



LGMSD 2022/23

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	75%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	85%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	55%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	30%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	66%
Educational Performance Measures	73%
Health Performance Measures	53%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	46%

**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 project implemented using DDEG funding and it was completed and being utilised as follows</p> <p>Furnishing the chamber hall at Ushs 46,515,000 (Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 11).</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 assessment results presented by OPM indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 10% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 64%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 54%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>$= (0.64 - 0.54 / 0.54) * 100\% = 10\%$</p> <p>The LLG performance assessment for the current year increased by 10% from previous year 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 was implemented in the FY 2021/2022 and was completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>- Furnishing the chamber hall at Ushs 46,515,000 (Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 11)</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 and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementation guideline as indicated below; - Furnishing the chamber hall at Ushs 46,515,000 (Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 11)	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was only one DDEG funded project-furnishing of chamber of the Council Hall. According to records provided, there was no contract price variations indicated below; Project: Furnishing of chamber of the Council Hall Estimated cost: Ugx 46,515,000/= Contract Cost: Ugx 46,515,000/= Variation Ugx 0	2
---	--	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	The information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, For example for Lokales Sub County and Amudat Town Council the information from the staff lists tallied with the staff found on ground.	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	There was no evidence of completion reports for DDEG projects implemented that were availed to the assessment team.	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 Lokales /C 79 83 Losidok S/C 56 00 Karita T/C 73 24 Amudat S/C 68 42 The performance of three LLGs 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	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.	0
---	---	--	---	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.	0
---	---	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	On the 24th September 2023 under ref.CR/102, Amudat DLG had submitted their staffing requirements for the FY2022/2023 to MoPS. They copied in the Permanent Secretary to the Treasury, MoFPED, the PS, MoLG, the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health, Budget Desk MoFPED, CFO, Internal Auditor and the Principal Human Resource Officer.	2
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p>	<p>Amudat DLG conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance for the FY2022/2023 as seen in the Monthly Daily Staff attendance reports submitted by the Human Resource Officer Ms. Agudo Dinah to the Chief Administrative Officer.</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>1. In the Finance department, in the month of July Welikhe David Ambrose had an attendance of 71% and the worst attendance was by Inyelle Jane Rose at 38%.</p> <p>2. In the Natural Resources department in the month of July Ochan Ronald had an attendance of 78% while Amutale Newton Yeko was at 48%.</p> <p>3. In the administration department, in the month of July 3 staff, Logwe Alfred, Meheret Grace, and Agudo Dinah had 100% attendance while the worst was Psorich Samuel at 38%.</p>	
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had 5 substantively appointed HoDs including, DCDO, DHO, DPMO, CFO and District Planner. With the exception of DPMO who was on study, the rest of the HoDs were appraised for FY 2022/2023 on 29th July 2023 and 5th July 2023. There was no evidence for appraisal of of the Ag. HODs</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>1. The rewards and sanctions committee held a meeting on 15th February 2023 in the office of the Principal Human Resource Officer to address a case of insubordination and gross misconduct by the Parish Chief, Losur Joshua. The officer was given a last warning and asked to write an apology to his immediate supervisor.</p> <p>2. The rewards and sanctions committee held a meeting on 19th September 2023 in the office of the Principal Assistant Secretary to address cases of absenteeism and non performance of duty by two drivers Ichumar Lawrence Desmond and Omari Naruti.. Their salaries were withheld.</p> <p>The administrative rewards and sanctions committee was in place and it comprised of Dr.Sagaki Patrick- member, Lawot Lam Anthony - member, Lodungokol Patrick-Member, Logwe Alfred Tightoket-Chairperson, and Grace Meheret- Secretary as appointed on 30 January 2023 by the CAO Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel.</p>	1

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>On 7th July 2020 members of the administrative rewards and sanctions committee were appointed by the CAO and the committee is comprised of Lokoroi Charles Okwi- Chairperson, Agudo Dinah- Secretary, Kaliamoi Walter - member, Simiyu Daniel- member, Esther Acheng - Member.</p> <p>In a meeting held on 13th February 2023 in the board room, the Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress handled two staff grievances relating to the bushy compound which was not safe for the staff.</p>	1
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>Amudat DLG was not in position to recruit any new staff during the previous Financial Year following the ban on recruitment by MoPS.</p>	1
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>Amudat DLG did not have any retirees during the previous Financial Year.</p>	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in the previous FY as per the releases below;</p> <p>Amudat S/C received Ushs 41,949,242</p> <p>Amudat T/C received Ushs 29,324,469</p> <p>Looro S/C received Ushs 30,168,548</p> <p>Karita S/C received Ushs 25,119,680</p> <p>Karita T/C received Ushs 3,810,524</p> <p>Abiliyep S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>Achorichor S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>Katabok S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>Kongorok S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>Lokales S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>Losidok S/C received Ushs 3,241,249</p> <p>The total transfers to all the LLGs in the LG added up to Ushs 149,819,957 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two installments dated:</p> <p>In quarter 1 the LG didn't receive DDEG grant.</p> <p>Quarter 2 paid on 12th October 2022;</p> <p>Quarter 3 was paid on 05th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 the LG didn't receive DDEG grant.</p>	2
10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the LG did not do timely warranting of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>In quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2: Release was 3rd /10/2022, warranted on 17th /10/ 2022, warrant was 14 days; and</p> <p>In quarter 3: Release was on 01st /01/2023, warranted on 05th /01/ 2023 which was within the time limit day.</p> <p>In quarter 4 : Didn't receive DDEG.</p>	0

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

The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done. However, it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;

Quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,

Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 12 October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days

In quarter 4, LG didn't receive DDEG funds.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence the district supervised and mentored all LLGs in the District at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines as per the monitoring reports. The LG mentored the LLGs in all the quarters. The supervision and mentoring were done in each quarter as per the reports:

Quarter 1 for FY 2022/23 report dated 30th September 2022 made a follow-up on government projects in all the administrative Units (sub-counties) of Karita, Loro, Amudat, and Amudat Town council by the New district Planner. The main objective was to establish projects and their funding sources either government/development partners/Donor funds.

and the supervision and evaluation exercise conducted by the District Planner, technical staff (head of departments), security team (RDC and DISO), and others.

Quarter 2 of the FY 2022/23 supervision report dated 29th March 2023 was a joint monitoring encompassed all government projects ranging from Health, Education, works, and Water among others. Some of the issues to check on were, to find the challenges hindering the completion of projects, to avoid duplication of similar projects by the development partners, and to eliminate poverty from the Amudat community through proper service delivery.

Quarter 3 of the FY 2022/23 monitoring report dated 25th April 2023 on-site monitoring for construction of 4 unit Staff House at Chepongogs Primary School and 2 stance VIP latrines at Katabok Primary School by the Technical Team. Participants were CFO, Ag.

District Engineer, Ag District Community Development Officer, District Planner, and others. The main objectives were to establish the level of contract progress and assess the quality of the projects under construction.

Quarter 4 of the FY 2022/23 monitoring report was not dated however it was a joint monitoring of the government projects by all the stakeholders. The objective was to ascertain the proper usage of government/development partners/Donor funds to the district, find out the challenges hindering the completion of the projects, and avoid duplication of similar projects by the development partners. The exercise was done by the District Planner, technical staff (head of departments), security team (RDC and DISO), and others.

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 reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by Chairperson Tumusiime Leonard and were as below;</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <p>Quarter one report was discussed on 26th October 2022- TPC- MIN 2022/23-027: Discussion of monitoring reports for Quarter one.</p> <p>Quarter two report was discussed on 24th January 2023- TPC- MIN 2022/23-055: Departmental Reports and Monitoring of Quarter two report discussion.</p> <p>The quarter three report was discussed on 27th April 2023- TPC- MIN 2022/23-80: Departmental and Monitoring updates and report.</p> <p>The quarter four report was included on the agenda for the meeting held on 28th June 2023- TPC- MIN 2022/23-96: Departmental and Monitoring updates and report however the details for the quarter four report were blank.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>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>A review of the assets register presented by the CFO indicated that although all categories of assets are captured, not all the details are recorded as per the Accounting Manual. For example, the following vehicles did not have other details of the chassis and engine numbers, cost and date of acquisition. Ford Ranger Reg. No UG 0655Z; Hilux Reg. No.UG2497A, Nissan Hard Body UG2242M, Land Cruiser UG1714-52.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 in place a copy of which was submitted to the Accountant General on 30th August 2022 with no reference. The report was acknowledged by the Accountant General on 5th September 2022. The Board made several recommendations some of which were being acted on and others cleared at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Examples of recommendations raised by the Board included the disposal of district old assets, engraving the district assets, disposal of old computers, keyboard printer, old furniture, etc as detailed on page 145 of the Board of Survey report.</p>	1
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 CR/ADM/206/1 dated 20th July 2019.</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 12nd August 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting was held on 18th October 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting was held on 22th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting was held on 08th June 2023.</p> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows</p> <p>Quarter 1 was submitted on 18th September 2022, Quarter 2 minutes were submitted on 6th December 2022, Quarter 3 was submitted on 17th March 2023 and Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to Ministry on 29th 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. For the DDEG project was desk appraised on 22nd April 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP and availability of funds in the Approved budget</p> <p>- Furnishing the chamber hall at Ushs 46,515,000 and the projects was recommended for funding and implementation.</p>	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 17th April 2022 for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <p>- Furnishing the chamber hall at Ushs 46,515,000</p> <p>The project was appraised by the District Planner, DCDO, and other technical team. The project was recommended for funding to improve on the service delivery at the district Headquarters.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Project Profiles with costing endorsed by the District planner dated 30th June 2023 were provided at the time of assessment however there was no evidence of TPC minutes showing that the Projects profiles were discussed.</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>There was no screening for environmental and social risks/impacts for projects in the current FY and monitoring checklists were not availed at the time of assessment in spite of a project list that had been approved for the FY 2023/4 that was availed the Planner</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The approved consolidated procurement plan dated 29th August, 2023 signed by the CAO, Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel, had DDEG project listed as construction of a five-stance VIP latrine at Loroo HCIII.</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 all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the contracts committee before commencement. This was done on 22nd September,2023 at the sitting of the contract committee under min152/Amudcc/22-9/2023-2024 as item vii.</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 that the project implementation Team had been properly established in a letter written by the CAO, naming members to the PIT.</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 no drawing provided by the LG Engineer as evidence to show that the rehabilitation and renovation followed standard technical.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was evidence that LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for the infrastructure prior verification and certification of the works in the previous FY. This was in an inspection report dated; 15th May,2023 by the Acting District Engineer. However, other officers like the DCDO, and the environment officer did not sign the report.</p>	0

