did not provide evidence to show that the DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY.</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>The LG Human Resource department did not provide evidence to show that the DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY.</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"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • • If 80-99%: Score 2 • • If 60-79: Score 1 • • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The DWO allocated over 40% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 87%.</p> <p>The water stressed sub-counties were;</p> <p>Agwingiri S/C with safe water coverage of 78% was allocated rehabilitation of 1 borehole, Arwotcek S/C with a safe water coverage of 80% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation 1 borehole, Namasale S/C with a safe water coverage of 87% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and Awelo S/C with a safe water coverage of 87% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 1 borehole.</p> <p>The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 115,352,759</p> <p>The total annual development budget for Amolatar DWO for the current FY was UGX 283,331,626</p> <p>Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was = $115,352,759/283,331,626*100\% = 41\%$</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that DWO communicated to the LLG their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY.

The DWO presented the correspondence file in which communications to Lower Local Governments were contained.

In this file there was a letter dated 1st August, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Aputi, Arwotcek, Etam, Awelo and Namasale; a copy of the same notification was seen on the DWO notice board.

The letter had details of the planned projects to be implemented in the current financial year and also detailing the allocations to each sub-county together with the financial amounts for each project.

The DWO also made a presentation during the district budget conference which was held on 7th November, 2023 in slide number 7 in his presentation the allocations were summarized.

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)

- If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

There was evidence that the DWO monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly.

The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and the quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 10th October, 2022, it was noted that there was a summary table in the report which showed that 467 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 19th January, 2023, a total of 483 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 20th April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 497.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 29th June, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 515.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $467 + 483 + 497 + 515$
 $= 1,962/4 = 491$.

Amolatar DLG had a total of 534 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $491/534 * 100\% = 92\%$

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO conducted DWSCC meetings quarterly, the DWO presented four sets of minutes of the DWSCC meetings. The following were the meetings that were conducted:-

In the first quarter the meeting was held on 8th August, 2022. The key issues discussed during this meeting were found in minute Min.05/2022 where the DWO gave a report on the achievements of the previous FY i.e. 2021/2022 which included the drilling of 8 boreholes, rehabilitation of 8 boreholes and construction of a latrine in Kitaleba landing site.

During the second quarter the meeting was held on 29th November, 2023 and the key issues discussed during the meeting were found in minute Min.05/2023 among the key issues discussed was the achievements of the second quarter which were; software activities, community sensitization on the new boreholes and advocacies.

For the third quarter the meeting was held on 7th February, 2023 and the major issues of discussion were found in minute Min.6/2023. One of the main issue of discussion was reactivation of the non-functional water user committees by using the CDOs and H/A.

Whereas in quarter 4 the meeting was held on 9th June, 2023, and key issues discussed under minute Min.06/2023. The specific issue discussed here was the presentation by the DWO who gave the achievements of the year since this was the final quarter of the year.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 87% as per the letter dated 5th September, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties;</p> <p>Aputi, Arwotcek, Etam, Awelo and Namasale; a copy of the same notification was seen on the DWO notice board.</p> <p>The letter detailed the projects allocated to these LLGs together with their budgeted amounts. The allocations were as follows: Aputi S/C UGX 70,284,253, Arwotcek S/C UGX 25,284,253, Etam S/C UGX 50,568,506, Awelo S/C UGX 25,284,253, and Namasale T/C UGX 20,000,000.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Amolatar DLG water sector was UGX 61,939,000. The DWO allocated UGX 24,796,000 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $24,796,000 / 61,939,000 * 100\% = 40\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities.</p>	3

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 10th November, 2023. The training period spanned from 6th to 9th November, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others. Under O&M emphasis was put on identification of faults, preventive maintenance and minor and major repairs</p> <p>The trainers were; Orech Michael ADWO in charge mobilization, Otik Patric the DCDO.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	----------

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were included in the register as they were detailed in form 1 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 12th September, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base.</p>	4
----	--	---	---	----------

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize 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.

The evidence showed the LG's DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted a desk appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget. It was established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage). The desk appraisals were conducted and discussed on 21st June 2023. The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 183 and Approved Budget pages, 46.

Projects appraised were;

1. Drilling of a borehole at Arwot.
2. Drilling of a borehole at Adole.
3. Drilling of a borehole at Alongotidi.
4. Drilling of a borehole at Aribi B.
5. Drilling of a borehole at Awanyi.
6. Drilling of a borehole(water for production at Aputi HC III) at Otimai A.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2

All the budgeted investments for the current FY had completed application forms from the beneficiary communities as per the records reviewed from a file of community application forms presented by the DWO to the assessor. Some of the sampled community applications included:

1). Application from Arwot village in Etam S/C, the application date was 9th May, 2022, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 23rd April, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LCI, Opio Peter together with Opio Richard, Apio Ketty, and Atim Catherine on behalf of the community.

2). Application from Adole village in Acii S/C, the application was dated 10th August, 2022, and was endorsed by the LCI, Ojok Peter Obanange with Oyuru Solomon, and Ogwal Bonny on behalf of the community.

The DWO cleared it for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on the 15th April, 2023.

3). Application from Alongotidi village in Awelo S/C, this application was dated 27th April, 2023 and was endorsed by the LCI, Ebong David, with Ogwal Ambrose, Ocen Bonny, and Abote Evalin on behalf of the community. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 20th May, 2023 by the District Water Officer.