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 verified works and initiated payment of contractors within two months. A claim of Ugx 515,943,747/= raised on 15th May 2023 by the contractor M/s Adler construction company limited for construction works at Loro seed secondary school. The District Engineer, DCDO, DEO and Environmental officer certified it on 10th June,2023 and was paid, Ugx 484,987,122/= on 21st June,2023 under voucher No5970066. Which was within the two months' time as required and they therefore complied.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had complete procurement files in place for each contract and those reviewed were;</p> <p>Project 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of a one-stance VIP latrine and rehabilitation of a water harvesting tank at Karita town council headquarter. <p>Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00010, The file contained the following documents.</p> <p>i) Signed works contract dated 24th February,2023 with NINHA and Nina investors limited</p> <p>ii) Contract committee decision dated 24th January,2023 in which the contract was award under min 120/Amudcc/24-1/2022-2023</p> <p>iii) Evaluation reported dated 9th December,202</p> <p>iv) PP1, Call for bids, award letter, supervision report, certificate of payment among other documents on file.</p> <p>Project 2</p> <p>Construction Loro of Seed Secondary School</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoES/wrks/2021-22/00003, had the following documents;</p> <p>v) Signed works contract dated 12th August,2022 with Adler construction company limited</p> <p>vi) Contract committee decision dated 16th March,2022 in which the contract was award under min 72/Amudcc/16-3/2021-2022</p> <p>vii) Evaluation reported dated 4th December,202</p> <p>viii) Solicitor general letter dated 11th August signed by Magomu David Andrew in which the contract for construction of Loro seed secondary school was made</p> <p>ix) PP1, Call for bids, award letter, supervision report, certificate of payment among other documents on file</p>
---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District designated (i). Ms. Agudo Dianah the Human Resources Officer as the grievances focal officer with an appointment letter that was issued on 7th July, 2020 to coordinate grievance/complaints and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprising of Ms. Agudo Dianah the Human Resources Officer as the grievances focal officer; Mr. Kaliamoi Walter the education officer, Ms. Acheng Esther the senior nursing officer, Mr. Siminyu Daniel the agricultural officer, Mr. Koryang Moses the senior assistant secretary, with an appointment letters that were issued on 7th July, 2020.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a centralized complaints log specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances for example, a). case recorded on 9th August, 2022 of community displacement without compensation where the Kosike dam was constructed at Kosike village b). also a complaint registered on 26th October, 2023 at Loroo seed school of non-payment of labourers.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was also a public display of the grievance redress mechanisms at the district notice board dated 26th April, 2022 with a title publicization of the grievances handling committee for Amudat district local government and a copy archived at the human resources filing system.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LGDP, AWP and budgets complied with as elaborated below;</p> <p>District Wetland planning regulation and promotion, Tree planting and afforestation, Forestry regulation and inspection, River bank and wetland, Monitoring and evaluation of environment compliance, Land management services as per LGDDP III page 64 to 69 and 204, Annual work plan page 10 -12 , Approved Budget Page 47-50 .</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines. A meeting held on 18th April 2023 in the CAO's Office under MIN no 07/DTPC/04/2021Disseminationof DDEG guidelines for FY 2022/23 to LLGs and departments. However the distribution list of DDEG guidelines was not attached.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	The LG did not have investment DDEG projects financed in the previous FY because none had been approved. The only project that was financed was furnishing the Chamber Hall at Ushs 46,515,000 and this did not require ESMPs.	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 was no evidence of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change because the LG had not budgeted for them and or implemented them.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of land ownership for DDEG projects.	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	There was evidence of support supervision and monitoring by the environment officer and CDO for the following projects below; 1. Supervision report for the construction of teachers house at Chepongos primary school prepared on 28th September, 2022 2. progress report for the construction of Karita seed secondary school prepared on 6th June, 2023 3. monitoring report for the construction of micro-scale irrigation sites at Nabokotom and Kaingenoi prepared on 17th May, 2023 4. Borehole rehabilitation report prepared on 28th 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	There was evidence of completion and signing of certification forms by the environment and community development officers for example, 1. payment certificate NO 1. issued on 25th May, 2023 for the construction of 2 stance latrine at Katabok primary school 2. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 29th March, 2023 for the rehabilitation of 10 boreholes (not signed by both) 3. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 14th December, 2022 for the construction of Achorichor solar powered piped water supply system - phase 1 4. payment certificate No. 1 issued on 16th June, 2023 for the supply and installation of solar systems at 3 selected demonstration sites for micro-scale irrigation system	1

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to-date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to Assessment Team as detailed below;</p> <p>A/c name: AMUDAT DLG GLOBAL</p> <p>A/c No: 9030011680428</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Ltd</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 299,126</p> <p>A/c name: AMUDAT DLG YOUTH</p> <p>A/c No: 1630054000007</p> <p>Bank Name: Post Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 15,777,810</p> <p>A/c name: AMUDAT DLG YOUTH</p> <p>A/c No: 1630054000007</p> <p>Bank Name: Post Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30st September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 15,777,810</p> <p>A/c name: AMUDAT DLG UWEP</p> <p>A/c No: 1630054000010</p> <p>Bank Name: Post Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 12,977,711</p>
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 25th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 26th April 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 26th April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 14th August 2023</p>

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY for only 4th quarters as per the submission letter Ref No. CR/ADM/251/3 dated 28th August 2023 signed by the District Internal Auditor – Loese Denis however Quarter 1,2and 3 were not presented at the time of assessment.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no LG PAC minutes presented at the time of assessment showing that the internal audit reports for previous FY were discussed.</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 46,873,389 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 33) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 51,560,728 which gave a variance of Ushs (4,687,339) this indicate that Amudat District local Government over collected local revenue which shows good performance.</p> <p>$(51,560,728/46,873,389) \times 100\% = 110\%$</p> <p>Budget realisation by Amulet DLG was within +/- 10 %</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

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 33was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 49,352,875</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 51,560,728</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 51,560,728- Ushs 49,352,875= Ushs 2,207,853</p> <p>=(2,207,853/49,352,875) x 100= 5%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 increased by 5%.</p>
----	--	--	---

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>The shareable revenue of Ugx 24,096,250 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <p>Amudat S/C received Ushs 1,821,625</p> <p>Amudat T/C received Ushs 7,523,750</p> <p>Looro S/C received Ushs 2,101,500</p> <p>Karita S/C received Ushs 1,436,875</p> <p>Karita T/C received Ushs 5,072,500</p> <p>Abiliyep S/C received Ushs 1,301,500</p> <p>Achorichor S/C received Ushs 550,000</p> <p>Katabok S/C received Ushs 1,81,375</p> <p>Kongorok S/C received Ushs 300,000</p> <p>Lokales S/C received Ushs 1,562,875</p> <p>Losidok S/C received Ushs 1,244,250</p>
----	--	--	---

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 that the LG publicized information to citizens on awarded contracts and amounts this was observed from one document on file that had been removed from the notice board it read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder Notice”</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: Renovation of one stance and Rehabilitation of a water harvesting tank at Karita town council”</p> <p>Type of procurement: Selective bidding</p> <p>Name of best evaluated bidder: NISHA AND NINA INVESTORS LIMITED</p> <p>Contract price: Ugx 6,000,000/=</p> <p>Date of display: 31st January, 2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 9th February 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>There was evidence that the LG had the performance assessment results and the implications for the FY 2021/22 on the file endorsed by the District Planner dated on 28th June 2023 however they were publicized on the notice board.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>During FY 2022/2023, the District conducted a Barraza dated 12th October 2022 and the report was submitted on 18th October 2022. The main objective was to share ideas pertaining education status of schools in Amudat and to analyse and ensure continuous enrolment, analysis of enrolment, retention and completion rate in our the schools.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal dated 12nd October 2022 with ref CR/104/2 on the notice board.</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

It was noted by Clerk to Council that no IGG issues were reported in previous Financial Year.

**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 337</p> <p>Total absentees were 08</p> <p>Total that sat were (337- 8) =329</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 04+101+94=199</p> <p>Pass rate = $199/329 \times 100 = 60.48$</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 438</p> <p>Total absentees were 13</p> <p>Total that sat were (438- 13) =425</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 5+210+87=302</p> <p>% pass rate= $(302/425) \times 100 = 71.05$</p> <p>% improvement = $71.05 - 60.48 = 10.57$</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was =111</p> <p>Total absentees were =2</p> <p>Total that sat were (111- 2) =109</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 01+5+26 =32</p> <p>Pass rate = $32/109 \times 100 = 29.35$</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 89</p> <p>Total absentees were =6</p> <p>Total that sat were (89- 6) =83</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 3+17+20=40</p> <p>% pass rate= $40/83 \times 100 = 48.19$</p> <p>% improvement = $48.19 - 29.35 = 18.84$</p>	3

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>There was no assessment for LLG for previous year but one.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLG did receive a Sector Development Grant for FY 2022/2023 and were implemented on the following projects as follows; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 2 Stance Vip Latrine with a Urinal at Primary School at a contract price of Ushs 23,000,000. 2. Construction of 2 a Stance VIP Latrine with a Urinal at Achorichor Primary School at a contract price of Ushs 21,556,000. 3. Construction of a 4 4-unit staff house at Chepongos primary school at a contract price of Ushs 240,000,000. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on education constructed projects implemented in the previous FY for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate NO 1. issued on 25th May, 2023 for the construction of 2 stance latrine at Katabok primary school 2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 6th June, 2023 for the construction of Karita seed secondary school 	2

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

There were three projects reviewed, all were within + 3.97% and complied with the +/-20% acceptable variation.

Project1.

Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Katabok primary school

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00006

Project2.

Construction of a 4-unit teachers house at Chempongos primary school

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00003

Project 3.

Construction of a 2-stance VIP latrine at Achorichor primary school.

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Project 1

Estimated cost: Ugx 23,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 22,981,525/=

Variation: Ugx 18,475/=

%age variation $(18,475/23,000,000) \times 100\%$

0.08%

Project 2

Estimated cost: Ugx 240,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 230,467,406/=

Variation: Ugx 9,532,594/=

%age variation $(9,532,594/240,000,000) \times 100\% = 3.97\%$

Project 3

Estimated cost: Ugx - 21,556,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 21,362,537/=

Variation: Ugx 193,463/=

%age variation $(193,463/21,556,000) \times 100\% = 0.89\%$

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The project implementation started on 6th September, 2022 when the site was handed over to the contractor. By close of June 2023 the contractor had only achieved 25% percent work on the foundation, as was indicated in the evaluation report for payment by the District Engineer. This was confirmed during the site visit where it was established that there was minimal activity on site.	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	From the staff list and the approved costed staff establishment, the LG had deployed 247 (91.5%) out of the expected 270 primary school teachers.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	During the assessment, an asset register was provided by the District Local Government (DLG). This register contained asset data for 27 schools, with 25 being UPE schools and 2 being USE schools.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>Three primary schools were randomly selected for sampling, and the assessment confirmed that the assets at these schools matched the records in the DLG's registry:</p> <p>Katikit P/S had 7 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 256 three-seater desks, and 12 teacher houses.</p> <p>Nabokotom P/S had 8 classrooms, 16 latrine stances, 152 desks, and 7 teacher houses.</p> <p>Nakipom P/S had 4 classrooms, 4 latrines, 71 desks, and 2 teacher houses.</p>	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p>	<p>The LG/DEO's deployment list consisted of 247 primary school teachers. The LG accurately reported on the teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving. During visits to three schools, namely Katikit Primary School (urban), Nabokotom Primary School (semi-urban), and Nakipotom Primary School (rural), the actual presence of the teachers, as per the deployment list at the DEO's office, was verified.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>At Katikit P/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Head Teacher's office indicated that there were 19 GOU teachers, which matched the DEO's deployment list. Meanwhile, at Nabokotom Primary School, the staff list on the wall of the Head Teacher's office showed that there were 11 GOU teachers, consistent with the DEO's deployment list. At Nakipotom P/S, the staff list on the wall of the Head Teacher's office indicated that there were six (6) GOU teachers, a number that aligned with that displayed on the notice board at the DLG offices.</p>	
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>The consolidated school asset register at the DEO's office accurately reported the primary school assets for some schools. The assessment team sampled three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the consolidated asset register, it was reported that Katikit P/S had seven classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 256 desks, and 12 staff houses. The performance assessment verifications confirmed that the same assets were accurately reported in the consolidated asset register at the DEO's office. 2. In the consolidated asset register, it was reported that Nabokotom P/S had eight classrooms, 16 latrine stances, 152 desks, and seven staff houses. A comparison with the field findings revealed that the same assets were accurately recorded. 3. In the consolidated asset register, it was reported that Nakipom P/S had four classrooms, four latrine stances, 71 desks, and two staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, the head teacher presented similar asset records that matched those in the consolidated asset register. 	

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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:

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4
- Between 80 - 99% score: 2
- Below 80% score 0

The DLG had registered 25 UPE schools and submitted the annual school reports for 2022 that compiled with annual school budget guidelines.

The report included annual budget, annual highlights, school performance, reconciled cash flow as well as asset register such as:

- -katikit primary school had annual report dated 23rd November 2022
- Nabokotom primary school had annual report for 2022-2023
- -Nakipotom primary school had annual report dated 14th December 2022

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30- 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

There was no evidence that schools were supported by the DLG education department to prepare the work plans on SIP and implement SIPs in line with inspections though school had individual school improvement plans assisted by the parents and NGOs such as ZOA recommendations for instance;

- KATIKIT primary school prepared a SIP for calendar year 2022-2023 the SIP contained the following: Providing more hand washing facilities Improving the girls dormitory facility Lobbying for more classrooms for pupils. Back to school campaigns.

NAKOPOM P/S had a SIP dated 18th July,2023 -NABOKOTOM P/S prepared but dated and minutes were not availed at the time of assessment Key issues meant to address the SIP 1. KATIKIT Primary school. -Late coming -Teacher performance assessment -Demarcating walk ways campaigns.

NAKOPOM P/S had a SIP dated 18th July,2023

NABOKOTOM P/S prepared but not dated and minutes were not availed at the time of assessment

Key issues meant to address the SIP

Late coming

-Teacher performance assessment-
Demarcating walk ways

1. Nakipom Primary school.

-Departmental meetings

-Back to school campaigns

-Tree planting

2. Nabokotom primary school.

-Poor sanitation

-Increase Pupil enrolment

-Parents involvement in school activities

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>Nakipotom Primary school, had partial file of compiled EMIS for the learners which had only 219 learners fully registered out of 309 at the DLG dated 10May,2023, they referred to the District., there was no evidence of such information at the time of assessment, the Education officers present kept referring to the previous DEO.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had budgeted for head teachers and a minimum of 7 teachers per school, as captured in vote 806 of the approved budget estimates for the Fiscal Year 2023/2024 for the Education Department, totalling to Ugx 2,320,990,000 on page 32.</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 DLG had deployed 247 teachers as per sector guidelines according to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment. There was a teacher deployed at least per school as in the examples provided below;</p> <p>Katiki t primary school taken as urban school had 19 teachers. Head teacher is Akol Faith Grace.</p> <p>Nakiptom primary school taken as rural had 06 teachers.head teacher as Adongu Samson, and</p> <p>Nabokotom primary school taken as semi urban had 11 teachers. Head teacher as Chelimo Veronica</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

In all the schools we visited the staff lists were prominently displayed in the Head Teacher's office. These lists matched the ones provided by the District Education Officer (DEO) which had been displayed at the LG notice board. Here are some of the staff names from the notice board for the visited schools;

Katikit Primary School:

Akol Faith Grace - Head Teacher

MoiteEtapukan

Elijah Chelengat Patricia

Nabokotom Primary School:

Chelimo Veronica - Head Teacher

Chekwt Joseph

Cherotich Jackline

Mwanga Ivan

Nakipotom Primary School:

Adong Samson - Head Teacher

Nakiru Christine

Salleh Emmanu

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p>	<p>At the time of assessment all the 18 primary school head teachers were appraised for the calendar year 2022. For instance;</p>	2
		<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anyait Norah of Chepkararat P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 2. Adongo Felista of Abongai P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 3. Akol Faith Grace of Achere P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 4. Lochugae Anthony of Nadunget P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 5. Nekesa Betty of Cheptuis P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 6. Watenga Maureen of Namodo P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 7. Nyambura Lucy of Alakas P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 8. Nantege Prossy of Kalas Girls P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 9. Oba Robert of Dingdinga P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 10. Loumo Jesca of Akorikeya P/S was appraised by SAS on 30th June 2023 	
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>There was no evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM. the DLG had two Secondary School Head teachers; Mr. Oculi Boniface and Kiisa David and none was appraised for the previous school year..</p>	0
		<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>All staff in Amudat DLG Education Department had been appraised against their performance plans for FY 2022/2023. However they were all appraised after deadline.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dicobibos Simon (Education Officer Special Needs) was appraised by the CAO on 5 July 2023 2. Malika Chemasuet (Education Officer Guidance and Counselling) was appraised by the CAO on 5 July 2023 3. Benton Luke Logiel (Senior Inspector of Schools) was appraised by DEO on 5 July 2023 4. Ling'aa Emmanuel (Inspector of Schools) was appraised by CAO on 5 July 2023 	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 Education department had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at both the school and LG levels. This plan was dated 8th July, 2023, and was designed to target the performance gaps identified through staff appraisals. The plan was encompassing the following areas:</p> <p>Training head teachers, deputy head teachers, and departmental heads on conducting regular internal support supervision, documentation, and continuous assessment at the school level by 30th December 2023.</p> <p>Conducting mentoring sessions with head teachers by 30th March 2023.</p> <p>Training head teachers on data collection, recording, analysis, storage, and dissemination at the district level by 30th March, 2023.</p> <p>Providing support to primary school teachers and administrators in innovative and inclusive child-centred teaching, mentoring female teachers, promoting early grade reading, and providing curriculum training at the school level by 30th October 2023.</p> <p>These initiatives are intended to address the identified capacity gaps and enhance the overall performance of the education staff at both the school and LG levels.</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>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The circular from the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), dated 15th May,2023, indicates that there are a total of 27 schools. These include 25 primary schools under the Universal Primary Education (UPE) program, with a total population of 15,376 pupils. Additionally, there are 2 secondary schools under the Universal Secondary Education (USE) program, which have a combined student population of 1,030.</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>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence of education sector guidelines dated June 2022 was found in the DEO's office. Additionally, the planner provided an annual sector work plan for the year 2022/2023, which outlined activities related to inspections that were in line with the sector guidelines established in 2005. The school inspection grant was valued at UGX 11,728,000, the DEO's monitoring budget was UGX 6,800,000, and the school monitoring budget was UGX 12,194,985.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 4th August, 2022 after 18 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 14 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 5th January, 2023 after 3 days. <p>4th Quarter released on 11st April 2023 and warranted on 20th April 2023 after 9 days</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 2nd August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 12 October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 4th April 2023 and the communication was made on 8th April 2023 which was within 5 days.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the District Local Government (DLG) Education Department prepared an inspection plan for schools in the district in a letter addressed to the CAO on 8th July 2022 with the following action plans,</p> <p>To support head teachers, deputy head teacher and head of departments to follow, implement and to develop inclusive school plans .</p> <p>To assess the general conditions in the schools.</p> <p>To assess teacher presence and absenteeism. It was attended by 7 inspectors</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>Evidence indicates that only 25 schools have been inspected: 25 under the Universal Primary Education (UPE) program. as reported to the Directorate of Education Standards (D.E.S) on June 22, 2023. The D.E.S duly acknowledged these circumstances on September 15, 2023.</p> $\frac{25}{25} \times 100 = 100\%$	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The assessment team observed that inspection reports were discussed at both the school level and the Local Government (LG) level, following the sector guidelines. On 25th March, 2023, Katikit Primary School was found to have the following areas in need of improvement:

Inadequate hand washing facilities

Insufficient classrooms

Limited girls' facilities especially dormitories.