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>LG conducted field appraisals and checked for technical feasibility environmental social acceptability, and customized designs for WSS projects for FY 2023/2024. LG DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted field appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget and established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The LG District Water Officer conducted a field appraisals for water projects on 25th June 2023.</p> <p>The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 183 and Approved Budget pages, 46.</p> <p>Projects appraised were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drilling of a borehole at Arwot. 2. Drilling of a borehole at Adole. 3. Drilling of a borehole at Alongotidi. 4. Drilling of a borehole at Aribi B. 5. Drilling of a borehole at Awanyi. 6. Drilling of a borehole(water for production at Aputi HC III) at Otimai A. 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The water infrastructure projects below for the current FY were not screened for environmental and social risks/impacts but yet they were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24 and neither were ESMPs prepared;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Plants - Construction at Aribi B Village at UGX. 24,000,000 2. Water Plants - Construction at Awanyi Village at UGX. 24,000,000 3. 5 Boreholes rehabilitation at UGX. 39,000,000 	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan that was signed on 12th July, 2023 by Mbiwa Paul Samuel. These were sitting, drilling and installation of 5 deep boreholes at Ugx 110M, construction of mini pipe water scheme at Aputi HCIII Ugx 86M and rehabilitation of 5-boreholes within Amolatar Ugx 32.5 M</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY, was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done in the sitting on 7th October, 2022 in which the approval of evaluation report and contract award for the construction of piped water scheme in Etamu town council and installation of 5 deep boreholes in Amolatar was done.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the District Water Officer did not properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines. This was in a letter dated 4th July, 2022 in which the following persons were named on the team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orech Edward-DWO- as project manager • Omara Apollo- senior Environment officer • Otile Patrick- DCDO • Ongom Dick-borehole technician as project supervisor <p>The letter left out the Labour officer and Clerk of works- among other members of the team.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><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>All the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example a boreholes in Arwotokwe cell of Amolatar T/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm, respectively as prescribed on the designs that were obtained from the DWO.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects, this was in a report by the borehole maintenance technician dated 10th June, 2023.</p>	2

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts

There was evidence that the DWO did verify works and payments were initiated. However payment to the contractors were not within specified timeframes in the contracts for example;

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

- o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2
- o If not score 0

- Voucher no.5298244 dated 17th May 2023 for Ushs 84,081,375 with certificate no. 1 Dated 3rd April 2023; contract no. Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00002, Siting, Drilling, and installation of five deep boreholes in the District by M/S KLR Uganda Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 4th April 2023, payment was initiated on 3rd April 2023 and made on 17th May 2023 which was more than 30 days.

- Voucher no.6438897 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 100,851,641 with certificate no. 1 Dated 20th June 2023; contract no. Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00006, Construction of pipe water system in Etam Town Council by Delvo Holdings Co. Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 21st June 2023, payment was initiated on 13rd June 2023 and made on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

- Voucher no.6442186 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 37,541,696 with certificate no. 1 Dated 8th June 2023; contract no. Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00008, Rehabilitation of six deep Borehole in Amolatar by Radiant General Supply and Construction limited was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 12th June 2023, payment was initiated on 8th June 2023 and made on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

As per the payment voucher one the LG didn't pay within the stipulated time flame.

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that a complete procurement file for each water infrastructure investments was in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;

Project: Construction of Pipe water scheme in Etamu town council

Procurement ref:

Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00006 had these signed documents;

- Signed works contract dated 28th October, 2022 with Delvo Holdings company limited
- Evaluation report dated 5th October, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th October, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records

Project: Sitting, drilling and installation of 5 deep boreholes

Procurement ref:

Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00002; had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 9th January, 2023 with KLR Uganda limited
- Evaluation report dated 5th October, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th October, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids

Project: Rehabilitation of 6 deep boreholes in Amolatar

Procurement ref:

Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00008 had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 23rd January, 2023 with Radiant General supply
- Evaluation report dated 2nd December, 2023
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record.

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>There were no records availed at the time of assessment showing that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee handled water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework.</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 & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the Uganda Catchment Management Planning Guidelines dated 2019 and the District Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Conditional Grant Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments dated 2023/2024 plus a report dated 12th October, 2022 titled “Water Users and Natural Resources Management Guidelines in the District” that was disseminated to through the water use committees at the sub-counties.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented for example, screening and ESMPs for all water points were done as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a pipe water scheme at Etam Town Council prepared on 19th August, 2022 2. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Akwon prepared on 8th August, 2022 3. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Nalubwoyo HCIII prepared on 4th August, 2022 4. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Aburkot prepared on 1st August, 2022 5. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Bautigo prepared on 16th August, 2022 6. Sitting, drilling and installation of 5 boreholes prepared on 20th July, 2022 <p>And a detailed projects plan dated 14th August, 2022 for projects to be implemented under the District Water and Sanitation Grant (DWSCG).</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <p>1). Land agreement signed on 10th January, 2023 between Ocen Bonny and the community of Arwotokwe cell of Amolatar T/C. This agreement was signed by Omara Victor the LCI together with Obong Isaac, and Apio Loyce on behalf of the community.</p> <p>2). Land agreement signed on 11th January, 2023 between Ocen Alfred Yubu and the community of Alwala C village of Nalubwoyo S/C, and was signed by Ajal Joel the LCI with Amule Lucy, and Ayalo Harriet on behalf of the community.</p> <p>3). Land agreement signed on 11th January, 2023 between Ongebo Francis and the community of Aleri village of Akwon S/C, it was also signed by Okello Godffrey the LCI with Adongo Janet, and Obong Willy on behalf of the community.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of E&S certificate forms were provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officer monitored water projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports as below;</p> <p>1. Monitoring report dated 6th May, 2023 for the drilling of 5 boreholes in the water sector</p> <p>2. Monitoring report dated 30th May, 2023 for the rehabilitation of 6 boreholes</p> <p>3. Monitoring report dated 15th June, 2023 for the rehabilitation of 6 boreholes</p>	2