A shortage of desks.

The meeting recommended that the school improvement plans be taken seriously to enhance the learning environment. The inspectorate also noted that in Amudat district, only 33.3% of primary schools had proper fencing, implying that nearly 66.7% of the schools were not yet fenced. They concluded that since this would require significant capital investment, it would need a concerted effort by various stakeholders to succeed.

Other schools with infrastructural challenges discussed included Kaloloty Primary School, which had dilapidated classrooms that were not conducive for learning. Achorichor Primary School had its improvement plans stalled for unknown reasons.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence of the Directorate of Education Standards (D.E.S) acknowledging the inspection by district inspectors was found, and this acknowledgment was dated 15th September, 2023."There was evidence of DIS following up on recommended corrective actions by DES dated 26th July,2023 at Katikit primary school

Nakipom Primary school -20th April,2023 and 12 people attended.

Nabakotom primary school 22th August,2023 and 41 people were in attendance for instance At Katikiti Primary School, the following areas were identified as needing improvement:

Inadequate hand washing facilities.

Inadequate classrooms.

Poor condition of the girls' dormitory.

These concerns were reported on 28th March, 2022, by Kibira Amos on behalf of the Directorate of Education Standards.

At Katikiti Primary School, evidence revealed that the District Inspector of Schools (D.I.S) presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to the Department of Education and Sports (D.E.S) 15th September, 2022.

Inspection reports were submitted to the D.E.S in four quarters:

- Quarter 1: Two reports dated 22nd, June, 2023.

- Quarter 2: One report dated 22nd June, 2023.

- Quarter 3: Two reports dated 22nd June, 2023.

- Quarter 4: One report dated 22nd,June, 2023.

These reports were all submitted by Kalimoi Walter, the Inspector of Schools. They were received and stamped on r 15th November,2023, by Took Victoria on behalf of the D.E.S, and acknowledgment letters were issued.

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 28th June 2023 at the District Council where at least 8 members were present. Under Min no MIN 83/ADC/06/2023. Presentation of Committees monitoring and some of the activity output include;</p> <p>Progress at schools ascertained, enrollment and attendance checked, school performance tracked, challenges and solutions in schools identified, feedback on monitoring shared.</p> <p>The joint monitoring was planned to cover three sub county of Abilyeb, Loroo and Achorchor.</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 that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called “Go back to school” campaign from both DLG education office and sampled schools.</p> <p>Evidence of sensitization meetings conducted were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio Talk show on 19th June 2023 on Kalya Radio station. KapeNguria- by Kalimoi Walter D.I.S • 4th April 2023 at Nakipom Primary school attended by 30 parents, LC1 SMC members PTA chairperson and 2 education officers. Report dated 12 June 2023 • 3rd March 2023 -LOPEDOT primary school. 19 members attended • 13/07/2023- Loroo P/S – 60 members attended • The campaigns were further enhanced by NGOs like WFP. It targeted Parents, guardians, children among other community members. 	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>During the assessment, an asset register was provided by the District Local Government (DLG). This register contained asset data for 27 schools, with 25 being UPE schools and 2 being USE schools.</p> <p>Three primary schools were randomly selected for sampling, and the assessment confirmed that the assets at these schools matched the records in the DLG's registry:</p> <p>Katikit P/S had 7 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 256 three-seater desks, and 12 teacher houses.</p> <p>Nabokotom P/S had 8 classrooms, 16 latrine stances, 152 desks, and 7 teacher houses.</p> <p>Nakipom P/S had 4 classrooms, 4 latrines, 71 desks, and 2 teacher houses.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 22rd August 2021 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 148 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of 2 Stance Vip Latrine with a Urinal at Katabok Primary School at Ushs 23,000,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal - Construction of 2 Stance Vip Latrine with a Urinal at Achorichor Primary School at Ushs 21,556,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal. - Construction of 4 unit staff house at Chepongos primary school at Ushs 240,000,000. <p>The Desk Appraisal report was Endorsed by the Ag, Planner.</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 2 Stance VIP Latrine with a Urinal at Katabok Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 27th August 2021.</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 2 Stance VIP Latrine with a Urinal at Achorichor. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 27th August 2021</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Chepongos primary school. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 27th August 2021.</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by District Planner, SCDO, PAS 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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the consolidated procurement plan. This plan was approved on 29th August 2023, endorsed by the CAO, Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel and submitted to Ministry of Local government and that of Finance planning and Economic Development on 4th September 2023. The education item was Construction of a boy's dormitory at Namondo primary school. However, there was no seed secondary school in FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that school infrastructure 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 16th March, 2022 under Min72/Amud/16-3/2021-2022 and in solicitor General letter dated 11th August, 2022, signed by Magomu David Andrew for solicitor general clearing construction Loro Seed Secondary School.</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 that the LG tried to establish a Project Implementation team for school construction projects in a letter dated 12th January,2023 signed by the CAO, Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel in which the following persons were named to the committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lawot Lam Anthony- DEO 2. Longok Micheal- Ag DCDO 3. Opio Martine - Ag DE 4. Aleper Esther - clerk of works 5. Bugosi Losira- Senior procurement officer <p>However, the labour and environment officer were not named on the team.</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 of compliance with the standard technical designs provided by the MoES as was observed during the site inspection at Loro Seed Secondary School, from where it was established that the plinth wall was topped up with a ring beam all-round the science laboratory, while the exterior of the plinth wall had been rendered with plaster and finished off with bituminous coat of paint. This was part of the project covered in FY 2022/23.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence was provided that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY, some of the reports showed that site meetings were held on 29th February 28th March 25th April 19th May, and 1st June all in 2023 for Loro Seed Secondary School.</p>	1
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 evidence to that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY at least one monthly joint technical supervision involving the engineer, environment officer CDDs were held, and these were dated 28th March,2023, 25th April, 2023 among the reports that were reviewed, the CAO, District Engineer, Environment officer, CDO and DEO did supervision</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were not within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voucher no. 5970449 dated 27th June 2022 for the construction of Karita Girls Seed School by African Business Associates Ltd was initiated on 6th June 2023 and paid on 27th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment. - Voucher no. 5897242 dated 27th June 2023 for the construction of 2 Stance VIP Latrine and a Urinal at Katabok Primary School at Ushs 20,522,502 by Walakori and Sons Family Enterprise was initiated on 25th May 2023 and paid on 27th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment. - Voucher no. 4744078 dated 27th June 2023 for the construction of 2 Stance VIP Latrine for Teachers at P/s and completion of 3 Stance VIP Latrine at Cheptapoyo Primary School at Ushs 25,338,027 by Kadigrey Construction & Supplies Limited was initiated on 21th March 2023 and paid on 27th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment 	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 evidence that the LG education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements by 30th April. The submission was made on the 11th April, 2022.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence showed that the LG had a complete file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by PPDA. The files reviewed were.

1. Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Katabok primary school.

Procurement Ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00006: This file had,

1. Evaluation reported dated 9th December 2022,
2. minutes of contracts committee decision dated 26th January 2023,
3. Work contract was signed on 22nd February, 2023, with Walakori and sons' family Enterprise,
4. PP1 form, call of bid notice, supervision reports among other documents on file.

2. Construction of a 4-unit teachers house at Chepongos primary school

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00003: These files had

1. contract committee minutes dated 5th October,
2. Evaluation report dated 9th August, 2022,
3. signed works contracts dated 14th November, 2022 with Galaxy General suppliers and contractors limited,
4. PP1 forms, call for bid, receipt of bid forms, letters of award offer acceptance letters, supervision reports, payment certificates among other documents on file.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of recorded, investigated, responded to grievances in the education sector in line with the grievance redress framework for example,</p> <p>1. a complaint recorded on 3rd November, 2022 of misbehaviour of teacher Nafuna Violet that was handled on 10th November, 2022 by the District Education Officer.</p> <p>The complaint was handled in the minutes of the joint meeting between education office staff and teachers of Nakipom primary school over issues between Nafuna Viole and the school administration held on 2nd November, 2022 MINUTE 05/JOINT MEETING/11/2022.</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 no evidence on the dissemination of the education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had a costed ESMP for the construction of Achorichor pit latrine that was prepared on 13th October, 2022 at UGX. 1,070,000 and incorporated into the BoQs under preliminaries with provision for environmental management including tree planting and maintenance for a period of five months at UGX. 500,000 and also a provision for removing rubbish and cleaning costed at UGX. 500,000</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, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The LG has secured land titles to ascertain that construction projects are secured on land without encumbrances for example, the drilling of a borehole at Loroo seed secondary school is secured on land with a certificate of title, certificate No. MOR-00000359 issued on 12th August, 2022 for Plot 239, Block 5 at Chukwara</p>	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. supervision report for the construction of teachers house at Chepongos primary school prepared on 28th September, 2022 2. progress report for the construction of 2-stance latrine at Katabok primary school prepared on 25th May, 2023 3. progress report for the construction of 4-unit teachers house at Chepongos primary school prepared on 15th May, 2023 4. supervision report for Katabok pit latrine at Katabok sub county prepared on 28th October, 2022 <p>monitoring report for the construction of pit latrine at Achorichor prepared on 8th October, 2022</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of approved and signed certification forms by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate NO 1. issued on 25th May, 2023 for the construction of 2 stance latrine at Katabok primary school 2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 6th June, 2023 for the construction of Karita seed secondary 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 for the 3 sampled Health centres Laroo HC III, Kosike HCIII, and Amudat HC IV,</p> <p>There was evidence that the Health services utilization (focus on Total deliveries), was less than 20%.</p> <p>The annual performance of the sampled facilities is indicated below:</p> <p>The 3 sampled Health centres Laroo HC III, Kosike HCIII, and Amudat HC IV indicate that their total deliveries for the two FY years 2021/22 2022/23 as indicated below:</p> <p>The total deliveries for FY 2021/22 were: 604,168,452, respectively, making a sub total of 1224 for FY 2021/22.</p> <p>While Total deliveries for FY2022/23 for the same Health Centres were:545,226,560 respectively, making a sub total of 1331 for FY 2022/23</p> <p>$\% \text{ Increase} = \frac{1331-1224}{1224} \times 100 = 8.7\%$</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 average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the previous FY was 61%, while for current FY was 65%. Therefore, the average score was 63%</p>	1
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>The indicator was considered not applicable because RBF operations were suspended during the FY under review.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 200,881,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of a chain link fence in Karita Health Centre IV at Ushs 100,000,000 approved Budget page 28. - Renovation of Staff houses at Lokales Health Centre II at Ushs 78,881,000 approved Budget page 29. <p>However the balance was used for payment of retention for construction of OPD block at Cheptapoyo II.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voucher no 5160612 dated 27th June 2023 for Ushs 22,099,269; Certificate No 2; dated 31st January 2023; Contract No. AMUD 806/WRKS/2020-2021/0007: Project; Construction of OPD PHASE 1 at Cheptapoyo HCII was certified by DHO, District Environment Officer on 23rd March 2023, district Engineer on 31st January 2023 and DCDO on 31st January 2023. - Voucher no 3754030 dated 27th June 2023 for Ushs 64,263,853; Certificate No 1; dated 31st January 2023; Contract No. AMUD 806/WRKS/2022-2023/00004: Construction of Chain Link Fence at Karita Health Centre IV was certified by the District Environment Officer on 31st January 2023, district Engineer on 31st January 2023 and DCDO and DHO verified the payment on 31st January 2023. 	2