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG presented data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>The updated report on Micro-irrigation activities implementation in Amolatar DLG dated 24th June 2023 by SAE - Sophania showed the following summary;</p> <p>2021/2022</p> <p>1. Angiro John (Farmer Initiative)</p> <p>Location: Muntu Sub-County, Nakituba Parish</p> <p>Acreage: 8 acres</p> <p>2. Kayago Fisheries and Farmer Cooperative (Cooperative Initiative)</p> <p>Location: Namasale T/C, Kayago Parish</p> <p>Acreage: 30 acres</p> <p>3. Olwata Tom (Farmer Initiative)</p> <p>Location: Muntu Sub-County, Nakatiti Parish</p> <p>Acreage: 8 acres</p> <p>Total Acreage in 2021/2022 = 46 acres</p> <p>2022/2023</p> <p>1. Etam Youth Tomatoes Growers Group (Demonstration)</p> <p>Location: Etam Town, Council</p> <p>Acreage: 1.875 acres</p> <p>2. Olal Mikele Eboko Vegetable Growing (Demonstration)</p> <p>Location: Awelo Sub-County</p> <p>Acreage: 1.25 acres</p> <p>3. Acio Betty Vegetable Grower (Demonstration)</p> <p>Location: Agwingiri Sub-County</p> <p>Acreage: 2 acres</p>	2

4. Obura Ojoko Bosco, Host Farmer (Demonstration)

Location: Muntu Sub-County

Acreage: 1.125 acres

Total acreage in 2022/2023= 4.25 acres

1

Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land

Maximum score 4

Maximum 20 points for this performance area

b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:

- By more than 5% score 2
- Between 1% and 4% score 1
- If no increase score 0

This district LG had 46 acres of irrigated land in FY 2021/2022.

In the FY 2022/ 2023, the LG had installed three Demo sites covering a total of 4.25 acres making a total of 50.25acres,

Increase in acreage.

Percentage Increase=(New Acreage–Old Acreage) / Old Acreage X (100)

Percentage Increase=(4.25 / 46) X100

Percentage Increase ≈ 9.78%

Therefore, the percentage increase in irrigated land from FY 2021/2022 to FY 2022/2023 was approximately 9.78% which was above 5%

2

2

N23_ Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:

- Above 70%, score 4
- 60% - 70%, score 2
- Below 60%, score 0

The average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 94% as per the OPAMS.

4

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	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>It was evident that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. E.g.</p> <p>The budget performance report for the financial year 2022/2023 found in the Q4 progress report presented by the SAE, verified by the DPO, and approved by the CAO, Ekaa Daisy on the 21st of June 2023. The report summarized the following expenditures</p> <p>i). Shs. 66,923,139 was used to establish four irrigation demonstration sites and procurement of field equipment and protective gear (less than 30% of the total grant).</p> <p>ii).Shs. 102,206,048 was used on awareness raising for the farmers, (40% of the total grant).</p> <p>iii). Shs. 38,327,268 was used on farmer visits and farmer Expression of interest (EOI) registration, (15% of the total grant).</p>	2
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	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	No evidence was provided, and no approved Farmer Acceptance Forms were signed by farmers. The CFO noted that the LG was still in the first year of implementing micro-scale irrigation.	0
Maximum score 6				

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

Variations in the contract price were within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates excluding the cost of agricultural inputs was calculated as follows.

SAE costed figure = UGX
42,185,862

Contractor's costed figure = UGX
41,619,308

Percentage Contract Variation =
((Contractor's Costed Figure - SAE
Costed Figure)/SAE Costed
Figure)X100

Percentage Contract Variation =
((41,619,308-
42,185,862)/42,185,862)X100

Percentage Contract Variation ≈
-1.36%

Therefore, the percentage contract variation was approximately -1.36%. The negative sign indicated a decrease in the contractor's costed figure compared to the SAE costed figure.

Hence the variation was within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates.

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>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>The Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation completion rate was at 100%. Percentage completion = $(4/4) \times 100 = 100\%$</p> <p>A signed supplier contract (Part 4 section 9 contract form), Ref number; Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00023 dated 21st December 2022 with M/s. Smart Agricultural Technologies, Supply and Consultancy (U) Limited and Amolatar DLG.</p> <p>A system-generated payment voucher of Ugx 66,923,139 dated 28th April 2023, versus the endorsed payment invoice of 29,575,520 by Smart Agricultural Technologies, Supply, and Consultancy (U) limited that was approved by the CAO on 4th April 2023 was presented.</p> <p>A completion certificate was also presented dated 9th March 2023.</p> <p>A Goods received note (GRN) was presented dated 06th February 2023.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>The LG approved staff structure provided for 45 extension workers and 18 were filled at the time of assessment = 40%.</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The irrigation demonstration sites in the two LLGs visited did not meet 100% standards as defined by MAAIF.</p> <p>Items listed in the Goods recieved note did not match the quantities outlined in the contractors BOQ.</p> <p>Only two irrigation technologies were demonstrated on the two sites instead of the three technologies. Sprinkler and drag hose systems. The two sites were a solar-powered system and a surface pump.</p> <p>No reservoir tanks on any of the sites were installed.</p> <p>No tank stand structure was established.</p> <p>However, site acreages were in line with MAAF standards i.e Farmer site (Olal Eboko), Awelo Sub-County (1.5 acres), and host farmer (Obula Bosco)in Muntu Sub-county, Nakatiti Parish (1.7 acres).</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Upon site visits on the 2 Demos, it was found that none of the installations were functional.</p> <p>Both sites were found flooded during the assessment and the farmers could not access part of the installed system.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence from the staff lists and attendance registers of the three LLGs visited that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed as below;	2
	Maximum score 4		Aboko Calvin, Agricultural Officer- Agwingiri Sub County	
			Enyang Joe Peter, Assistant Fisheries Officer - Agwingiri Sub County	
			Okello Douglas, Assistant Veterinary Officer - Agwingiri Sub County	
			Ocen Daniel, Fisheries Officer- Namasale Sub County	
			Ongodia Innocent, Assistant Fisheries Officer Namasale Sub County	
			Adong Agnes, Assistant Fisheries Officer- Namasale Town Council	
			Otema Sam, Animal Husbandry Officer- Namasale Sub County	
			Ogema James, Animal Husbandry Officer- Namasale Town Council	
			Okodi Edward, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Town Council	
			Acen Christine, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Sub County	
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	An inventory report presented by the SAE. A Goods received note (GRN) was presented dated 06th February 2023, indicating that the supplied equipment underwent inspection and was deemed satisfactory, meeting the specifications outlined in the Bill of Quantities (BOQs).	0
	Maximum score 4		However, upon a site visit, it was observed that the demonstrations were only partially functional, and some of the irrigation components, including hydrant assemblies, reservoir tanks, and drip systems were not installed.	

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

There was evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services, and farmer EOI.

For example, quarterly progress reports, compiled by SAE and endorsed by the CAO, were submitted on the following dates: Q1 (noted prepared) due to late release of funds, Q2 (4th January 2023), Q3 (13th April 2023), and Q4 (21st July 2023). It should be noted that the report for Q4 was submitted late.

In Q4 report;

Awareness raising for the district leaders (DTPC and political leaders, religious leaders. 18 awareness events were reported with a total of 510 attendance by leaders.

Meeting with the local leaders and farmers in all the 16 LLGs of Amolatar DLG

74 awareness-raising events for farmers and 2413 farmers across all the 16 DLG have been sensitized on social media and radio talk shows as well as the radio advert.

Recruited 388 farmers for expression of interest.

In Q3 report;

key statistics on farm visits EOI showed that 88 farm visits were done, 8 visits are ongoing, and 79 successful farm visits and one unsuccessful farm visit

Q3 report indicated that awareness events for farmers had a participation rate of 27.1% for females and 72.9% for males.

In Q2 report;

Q2 report indicated that all eleven (11) extension officers had completed 60% of the total modules for the MIS online training.

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>An up-to-date entry of Lower Local Government (LLG) information was made into the Management Information System (MIS). For instance, MIS reports displayed the following statistics: 2,424 attendees of awareness-raising events, 434 Expression of Interest (EOI) submissions, a total of 130 prepared farm visits, and 96 completed actual farm visits.</p> <p>During the assessment, the District Senior Agricultural Engineer (SAE) accessed his Irri Track application. The assessor then cross-verified the data on farm visits by comparing it with the information output in the MIS database for the previous financial year and for the current financial year.</p>	1
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG prepared quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p> <p>Quarterly progress reports, compiled by SAE and endorsed by the CAO, were submitted on the following dates: Q1 (noted prepared) due to late release of funds, Q2 (4th January 2023), Q3 (13th April 2023), and Q4 (21st July 2023). It should be noted that the report for Q4 was submitted late.</p> <p>The reports systematically presented crucial statistics derived from the Management Information System (MIS) dashboard. Notably, the reports included graphical representations of data, such as Expression of Interest (EOIs) across the 16 Sub-counties. The attendees of awareness-raising events were 2,424, with 434 EOIs submitted. Additionally, the reports provided information on the total number of prepared farm visits, which amounted to 130, with actual farm visits totaling 96.</p>	1

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). Amolatar was a Phase II district and PIP was only applicable to Phase I districts.	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had Implemented Performance Improvement Plans for lowest performing LLGs.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG had budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms at Ugx 1,170,000,000/=	1
	Maximum score 6			

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

The LG had deployed extension workers as per the guidelines. Below is the list;

1. Ocen Daniel, Fisheries Officer- Namasale Sub County
2. Ongodia Innocent, Assistant Fisheries Officer- Namasale Sub County
3. Adong Agnes, Assistant Fisheries Officer- Namasale Town Council
4. Enyang Joe Peter, Assistant Fisheries Officer - Agwingiri Sub County
5. Otema Sam, Animal Husbandry Officer - Namasale Sub County
6. Ogema James, Animal Husbandry Officer- Namasale Town Council
7. Okello Douglas, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Agwingiri Sub County
8. Episu Luke, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
9. Enyangu Patrick, Agricultural Officer
10. Okodi Edward, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Town Council
11. Acen Christine, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Sub County
12. Obong Ronald, Agricultural Officer
13. Aboko Calvin, Agricultural Officer- Agwingiri Sub County

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

There was evidence from the staff lists and attendance registers of the three LLGs visited that extension workers were working in LLGs where they are deployed as below for Agwingiri Sub County, Namasale Sub County and Namasale Town Council.