3

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

The two projects that were sampled were within +3.03% and complied with the required +/-20% variation. The projects reviewed were; Project 1:

Construction of chain link fence at Karita HCIV.

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Project 2:

Renovation of staff house Lokales HCII.

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00008

Project 1:

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Estimated cost: Ugx :100,000,000/=

Project cost: Ugx: 96,967,050/=

Variation cost: Ugx (3,032,950/100,000,000) x100%

%age variation 3.03%

Project 2:

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00008

Estimated cost: Ugx 48,881,000/=

Project cost: Ugx 47,569,225/=

Variation Ugx 1,311,775/=

%age variation (1,311,775/48,881,000) x 100% =0.27%

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1
- less than 80 %: Score 0

There was no project for HC upgrade that was implemented in the district during the FY2022/23.

2

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	From the DLG approved structure and staff list, there are 229 established health worker positions and 73 (32%) are filled	0
	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 no upgrade of HCII to HCIII nor construction of new health facilities in the FY under review.	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	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	AMUDAT STAFF LIST 2023/2024 dated 10th July, 2023 was received from DHO and reviewed in comparison with staff lists in the sampled Health facilities: Loroo HC III and Amudat HCIV	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		The DHO list for Loroo HCIII list had 11 health workers which collaborated with the list found at the health facility during field visits. Similarly, the DHO list for Amudat HCIV list with a total of 35 health workers collaborated with a list found picked at the health facility notice board and those signing in the staff arrival book.	
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The ADHO reported there was no upgrade or construction of Health Facility for the previous FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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 no evidence that the three sampled Health Centres namely: Laroo HC III, Kosike HC III, Amudat PNFP HC IV, complied to LG Planning Guidelines for Health of submitting by March 31st of the Previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loroo submitted on 10th August, 2022 and was received by DHO Dr. Patrick Segaki on the same date • Kosike Submitted on 10th August 2022 also received by DHO Dr. Patrick Segaki on same date. <p>There was no record for submission made by Amudat HC IV's at 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 implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the 3 sampled Health Facilities : Loroo HCIII, Kosike HCIII and Amudat HCIV submitted their Annual Budget Performance Reports for FY 2022/23 but didn't conform to the Budget and Grant Guidelines.</p> <p>Two(2) Health Centres submitted their Budget performance reports later than 15th July of 2023 terms of Submission date not later than</p> <p>The submission dates of the sampled Health Centres are indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loroo HCIII submitted its report on 10/08/2022 by the HC in-charge Gimono Haddy and received by DHO Dr. Patrick Segaki . • Kosike HCIII report was submitted on 10/08/2022 received by DHO Dr Segaki <p>Amudat HCIV submitted on 10th July 2022 HC II submitted on 13th Aug 2022 received by DHO Patrick Segaki .</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the 3 sampled health facilities submitted the performance improvement plan for the current FY which incorporated issues identified in DHMT monitoring and assessment reports as indicated below.

The performance improvement plan for Laroo HCIII was submitted on 20th August 2023, and included the issue of increasing on the number of outreaches in order to improve on service deliveries. This performance issue was one of the recommendations in the 3rd Quarter support supervision and monitoring report submitted on 8th March 2023.

The sector Support supervision that took place on 28th -30th November 2023 reported the attachment of an Ambulance to Loroo HCIII by the district to facilitate outreach programs and that Immunization coverages had started to improve.

The improvement plans for Kosike HC III submitted on 8th September 2023 included training of Health workers. These were among the issues recommended in the DHMT on support supervision of 23rd-26th May 2022 reported in the 4th Quarterly review meeting that was held on 6th June 2022. DHE Report dated 9th October 2023 reported community Dialogue meetings that were done in the peripheral of Kosike HCII to sensitize people to utilize the Health Centre Services

The improvement plan for Amudat HCIV, submitted on 20th Aug 2023 included Renovation, and improvement in Information management were among the recommendations of the DHMT support supervision of 23rd-26th May 2022.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the sampled HCs submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely as indicated below.

Amudat PNFP,HCIV:

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted 6th August 2022
 Aug 2022 submitted on 5th Sept. 2022
 Sept 2022 submitted on 6th Oct. 2022
 Oct. 2022 submitted on 6th Nov 2022
 Nov 20 22 submitted on 6th Dec 2022
 Dec 22 submitted on 6th Jan 2023
 Jan20 23 submitted on 6th Feb 23
 Feb 2023 submitted on 7th Marc 2023
 Marc 2023 submitted on 6th Apr 2023

April 20 23 submitted on 6th May 2023

May2023 submitted on 7th June 2023

Jun 2023 submitted on6th July 2023

Quarterly Reports

I. Quarter 1 was submitted 6th October,2022

II. Quarter 2 was 6thJanuary,2023.

III. Quarter 3 was submitted on 2nd April,2023

IV. Quarter 4 was submitted on 3rd July,2023

Kosike HC III

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted on 6th August 2022

Aug 22 submitted on 7th Sept. 2022

Sept 22 submitted on 6th Oct. 2022

Oct. 22submitted on 7th Nov 2022

Nov 22submitted on 6th Dec 2022

Dec 22 submitted on 4th Jan 2023

Jan 23 submitted on 7th Feb 2023

Feb 23 submitted on 7th Marc 2023

Marc 23submitted on 6th Apr 2023

Apr 23 submitted on 6th May, 2023

May 23 submitted on 6th June, 2023

Jun 23 submitted on 6th July, 2023

Quarterly Reports

Quarter 1 submitted on 6th October,2022

Quarter 2 submitted 6th Jan,2023

Quarter 3 Submitted on t7th April,2023

Quarter4 Submitted on 7th July,2023

Loroo HCIII

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted 4th August 2022

Aug 2023, submitted on 5th Feb 2023

Feb2023, submitted on6th Marc 2023

March 2023, submitted on 7th Apr 2023

April 2023 submitted on 7th May 2023

May2023 submitted on 7th June 2023

Jun2023 submitted on 6th July 2023

Quarterly Reports

Quarter 1 submitted 6th October 2022.

Quarter 2 submitted on 6th Jan 2023

Quarter 3 submitted on 7th April, 2023

Quarter 4 submitted on 7th 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>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>During the FY under review, there was no RBF activities following their suspension .</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>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>During the FY under review, there was no RBF activities following their suspension .</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<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>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. She noted the new system doesn't send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Amudat District Health department developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan for FY 2023/24 and implemented the plan.</p> <p>For the weakest Health facilities.</p> <p>The Performance improved plan included: Katabok HCIII and Amudat HCII as the weak Performing health facilities. This was approved by Dr. Segaki on 23th November, 2022)</p> <p>The planned actions included Conducting Community Dialogues and sensitization to improve Health service utilization, increase on number of Outreaches to help Communities that can't access services due to long distances and insecurity.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that Amudat District Health Department developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing facilities to be implemented in FY 2023/24 and implemented the plan.

The weakest Health facilities were:

Katabok HCIII

This was approved by Dr. Patrick Segaki on 23rd November 2022.

The area of weakness identified for the two health facilities were;

low utilization of health services at these Units as observed from the low deliveries and low immunization coverage. These weaknesses were attributed to inadequate awareness among community members a poor perception of Health services and insecurity for mothers to access Health centers These were issues raised in DHMT meeting of 20th Nov 2022

The planned actions included; Conducting Community Dialogues and sensitization to improve Health service utilization, increase on number of Outreaches to help Communities that can't access services due to long distances and insecurity

The DHE report of 24th March 2023 reported 6 Community dialogue meetings done at the catchment area of Katabok HCIII to promote utilization of Health services

Human Resource Management and Development

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:
i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that Amudat DLG budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The budget for Health Workers was Ugx 2,660,433,000/- as per the recruitment workplan for financial year 2022/2023.

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).

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

Amudat HC II

5 out of 11 staff according to staffing norm, appeared in the attendance register making 45% of the staffing norm.

Loroo HC III

9 staff out of 19 as per the staffing norms appeared in Daily attendance register and on the Health Centre Notice board making 47%.of the staffing norm.

Amudat HC IV

All the 8 names on the DHO staff list appeared on the Hospital Staff list and attendance register. there were 65 additional staff at the HC who are not paid by the LG making a total of 73 making a total of 72%.

0

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).

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

Staff names were verified and found on the Staff lists and status of attendance of 30th October 2023 of the sampled Health facilities were as indicated below:

Amudat HC IV

All 8 names on the DHO staff list appeared on the Hospital Staff list and attendance register.