1. Enyang Joe Peter, Assistant Fisheries Officer - Agwingiri Sub County
2. Okello Douglas, Assistant Veterinary Officer - Agwingiri Sub County
3. Ocen Daniel, Fisheries Officer- Namasale Sub County
4. Ongodia Innocent, Assistant Fisheries Officer Namasale Sub County
5. Acen Christine, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Sub County
6. Otema Sam, Animal Husbandry Officer- Namasale Sub County
7. Ogema James, Animal Husbandry Officer- Namasale Town Council
8. Okodi Edward, Agricultural Officer- Namasale Town Council
9. Adong Agnes, Assistant Fisheries Officer- Namasale Town Council

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

There was evidence at Agwingiri Sub County, Namasale Sub County, and Namasale Town Council that extension workers' deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff lists on the LLG notice board. That is to say;

Aboko Calvin, Agricultural Officer-
Agwingiri Sub County

Enyang Joe Peter, Assistant
Fisheries Officer - Agwingiri Sub
County

Okello Douglas, Assistant
Veterinary Officer - Agwingiri Sub
County

Ocen Daniel, Fisheries Officer-
Namasale Sub County

Ongodia Innocent, Assistant
Fisheries Officer Namasale Sub
County

Acen Christine, Agricultural Officer-
Namasale Sub County

Otema Sam, Animal Husbandry
Officer- Namasale Sub County

Ogema James, Animal Husbandry
Officer- Namasale Town Council

Okodi Edward, Agricultural Officer-
Namasale Town Council

Adong Agnes, Assistant Fisheries
Officer- Namasale Town Council

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

The District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and had submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY as below;

Appraised:

1. Enyangu Patrick, Agricultural Officer was appraised on 17th August 2023 by Echeu Jacob, SAS
2. Obong Ronald, Agricultural Officer was appraised on 9th August 2023 by Acio Suzan, SAS
3. Odyek Francis, Assistant Agricultural Officer was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Ongom Maximillian, SAS

Not Appraised:

1. Ocen Daniel, Fisheries Officer
2. Ongodia Innocent, Assistant Fisheries Officer
3. Adong Agnes, Assistant Fisheries Officer
4. Enyang Joe Peter, Assistant Fisheries Officer
5. Otema Sam, Animal Husbandry Officer
6. Ogema James, Animal Husbandry Officer
7. Okello Douglas, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
8. Episu Luke, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
9. Okodi Edward, Agricultural Officer,
10. Acen Christine, Agricultural Officer
11. Aboko Calvin, Agricultural Officer
12. Ekit Harriet, Agricultural Officer
13. Okello Darius, Assistant Agricultural Officer
14. Okello Seydou, Assistant Agricultural Officer
15. Ocen Morish Leo, Assistant Agricultural Officer

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	The HR department did not provide evidence that appraisals for extension workers were conducted last FY.	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	There was no evidence provided by the LG Human Resource Department that training activities were conducted for extension workers nor was a training plan provided at the time of assessment.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided by the LG Human Resource Department that training activities were conducted for extension workers nor was a training plan provided at the time of assessment.	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	The LG had appropriately allocated the micro-scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro-scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 255,515,120 of which UGX 191,636,340 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 63,878,780 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services.	2
---	--	--	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG which was in phase 2 ,100% micro scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.38,327,268</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.102,206,048</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.76,654,536</p> <p>15% farmer visits was Ushs 38,327,268</p> <p>According to Page 7 of Sector Grant guidelines.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of cofunding planned as per the current budget.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that the LG used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant since they are still on stage two of implementation.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

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

Maximum score 10

e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding e.g.,

A report on MSI pre-visits and farm Visits conducted in Awelo Sub-County dated 3rd April 2023.

Radio Talk Show and radio advert: Coordination, Development, and running radio short messages on the UGIFT MSI program implemented between 22nd June to 24th July dated 24th July 2023.

Awareness creation for farmers about the Ugift Irrigation Project, adoption and promotion of irrigation projects in Etam S/C, Abeja S/C, Awelo S/C, and Etam Town Council dated 21st May 2023.

Farmer exchange visit to Jinja DLG between 17th -18th April 2023.

Awareness raising for the DTPC 8th December 2022.

Awareness raising for farmers in Aputi S/C, Agikdak S/C. Opali S/C and Amolatar T/C dated 1st March 2023.

Training of farmers on the operation, utilization, and management of the irrigation Demo sites established under the Ugift MSI program dated 11th April 2023.

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines

Maximum score 8

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.)

- If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2

- 70-89% monitored score 1

Less than 70% score 0

There was no evidence that the DPO had monitored the installed micro-scale irrigation equipment every month.

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 & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Amolatar DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding the MSI projects.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government (LG) provided hands-on support to the Local Level Government (LLG) extension workers during the implementation of complementary services in the previous financial year. Supervision reports were not on file, and minutes of field meetings were also not documented.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Amolatar DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0

- 11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0
- Maximum score 4
- There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines, for example, the awareness-raising reports for the LLGs and Town Councils. These included;
- Farmer exchange visit to Jinja DLG between 17th -18th April 2023.
- Awareness raising for farmers in Aputi S/C, Agikdak S/C. Opali S/C and Amolatar T/C dated 1st March 2023. Awareness raising for farmers in Aputi S/C, Agikdak S/C. Opali S/C and Amolatar T/C dated 1st March 2023.
- Training of farmers on the operation, utilization, and management of the irrigation Demo sites established under the Ugift MSI program dated 11th April 2023.
- A report on MSI pre-visits and farm Visits conducted in Awelo Sub-County dated 3rd April 2023.
- Radio Talk Show and radio advert: Coordination, Development, and running radio short messages on the UGIFT MSI program implemented between 22nd June to 24th July dated 24th July 2023.
- Awareness creation for farmers about the Ugift Irrigation Project, adoption and promotion of irrigation projects in Etam S/C, Abeja S/C, Awelo S/C, and Etam Town Council dated 21st May 2023.
- 11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0
- Maximum score 4
- Evidence was presented about the training of staff and political leaders at the District and LLG levels. For example, a report on awareness raising for the district leaders (DTPC and political leaders, religious leaders) was provided. Eighteen (18) awareness events were reported with a total of 510 leaders in attendance, dated 8th December 2022.

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had maintained an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to host farmers/institutions in the previous financial year under Ugift Demos.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>However, at the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were not on file, and the verification in the Irri Track application and MIS database was not done.</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>There was evidence presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers who submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p> <p>MIS data in the Q4 report (21st July 2023) showed that out of 130 successfully prepared farm visits, 96 farm visits had been done by the end of the previous FY.</p> <p>Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) dated 23rd June 2023 mandated the production department to proceed with the implementation of the program to the approved farmers.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no information found on the LLG noticeboards publicizing eligible farmer approval.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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.	There was evidence that no micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY. This plan was signed by the CAO Mbiwa Paul Samuel on 12th July, 2023.	0
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that the LG did not request for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). They requested from a list of pre-qualified suppliers at the district and quotations were got from;	0
Maximum score 18			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adritex Uganda limited • Real Irrigation Engineering limited • Smart Agricultural, Technologies, Supplies and Consultancy Uganda limited 	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria of signing contract with the lowest bidder. This was done when a contract was signed with Smart Agricultural, Technologies, Supplies and Consultancy Uganda limited who was evaluated as the lowest bidder among those who submitted their bids and these included;	2
Maximum score 18			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adritex Uganda limited • Real Irrigation Engineering limited • Smart Agricultural, Technologies, Supplies and Consultancy Uganda limited 	

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were approved by the Contracts Committee. This was done in the sitting of 7th December, 2022 where they approved the evaluation report and contract award for the supply and installation of two micro-scale irrigation systems in Etamu and Amolatar town councils, in minute 61/Amol564/cc08/2022-2023.	1
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	The LG did not sign the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation since these were still as demonstration stage.	0
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence presented that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App). This was because the DLG was in its first year of implementation, and for Ugift demonstrations, the DLG received approved designs from MAAIF that they customized to fit site conditions. SAE presented the customised designs for the installed demonstration sites.	2
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Evidence was presented indicating that the Local Government (LG) conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects through relevant technical officers. For instance, a technical Supervision report for demonstration installation by DPO, SAE, dated 11th April 2023 A report on Micro-scale irrigation supervision and monitoring by DAO, DPO, SAE, and internal auditors dated 28th June 2023.	2
Maximum score 18			The LG was using visitors' books on the two sites since Ugift site books were not provided by MAAIF.	

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	There was no evidence that the LG oversaw the irrigation equipment testing for functionality after installation.	0
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during the handover of the equipment to the approved farmer (Host farmer/ institution).	1
Maximum score 18			SAE presented a payment voucher for the contract, dated 28th April 2023 for the supply and installation of MSI equipment.	
			Goods Recieved Note (GRN) was presented dated 06th February 2023	
			A completion certificate was also presented dated 9th March 2023.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	The CFO noted that the LG was still in the first year of micro-scale irrigation implementation, no approved farmer have been selected yet.	0
Maximum score 18				

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>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for the contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law. The file reviewed was</p> <p>Project: Supply and Installation of 2-Micro-scale Irrigation equipment in Etam and Amolatar town councils</p> <p>Procurement ref: Amol564/wrks/2022-2023/00023 had these documents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed works contract dated 21st December, 2022 with M/s. Smart Agricultural Technologies, Supply and Consultancy (U) limited 2. Evaluation report dated 6th December, 2022 3. Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022 4. PP1 form, call for bids record issue and receipt of bids records, opening of bids records among the documents therein. 	2
----	---	---	---	----------

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>A micro-scale irrigation Grievances Redress Mechanism was publicized on the notice board in the production department dated 17th August, 2023 clearly indicating the pathways for handling Grievances within the irrigation sector.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>A complaint recorded on 9th January, 2023 for the change of Irrigation demonstration site from Amolator Town Council to Awelo sub-county as a result of the drastic reduction in the water levels of the water reservoir at one of the sites located at Mr. Okello Bazil's making it no longer suitable to host the irrigation demonstration. This complaint was handled on 10th January, 2023 and instructions given to the District Production Marketing Officer to proceed with the relocation of the site.</p>	1

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	A complaint recorded on 9th January, 2023 for the change of Irrigation demonstration site from Amolator Town Council to Awelo sub-county as a result of the drastic reduction in the water levels of the water reservoir at one of the sites located at Mr. Okello Bazil's making it no longer suitable to host the irrigation demonstration. This complaint was handled on 10th January, 2023 and instructions given to the District Production Marketing Officer to proceed with the relocation of the site.	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	A complaint recorded on 9th January, 2023 for the change of Irrigation demonstration site from Amolator Town Council to Awelo sub-county as a result of the drastic reduction in the water levels of the water reservoir at one of the sites located at Mr. Okello Bazil's making it no longer suitable to host the irrigation demonstration. This complaint was handled on 10th January, 2023 and instructions given to the District Production Marketing Officer to proceed with the relocation of the site.	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	A complaint recorded on 9th January, 2023 for the change of Irrigation demonstration site from Amolator Town Council to Awelo sub-county as a result of the drastic reduction in the water levels of the water reservoir at one of the sites located at Mr. Okello Bazil's making it no longer suitable to host the irrigation demonstration. This complaint was handled on 10th January, 2023 and instructions given to the District Production Marketing Officer to proceed with the relocation of the site.	1

Environment and Social Requirements

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

There was evidence that LGs disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to farmers to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals, and safe disposal of chemical waste containers. The LG disseminated the following guidelines.