Some of the names that appeared on the daily attendance book were and DHO's list were;

Kalepon Daniel-Senior Laboratory Technologist

Alirach Jane, Nursing Officer

Ogwang George- Clinical Officer.

Agella David- Laboratory Assistant.

There were also other names that Sister in-charge reported to be seconded from the Hospital by the LG but were not on the DHO staff list

These were Dr. Sengaki Patrick PMO who is the current DHO, Dr.Ogwang G. MO, Emetu MCO,

Amudat HC II

All the 11 names on the DHO staff list that appeared on the health facility staff list and in the daily attendance register. These included:

- Arinaitwe Rebecca E/M
- Chemutai Wisco Nursing Assistant
- Wandagwa Florence E/N
- Asuba Moses - Health Educator.

Loroo HC III

All the 9 names that appeared on the DHO's

0

deployment list , appeared on the Facility Staff list at the notice board and in the daily attendance register .

Some of the names that appeared on the DHO's Staff list and on attendance list of 1st Nov, 2023 and Health facility notice board were as follow:

Gimono Haddy Clinical Officer

Apio Gloria EMW

Poghon Vicent Lab Assistant

Some two names which appeared on the DHO 'Staff list didn't appear on the Health Facility list and in the daily attendance register these were:

Acheng Esther who was acting as ADHO

Achuma Richard Assistant Entomologist

They were substantively working in the DHO's Office

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).

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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 Amudat DLG had publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by posting on the DLG and health facility notice boards, for the current FY. The lists were seen at Amudat Health Center IV, Amudat HC II and Loroo HC III.

2

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:
i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence that the DLG 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.

0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. Apart from the DHO's appraisal, There was evidence of only 4 appraisals were on record for Cherop Zaino- Assistant Nursing Officer, Cherotich Jabeth- Enrolled Nurse, Akello Joyce Mary- Enrolled Midwife and Apio Gloria- Enrolled Nurse</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Amudat DLG took no corrective actions based on the appraisal reports since the DLG had not conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility workers during the previous FY.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Amudat DLG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District level.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that training activities were conducted and documented in the training database.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the letter from CAO to MOH dated 2nd September 2023, confirming a list of health facilities (GoU and PNFP facilities) to benefit from PHC fund in the FY 2023/24. They were 9 Health out of 11 Facilities.</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the Q4 performance report showed that on page 62 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 43,365,000 and on (page 17) , PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 289,105,000.</p> <p>As per the computation $43,365,570/289,105,000 \times 100 = 15\%$</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 4th August, 2022 after 18 days. • 2nd Quarter was released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 14 days. • 3rd Quarter was released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 5th January, 2023 after 3 days. <p>4th Quarter date was not indicated however LG warranted on 20th April 2023.</p>	0

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities was not within 5 working days from the day of funds release;</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds were released on 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 2nd August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 12nd October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>The quarter 4 funds release date was released on 11th April 2023 from the MoFPED and the LG communicated on 18th April 2023 which was not within the 5 working days.</p>	0
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted quarterly review meetings, including;</p> <p>Quarter Review meeting took place on 3rd October 2022</p> <p>The 2nd Quarter review meeting took place on 15th January 2023.</p> <p>The 3rd quarter meeting on 4th-5th April, 2023</p> <p>4th quarterly review took place 28th June, 2023.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of attendance and involvement of DHMT, Health Facility In-charges, for example;</p> <p>1st Quarter held on 3rd Oct 2022 had 29 participants, who included DHT, Health Facility In-Charge, Partners like ANECCE, IDI, and Councilors.</p> <p>2nd Quarter held on 15th January 2023 had 31 participants, who included DHT, Health Facility In-Charge, Partners like ANECCE, IDI and the Speaker.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including 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 the LG carried support supervision to HCIVs, for example on 11th July, 2022 Kalepon Daniel (Laboratory Technologist supervised Amudat HCIV on the area of disease monitoring and data management. Recommended the Hospital to update the disease monitoring Charts.</p> <p>On 18th July 2022, Khepukul Saimon Peter (Stores Assistant) advised the Unit on Stock cards and FIFO and drug storage.</p> <p>On 18th July 2022 Sis Achen Esther- ADHO, visited the Amudat HCIV and advised on Cold chain.</p> <p>Other supervisions were done on 2nd December 2022,</p> <p>On 22 nd March 2023 and 29th June 2023</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that that DHMT ensured that HSDs carried out support supervision. No support supervision reports were provided to this effect.</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>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 for Feedback reports at the DHO's office.</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 evidence that Support the supervision on medicine management took place in FY 2022/2023. From supervision books at the sampled health facilities of Amudat HCIV, indicated that on 18/07/2022 Khepukul Simon Peter (Stores Assistant) supervised the Health Facility and advised the Unit on Stock Cards and FIFO and drug storage.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the performance report showed that the DHO Office received UGX 183,332,000. A review of the report showed that there was no clear allocation for Health promotion. However, a summary from the payment vouchers showed that Ugx 32,999,760 was spent on Health promotion.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = $32,999,760 / 183,332,000 \times 100$. This was 18%</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Amudat LG conducted health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.</p> <p>For example, the activity progress report dated 18th March 2023 indicated that 4 community dialogue meetings were conducted in Loroo from 7th - 11th March 2023. The purpose of the dialogue meetings was to discuss the causes of high malaria cases and reduced health service utilization.</p> <p>There was community sensitization on Sanitation and Hygiene reported 20th January 20223. Furthermore, community social mobilization was conducted by LCI from 4th - 16th January 2023 on Immunization (Report dated 30th January 2023)</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was no evidence on follow up actions taken on Health promotion. There were no reports were provided to assessors to this effect.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	----------

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an updated Asset register where every incoming item is entered on its page and date of entry. The register included items like: medical equipment for Health Facilities. Motor vehicles, Motorcycles Computers, etc. Some of the recently updated on 29th July 2023 items identified in the register included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Top Computers located in DHO's office • The DHO's office had 5 Motor vehicles (1 is new UG624M Toyota Hilux the 4 are in poor mechanical condition,1 is grounded) • .6 Motorcycles • 4 Land Cruiser Ambulances of which 1is attached tor Loroo HCIII, 2 are attached to Amudat PNFP HCIV,1 attached to Karita HCIV <p>There are other 12 motorcycle attached to different HCs. There is Asset register for land and buildings</p> <p>Medical Equipment; Vote code: 008 was seen at DHO's office and listed a number of equipment like gas Cylinders</p> <p>Each item had its own page in the general register.</p>	1
----	--	--	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived DDP III and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of a chain link fence in Karita Health Centre IV. - Renovation of Staff houses at Lokales Health Centre II <p>All the projects were appraised on 4th April 2022 by the Senior Planner, Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>		
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field appraisal Construction of a chain link fence in Karita Health Centre IV. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 7th April 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, SCDO and PAS. - Field appraisal Renovation of Staff houses at Lokales Health Centre II . Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 7th April 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, SCDO and PAS. 	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of screening for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures for health facility investments</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 to show that the LG health department did submit timely by April 30th as they did so on 26th August, 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>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG health department submitted procurement request form PP1 to PDU by 1st quarter of the Current FY. The forms were submitted on 11th July,2023 and they were for;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of placenta pit and drainage system at Ugx 27,486,000/= 2. Completion of fence at Karita HCIV at Ugx 81,176,000/= 3. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Loroo HCIII at Ugx 35,000,000/= 	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 to show that the health investments for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement of construction this was done when the committee sat on 5th October, 2022, under minute 100/AMUDCC/55-10/2022-2023 under 4(f).</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 in a letter dated 12th January,2023, by the CAO, Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel, in which the following were named to the PIT team;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opio Martine Ag District Engineer 2. Amutale Newton Yeko Environment officer 3. Dr. Sagaki Patrick DHO 4. Lawot Lam Anthony DEO 5. Otoko Tonny Water officer. <p>The team was not properly constituted as it lacked the CDO and Labour officer, as is required.</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 no facility upgrade implemented in the LG during the year for which the assessment was done that is FY 2022/2023</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records since no infrastructure upgrade was implemented during the year for assessment FY 2022/23.</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 no upgrade of health facilities undertaken in the LG during the year for assessment FY2022/23.</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 no health upgrade project implemented in the district in the FY 2022/23.</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, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;</p> <p>- Voucher no 5160612 with dated 27th June 2023 for Ushs 22,099,269; Certificate No 2; dated 31st January 2023; Contract No. AMUD 806/WRKS/2020-2021/0007: Project; Construction of OPD PHASE 1 at Cheptapoyo HCII was certified by DHO, District Environment Officer on 23rd March 2023, district Engineer on 31st January 2023 and DCDO on 31 January 2023, payment was initiated on 31 January 2023 and payments were done on 27th June 2023 which is outside the time frame.</p> <p>- Voucher no 3754030 with dated 27th June 2023 for Ushs 64,263,853; Certificate No 1; dated 31st January 2023; Contract No. AMUD 806/WRKS/2022-2023/00004: Construction of Chain Link Fence at Karita Health Centre IV was certified by the District Environment Officer on 31st January 2023, district Engineer on 31st January 2023 and DCDO and DHO verified the payment on 31st January 2023 the same date when the payment was initiated and payments were made on 27th June 2023 which was outside the timeframe.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG had complete procurement files for each health infrastructure contract with all records required by PPDA law. The files reviewed were.</p> <p>1. Construction of chain link fence at Karita HCIV,</p> <p>Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00004: The file had these documents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed works contract dated 14th November,2022, with Premier contractor and consultancy company limited, 2. contract committee minutes dated 5th October,2022 3. Evaluation report dated 4th October,2022 4. PP1 form, call for bids, bids receipt record, 	1

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 Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of a grievance redress framework with clear records on grievance recording, investigation and reporting that was available at the time of assessment..	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	There was evidence of the Infection Prevention Control Guideline and the National Health Care Waste Management Guideline prepared by the Healthcare Waste Management Working Group and a report on training of health workers on waste management in Amudat prepared on 23rd August, 2022. The training was conducted in the month of August 2022 and the health facilities that benefited included Loroo HCIII, Karita HCIII, Amudat hospital, Abilype HCIII, Achorichor HCII, Alakas HCII, Cheptapoyo HCII and Lokales HCII. And the officers who conducted the training included Sr. Acheng Esther the Assistant District Health Officer (ADHO) Amudat DLG and Chemutai Alfred the DNFP Amudat DLG and a list of health facility staff that were trained was also available who were given copies of the guideline above that were used for the training.	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	The LG had its own functional system for medical waste management such as placenta pits and incinerators particularly for health centre IV, coded waste bins for segregating and categorizing different medical waste in all health units, dug out pits for burning non-wet generated waste.	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of a report on training of health workers on waste management in Amudat that was prepared on 23rd August, 2022 that included the health facilities of Loroo HCIII, Karita HCIII, Amudat hospital, Abilype HCIII, Achorichor HCII, Alakas HCII, Cheptapoyo HCII and Lokales HCII.	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of costed ESMPs for health infrastructure projects in spite of the fact that BoQs were reviewed for the construction of a 3 stance latrine with urinals at Loroo health centre III OPD costed at UGX. 29,702,225 and for the renovation of 2 twin staff houses in Locales health centre II with a total cost of UGX. 47,560,225</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG had proof of land ownership for its health sector projects for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abiliyep health centre, certificate No. MOR-0000088 issued on 17th March, 2021 for Plot 107, Block 5 at Abiliyep 2. Karita health centre, certificate No. MOR-0000090 issued on 17th March, 2021 for Plot 105, Block 5 at Karita 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence at the time of investigation to show if the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no Environment and Social certification forms for health sector projects because no project had been approved and implemented.</p>	0

**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 Amudat DLG in the previous FY was 94%</p>	2
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 Amudat DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 99%</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 47% as for the results viewed in the OPAMs.</p>	0

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 whose safe water coverage was below the District average, which was 55% were:- Drilling of 2 boreholes installed with hand pumps in Loroo S/C, drilling of 2 boreholes in Kongorok S/C, Construction of a piped water system in Achorichor S/C, and a design of a piped water supply system in Abiliyep S/C (All these sub-counties were created from Loroo Sub-County which had a safe water coverage of 48%), drilling of 1 borehole in Katabok S/C, (created from Amudat S/C which had a safe water coverage of 52%), and drilling of 1 borehole in Losidok S/C which was created from Karita S/C with a safe water coverage of 49%.

Hence the total number of water infrastructure implemented in sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average was 8 and the total number of water projects planned and implemented in Amudat DLG was 8.

Therefore, the percentage of the projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was: $8/8 \times 100\% = 100\%$

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 6 boreholes in various Lower Local Government:

Engineer's estimate = UGX 129,000,000

Contract Sum = UGX 125,815,140

Various = UGX 3,184,860

Percentage variance =
 $3,184,860/129,000,000 \times 100\% = 2.5\%$

2). Construction of a piped water supply system Kakalas village in Achorichor sub-county.

Engineers estimate = UGX 184,860,469

Contract price = UGX 182,206,774

Variation = UGX 2,653,695

Percentage variation =
 $2,653,695/184,860,469 \times 100\% = 1.4\%$

3). Design of a piped water supply system in Lokokor RGC in Abiliyep Sub-county

Engineers estimate = UGX 24,729,370

Contract price = UGX 23,942,220

Variation = UGX 787,150

Percentage variance =
 $787,150/24,729,370 \times 100\% = 3.2\%$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.

- o If 100% projects completed: score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1
- o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY as captured on page 3 of the AWP included the following:-

Drilling of 6 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, Construction of a piped water supply system in Achorichor S/C, Design of a piped water supply in Abiliyep S/C. Basing on the sampled facilities all of them were completed and were functioning implying that the percentage of projects completed as per the annual work plan was: $8/8 \times 100\% = 100\%$

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>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 76% and FY 2022/2023 was 99% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage change was $99\% - 76\% = 23\%$</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> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of 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 83% and 94% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage change was $94\% - 83\% = 11\%$</p>	2

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 per the examples below;

1). Drilling of deep borehole in Kogwalap village in Kongorok sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 86546 and completed on 14th April, 2023.

2). Construction of a piped water supply system in Kalalas village in Achorichor sub-county, funded under DWSCG and UGIFT and the water supply system was completed on 28th April, 2023. The production well from which the water was pumped was constructed in 14th March, 2022 with DWD number 88672.

3). Design of a piped water system in Lokokor, funded under UGIFT and the design was approved by the Commissioner Rural water of the Ministry of Water and Environment on the 24th May 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.

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 14th October, 2022, on pages 59 to 66, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 10th January, 2023 on pages 63 to 70; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties in the District.</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 61 to 68.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 10th July, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 61 to 68.</p> <p>Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</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 together with the fourth quarter report on 10th July 2023 for inclusion in the national data base.</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, and the following LLGs were the least performing Achorichor, Amudat T/C, Abiliyep s/c and Kongorok s/c; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for the any of the LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p> <p>Therefore, there was no evidence for justifying any score for this indicator for the LG.</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>There was evidence from the staff list and wage estimates for FY 2022/2023 that 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. The total budget was 60,800,000/=.</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>There was evidence from the staff list and wage estimates for the FY 2022/2023 that the Senior Environment Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: The total budget was 60,800,000/=.</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>There was evidence that the DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY. Ulaa Dennis Assistant Engineering Officer Water and Otako Tony Water Officer were appraised by the Principal Assistant Secretary on 16th September 2023 and 30th June 2023 respectively..</p>	3
---	--	--	---	---

7

Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO had identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisals for the District Water Office staff as seen in the DLG Capacity Building Plan for the FY 2022/2023. One of the capacity needs that was reflected in the DLG capacity building plan was inadequate skills in water quality test and analysis and the activity that was tagged to it was training in water quality testing and analysis

3

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO allocated over 70% 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 55%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Loroo S/C with safe water coverage of 48% was allocated drilling of 1 boreholes and Rehabilitation of 2 boreholes, Achorichor S/C with safe water coverage of 49% was allocated construction of a piped water supply system, Abiliyep S/C with safe water coverage of 47% was allocated rehabilitation of 2 borehole, Kongorok S/C with safe water coverage of 48% was allocated drilling of 2 boreholes and Katabok S/C with a safe water coverage of 52% was allocated drilling of 1 production well, rehabilitation of 1 borehole and design of one piped water supply system.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 420,685,030.

The total annual budget for Amudat DWO for the current FY was UGX 565,131,016.

Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =
 $420,685,030/565,131,016 * 100\% = 74.4\%$

1

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO communicated to the LLG their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY.</p>	3
			<p>The DWO presented the correspondence file in which communications to Lower Local Governments were contained.</p>	
			<p>In this file there was a letter dated 30th September 2022 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Loroo with safe water coverage of 48%, Achorichor sub-county with a coverage of 49%, Karita sub-county with a coverage of 49%, Kongorok with a coverage of 48%.</p>	
			<p>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.</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DWO monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly.</p>	4
			<p>The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 14th October, 2022, it was noted that 201 water facilities were monitored.</p>	
			<p>In the second quarter as per the progress report dated 10th January, 2023, a total of 204 water sources were monitored during this quarter.</p>	
			<p>Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 20th April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 198.</p>	
			<p>In quarter 4 as per the report dated 10th July, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 216.</p>	
			<p>On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $201 + 204 + 198 + 216 = 819/4 = 205$.</p>	
			<p>Amudat DLG had a total of 216 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.</p>	
			<p>The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $205/216 * 100\% = 95\%$</p>	

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented 2 sets of DWSCC meeting minutes to be reviewed by the assessor.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>For quarter 1 the meeting was held on 25th August, 2022 and issues of importance were discussed under minute Min.03.Brief from the DWO. The DWO emphasized on the issues of low safe water coverage against the high population this was recommended to be an item in the work plan and budget to have one of the high yielding borehole motorized hence the construction of a piped water supply system in Achorichor sub-county.</p>	
			<p>In quarter 2 the meeting was held on 14th December, 2022, issues of concerned were discussed under minute Min.04 Brief from the DWO. The key issue discussed here was safe water coverage, latrine coverage, functionality of water sources and functionality of WSCs, which ended up in the current work plan, under activity rehabilitation of boreholes captured on page 3 of the AWP 2023/2024.</p>	
			<p>Since the DWO presented only two sets of meeting minutes during the time of assessment, it was concluded that the DWSCC meetings were not conducted quarterly</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 55% as per the letter dated 30th September, 2022 which was found in the file not noticeboard.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Some of the allocations are as follows;</p> <p>Loroo with safe water coverage of 48% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 2 boreholes, Achorichor sub-county with a coverage of 46% was allocated construction of a piped water supply system, Karita sub-county with a coverage of 49% was allocated rehabilitation of 3 boreholes, drilling of one borehole and design of a piped water system, Kongorok with a coverage of 48% was allocated construction of a piped water supply system.</p>	

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 Amudat DLG water sector was UGX 61,716,870. The DWO allocated UGX 21,180,870 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $21,180,870/61,716,870*100\% = 34.3\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO did not follow the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	0
----	---	--	--	----------

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 3rd January, 2023. The training period spanned from 12th December, 2022 up to 20th December, 2022, the topics handled included safe water chain, O&M, roles and responsibilities and book keeping among others.</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:</p> <p>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 seen on page 3 and 5. On page 3 of the asset register for instance there was a borehole DWD 86550 in Chepkukui village of Kongorok Sub-County and on page 5 there was a borehole DWD 86547 in Chuwat village of Losidok Sub-County</p>	4
----	--	--	---	----------

11

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.

Evidence provided at the time of assessment indicated that LG conducted desk 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 desk appraisal for water projects on 22nd August 2022.

The projects were derived from LG DP III, page- 172.

1. Sitting and Drilling borehole in Ablemong.
2. Sitting and Drilling borehole in Losidok.
3. Construction of Production well in Katabok.
4. Sitting and Drilling borehole in Kolewlewi.
5. Sitting and Drilling borehole in Likibworekori.

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 Lowunyakur village in Karita S/C, the application date was 2nd March 2021, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 22nd May, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LC I Mr. Longurapel Nanywakan.

2). Application from Tombolongole village in Kongorok S/C, the application was dated 21st January, 2022, and was endorsed by the LCI Mr. Lochonga.