Micro-scale irrigation program improving farmers' livelihood guide for farmers dated April, 2023 part 1 and 2.

UgIFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program Improving Farmers' Livelihood Technical Guidelines version 3, April 2023.

Additional environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for the micro-scale irrigation projects below were carried out;

1. Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebolle at Akongomit parish prepared on 9th March 2023.

2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 9th March 2023.

3. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco, Nakatiti parish prepared on 9th March 2023.

4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish prepared on 9th March 2023.

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the micro-scale irrigation projects below was carried out;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebolle at Akongomit parish prepared on 9th March, 2023 2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 9th March, 2023 3. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco, Nakatiti parish prepared on 9th March, 2023 4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish prepared on 9th March, 2023 <p>And their respective ESMPs were prepared as below and incorporated into designs. BoQs, bidding and contractual documents;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 10th March, 2023 at UGX. 10,421,389 2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish prepared on 10th March, 2023 at UGX. 20,763,127 3. Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebolle at Akongomit parish prepared on 10th March, 2023 at UGX. 21,422,735 4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco, Nakatiti parish prepared on 10th March, 2023 at UGX. 19,798,488 	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>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</p>	<p>A monitoring report dated 30th March, 2023 for the 4 micro-scale irrigation projects was availed showing monitored aspects of the irrigation projects for impacts throughout the implementation cycle.</p>	1

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	<p>Certification forms were completed and signed by Environment Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certificate of completion I.P.O number 131, issued on 9th March, 2023 for the Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county and Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco Obura at the Muntu sub county 2. Certificate of completion I.P.O number 130, issued on 9th March, 2023 for Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish and Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebolle at Akongomit parish 	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	<p>Certification forms were completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certificate of completion I.P.O number 131, issued on 9th March, 2023 for the Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county and Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco Obura at the Muntu sub county 2. Certificate of completion I.P.O number 130, issued on 9th March, 2023 for Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish and Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebolle at Akongomit parish 	1

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had nether substantively appointed a Chief Finance Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Planner nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Engineer nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Omara Apollo Milton was substantively appointed as a Senior Environment Officer on 22nd December 2009 under Minute no. 26/2009.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Ojok Francis was substantively appointed a District Production Officer on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/9.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Otile Patrick was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/7.	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	Ayo Carla Teddy was substantively appointed as Principal Commercial Officer on 1st June 2023 under Minute no. 20/04/2023/3.0.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Procurement Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Auma Harriet was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer on 10th May 2019 under Minute no. 23/2019/8	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had neither Substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	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 had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Rapa Calvin was substantively appointed as Senior Land Management Officer on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/8.	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	Ogony Silvesto Alex was substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 30th September 2013 under Minute no. 84/2013/7.	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>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Obim Nixon was substantively appointed as Senior Internal Auditor on 15th May 2019 under Minute no. 23/2019/10.</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>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had nether substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff.</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 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed 9 Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) in the LLGs as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ogwok Patrick was appointed on 25th September 2013 under Minute no. 84/2013/1.3 2. Ogwang Andrew was appointed on 23rd October 2013 under Minute no. 91/2013/1 3. Odongo Lawrence was appointed on 1st December 2007 under Minute no. 34/2007 4. Ongom Maxwell was appointed on 21st December 2022 under Minute no. 100/08/2022/2.3 5. Obote Stephen Louis was appointed on 18th December 2020 under Minute no. 70/2020/15.1 6. Acio Suzan Okello was appointed on 16th June 2017 under Minute no. 93/2017/1.2 7. Ongom Maximillian Kolbe was appointed on 1st December 2007 under Minute no. 34/2007 8. Ekwire Jonathan was appointed on 21st December 2022 under Minuteno.1008/08/2022/2.2 9. Okwel James Aria was appointed on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/6.2 	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed 11 Community Development Officers/ Senior CDOs in the LLGs as below;

1. Echeu Jacob was appointed on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/6.3
2. Ogwang Boniface was appointed on 20th January 2012 under Minute no. 24/2011/1.1
3. Abulo Betty was appointed on 24th January 2012 under Minute no. 24/2011/12.2
4. Apio Immaculate was appointed on 21st April 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015/6.4
5. Ebil Jasper was appointed on 25th September 2013 under Minute no. 84/2013/11.2
6. Alobo Sharon was appointed on 31st August 2022 under Minute no. 30/08/2022/2.2
7. Apollo Rebecca was appointed on 31st August 2022 under Minute no. 30/08/2022/2.3
8. Achola Evelyn was appointed on 21st December 2022 under Minute no. 100/08/2022/2.4
9. Wacha Roger was appointed on 18th December 2020 under Minute no. 70/2020/20.3
10. Owidi Andrew was appointed on 31st August 2022 under Minute no. 30/08/2022/2.4
11. Amongi Harriet was substantively appointed on 18th December 2020 under Minute no. 70/2020/20.2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed 9 Senior Accounts Assistants/an Accounts Assistants in LLGs as below;

1. Auma Annet Vivian was appointed on 20th January 2012 under Minute no. 24/2011/4
2. Akeny Okwee was appointed on 10th December 2005 under Minute no. 236/2005
3. Okello Samuel was appointed on 2nd January 2008 under Minute no. 36/2007
4. Odur Mike Obong was appointed on 2nd January 2008 under Minute no. 36/2007
5. Alwoko Jepula was appointed on 20th January 2012 under Minute no. 24/2011/2.1
6. Elasu Emmanuel was appointed on 2nd January 2008 under Minute no. 36/2007
7. Ongwen Douglas was appointed on 16th June 2017 under Minute no. 94/2017/1.3
8. Okello Walter was appointed on 6th December 2005 under Minute no. 445/2005
9. Were Mathias was appointed on 18th April 2012 under Minute no. 14/2012/1.1

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:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 99% of Natural Resources as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	The warranted amount was UGX 271,524,663	
			The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 268.641,763 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14).	
			(UGX 268.641,763 /271,524,663)*100= 99%. The remaining 1% of the funds went into bank charges	
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:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 84% for community-based service as per the computation below;	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	The warranted amount was UGX 199,571,449	
			The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 166,628,682 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14).	
			(UGX 166,628,682 /UGX 199,571,449)*100=84%	
			This gives a variance of UGX 0. Therefore, the released was; 100%.	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was no screening done for DDEG projects in the previous FY, since it was already carried out in the FY 2021/22. So the completion of District Store a DDEG project at UGX. 35,000,000 was on phased implementation stage since FY 2021/22.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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>Since there were no DDEG projects screened in the previous FY therefore no Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) were verified.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Since there were no DDEG projects screened in the previous FY therefore no costed ESMPs were prepared since they were planned for in the FY 2021/22.</p>	4

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Alebtong LG had unqualified audit opinion for FY 2022/2023.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 3th February 2023. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	10

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 21st June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 16th August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 28th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 9th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 9th May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 16th August 2023</p> <p>From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

Education Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Achen Josephine Atia was substantively appointed as District Education Officer on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 93/2017/2	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed District Inspector of Schools as below; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ogeng Sam Ronald was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 23rd September 2021 under Minute no. 072/09/2021/7.1.1 2. The file of the inspector of schools was not provided by the LG Human resource department at the time of assessment. 	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. 	Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening was carried out for all Education sector Projects below; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with a urinal at Aromi primary school prepared on 18th July, 2022 2. Sitting, drilling and installation of 5 boreholes prepared on 20th July, 2022 3. Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Kayago primary school prepared on 22nd July, 2022 4. Construction of a block of 2 classrooms at Arwot primary school prepared on 25th July, 2022 5. Construction of a classroom at Burkwoyo primary school prepared on 28th July, 2022 6. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with a urinal at Muntu Township primary school prepared on 29th July, 2022 7. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with urinal at Akol primary school prepared on 3rd August, 2022 8. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with urinal at Aguludia primary school prepared on 5th August, 2022 	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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

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

The projects that were implemented in the Education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they were categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Health Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	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	Atim Victoria Sharon was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing on 31st August 2022 under Minute No. 30/8/2022/5.	10
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.	Ekoch Denis was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health under Minute no. 100/08/2022/1.1	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed a Principle Health Inspector nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	Omodi Patrick was substantively appointed as Senior Health Educator on 31st August 2022 under Minute no. 30/08/2022/6	10

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Okello Walter was substantively appointed as Biostatistician on 23rd September 2021 under Minute no. 069/09/2021/4.1</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Okello Willy Agel was substantively appointed as District Cold Chain Technician on 11th June 2020</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for the Health sector Projects below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a twin staff house at Awotcek HCIII prepared on 17th July, 2023 2. Completion of maternity ward at Amolator HCIV prepared 12th July, 2023 3. Construction of a pediatric ward at Amolator HCIV prepared on 10th July, 2023 	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) were not carried out because the Health sector projects were categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning.</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Mbabaali Sophania was substantively appointed as Senior Agricultural Engineer on 16th June 2017 under Minute no. 93/2017/1.4	70

Environment and Social Requirements

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.

Maximum score is 30

If the LG:

Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the micro-scale irrigation projects below was carried out;

1. Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebole at Akongomit parish prepared on 9th March, 2023

2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 9th March, 2023

3. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco, Nakatiti parish prepared on 9th March, 2023

4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish prepared on 9th March, 2023

And their respective ESMPs were prepared as below;

1. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco Obura at the Muntu village, Town Council prepared on 25th August, 2022

2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Acio Betty, Agwingiri sub-county prepared on 10th March, 2023

3. Micro-scale irrigation project at Alaro parish prepared on 10th March, 2023

4. Micro-scale irrigation project at Olal Mikele Ebole at Akongomit parish prepared on 10th March, 2023

5. Micro-scale irrigation project at Ojok Bosco, Nakatiti parish prepared on 10th March, 2023

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Orech Edward was substantively appointed as Water Officer on 23rd September 2014 under Minute no. 21/2014/4.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Ecir Denis was substantively appointed as Assistant Water Officer on 1st April 2008 under Minute no. 27/2008.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Ongom Dick was substantively appointed as Borehole Maintenance Technician on letter dated 4th October 2012 under Minute no. 37/2012/7.2	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Amolatar LG did not have a substantively appointed Natural Resources Officer at the time of assessment nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Omara Milton Apolo was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 22nd Dcember,2009 as directed by DSC minute No. 26/2009 ref HRM/155/2	10
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.	The position of Forestry Officer was not substantively filled and there was no seconded staff at the time of assessment.	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.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water sector projects below was carried out; 1. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Akwon prepared on 8th August, 2022 2. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Nalubwoyo HCIII prepared on 4th August, 2022 3. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Aburkot prepared on 1st August, 2022 4. Sitting and drilling of borehole at Bautigo prepared on 16th August, 2022 5. Sitting, drilling and installation of 5 boreholes prepared on 20th July, 2022 6. Construction of a pipe water scheme at Etam Town Council prepared on 19th August, 2022	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) were not carried out because the Water sector projects were categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	There was no abstraction permit despite the fact that the LG had a completed piped water system that was constructed last FY which was operational at the time of assessment.	0