The DWO cleared it for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on the 22nd May, 2023.

3) Application from Abilemong village in Loroo S/C, this application was dated 1st February, 2022, endorsed by the LCI Mr. Loyesengo Musa. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 22nd 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>There was evidence that field-based appraisals were conducted for WSS projects to determine whether they are technically feasible, environmentally, and socially acceptable and the designs have been customized in case of any technical issues</p> <p>Field appraisals were conducted between 24th August 2022 and reports were signed off by District planner, District engineer, District Water Officer, DCDO and Environment Officer.</p> <p>The following projects were sampled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sitting and drilling borehole in Ablemong. - Sitting and drilling borehole in Losidok. - Construction of Production well in Katabok . - Sitting and drilling borehole in Kolewlewi. - Sitting and drilling borehole in Likibworekori. 	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 sector projects for the current FY were not screened for environmental and social risks/impacts inspite of the fact that they were approved and budgeted for in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were the water projects that should have been screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drilling & installation of 5 boreholes; Drilling, test pumping and Water Quality Testing of one production well at Karita Sub-county at a cost of UGX. 147,500,000 2. Construction of Achorichor piped water supply system- Phase 2 at Achorichor County at a cost of UGX. 219,685,000 3. Construction of Achorichor piped water supply system- Phase 2 at Achorichor County at a cost of UGX. 54,274,000 	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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 consolidated LG approved procurement plan, that was endorsed on 1st September,2022 by CAO, Tumusiime Leonard. These were construction of Achorochor piped water system phase two, sitting and drilling supervision of six boreholes and drilling and installation of 6 deep wells 5 number.</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>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 was approved by the contracts committee before commencement this was done by the committee when they sat on 24th January,2023 in Min120/AMUDCC/24-01/2022-2023 4(ii).</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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The LG did not properly establish the PIT in a letter dated 12th January,2023, by the CAO, Oyuku Ocen Emmanuel, where the following were named to the PIT team;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opio Martine -Ag District Engineer 2. Amutale Newton Yeko- Environment officer 3. Dr. Sagaki Patrick- DHO 4. Lawot Lam Anthony -DEO 5. Otoko Tonny -Water officer. <p>The team lacked the CDO and the labour officer as specified in the sector guidelines.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>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 Kogwalap village of Kongorok S/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm as prescribed on the designs.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision on WSS infrastructure projects as observed from the report dated 28th March, 2023 signed by the District Water officer.</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>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p>	<p>The evidence provided shows that DWO verified the work. However, the payments to the contractors were not within the stipulated time.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no.4737916 dated 5th April 2023 for Ushs 35,145,660 with certificate no. 1 Dated 29th March 2023; contract no. AMUD806/Srvcs/2022-2023/00009; Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes under the water sector by Front Wave Technocrats Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 29th May 2023, payment were initiated on the same date and payments were made on 5th April 2023 which was within 30 days. 2. Voucher no.4276561 dated 16th March 2023 for Ushs 55,073,016 with certificate no. 1 Dated 16th December 2022; contract no. AMUD806/Wrks/2022-2023/00001; Construction of Achorichor Solar Powered piped water supply system by Real Irrigation Engineering Company Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 16th December 2022, payment was initiated on the same date and payments were made on 16th March 2023 which was not within 30 days. 	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p>	<p>There was evidence that complete procurement files for water infrastructure investments were in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA law. File reviewed were;</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Project 1 Construction of achorichor solar powered piped water supply phase 1 Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00001: The file had the following documents.</p>	

1. signed works contract dated 14th November,2022 with Real Irrigation and Engineering Company limited
2. Contracts committee minutes which sat on 5th October,2022 were the contract was awarded in minute 100/AmudCC/5-10/2022-2023 4(a)
3. Evaluation report dated 9th August,2022
4. PP1 forms, call for bids and receipt records, supervision reports among the documents on file.

Project 2

Drilling and Installation of six deep wells

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00002: The file had the following documents.

1. signed works contract dated 14th November,2022 with Mama Bore wells Africa limited
2. Contracts committee minutes with sat on 5thOctober,2022 in which the contract was awarded in minute 100/AmudCC/5-10/2022-2023 4(a)
3. Evaluation report dated 9th August,2022
4. PP1 forms, call for bids and receipt records, supervision reports among the documents on file.

Project 3

Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes

Procurement ref: AMUD806/wrks/2022-2023/00009: The file had the following documents.

1. signed works contract dated 14th February,2023 with Front Wave Technocrats limited.
2. Contracts committee minutes with sat on 24th December,2023 were the contract was awarded in minute 120/AmudCC/24-01/2022-2023 4(ii)
3. Evaluation report dated 26th Januaary,2023
4. PP1 forms, call for bids and receipt records, supervision reports among the documents on file.

Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence availed on the mechanism of grievance handling at the time of assessment for addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	0
14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence on dissemination of guidelines on Water source & catchment protection and Natural resource management to CDOs.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	There was evidence that water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented and integrated in the annual work plan 2022/3 under the budget line development worksheet	3
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	There was evidence of consent forms for voluntary land contribution for the respective boreholes that were implemented for example, 3. Consent form prepared on 22nd April, 2021 from the land owners Nokwans Kunnu and Loloka Natriku of Kongwalap village in Loro subcounty 4. Consent form prepared on 14th April, 2021 for the land owners Dan Kipel and Lokedi Lometro of Loroovillage	3
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	E & S certification forms were not on file.	0

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

The Environment officer and CDO participated in the monitoring of water projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided reports for example,

1. Borehole rehabilitation report prepared on 28th March, 2023

2. Ssupervision report for the construction of six boreholes in Amudat prepared on 15th October, 2022

**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 Agricultural Officer provided evidence for the three acres that were under irrigation at the end of the fiscal year 2022/23. These three acres consisted of two Ugift irrigation demonstration sites, with each site covering 1.5 acres, one located in Amudat sub-county and the other in Losidok Sub-County.</p> <p>He also mentioned that other non-beneficiaries' land under irrigation includes 10 acres under MAAIF and 12 acres managed by development partners (NGOs such as MERCORP, FOOD For the Hungry, ZOA, and Welt Hunger) but no report was presented documenting the 10 and 12 acres.</p> <p>Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) were submitted for the two UgifIT demonstration sites established in two sub-counties. The Kopulwo farmers' group in Losidok Parish signed the MOU on July 3rd, 2023, while Lomuget James, a farmer in Nabokotom village, signed the MOU on May 21st, 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>This district LG had Zero (0) acreage in FY 2021/2022</p> <p>LG had installed two (2) Ugift Demo sites as the total irrigated land in the FY 2022/2023</p> <p>Increase in acreage.</p> <p>= (3.0-0)/3.0 (100) = 100%</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>Microscale irrigation was not yet started in the previous financial year.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG adhered to the latest Grant guidelines, version 3 from April 2023. It was evident that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant was utilized for eligible activities.</p> <p>The district micro-irrigation program workplan and budget for the financial year 2022/23, totaling Ugx 176,895,084, was approved.</p> <p>The Budget performance report provided a breakdown of the eligible activities conducted. These activities included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UGX. 46,374,360: Spent on the supply and installation of solar systems for micro-scale irrigation at the two demonstration sites. 2. Farmer awareness creation: Costed UGX 70,758,084 (40% of the total budget). 3. Farmer exchange visit to Nwoya: Costed at UGX 16,838,034. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that was provided and the CFO noted that the LG is still in the implementation stage of micro-scale irrigation.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	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 not within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates.	0
	Maximum score 6		The supplier quote (Bill of Quantities) submitted by the contractor, Cornerstone Infrastructures Ltd, under Procurement Reference No: Amud806/Supls/2022-2023/00012, totalled to Ugx. 46,374,360 for the two demonstration sites.	
			At the time of the Assessment, AO estimated cost was not provided, making it impossible to calculate the percentage. Agricultural Officer Simyu did not provide the SAE cost figure, which prevented the computation of the percentage.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	Micro-scale irrigation equipment contracts were signed during the previous FY and installed, though not completed within the previous FY.	1
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Acceptance of award by the contractor procurement ref. no. Amud806/Supls/2022/2023-00012 dated 12th June 2023.	
			Letter of bid acceptance written by DLG to contractor (cornerstone) with procurement ref. no. Amud806/Supls/2022/2023-00012 dated 8th June 2023.	
			The supplier quote (Bill of Quantities) submitted by the contractor, Cornerstone Infrastructures Ltd, under Procurement Reference No: Amud806/Supls/2022-2023/00012, totalled to Ugx. 46,374,360 for the two demonstration sites.	

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	<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 	The LG had recruited 9 (75%) extension officers out the required 12 LLG extension workers at the time of assessment.	1
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	<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>Irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs met the standards as defined by MAAIF. For instance;</p> <p>Site acreages were measured, and it was in line with MAAF standards i.e in Losidok Parish (1.5 acres) and at Nabokotom (1.5 acres)</p> <p>Also, the installed systems were drip, sprinkler, drag hose, and rain gun both solar and generator powered, which is in line with MAAIF standards with the following specifications.</p> <p>Drip irrigation demo.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main Delivery line Dia = 50mm HDPE pipe 2. Drip lines Dia = 16mm black tubing 3. Drip line Wall thickness = 0.9mm 4. Emitter spacing = 30cm <p>Drag hose irrigation installed had a hose pipe of Dia = 0.75in, length of 25M, adjustable garden Nozzles and 4 hydrant assembly.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the sites featured reservoir tanks that were elevated less than 3 meters above the ground. This elevation failed to produce sufficient pressure for gravity irrigation, resulting in a low flow rate.</p>	2

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, systems were tested and found not working.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the site in Losidok was completely non-functional. Daniel reported that due to heavy runoff, all the drip lines were swept away and buried in the ground.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	----------

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence found on the notice LG noticeboard as well as on the LLG noticeboard showing the payroll of the extension workers.</p> <p>Stafflist was also pinned on the noticeboard.</p> <p>In the three sampled Lower Local Governments (LLG), namely Amudat TC, Karita S/C, and Losidok S/C, it was evident that the two recruited extension workers per subcounty were consistently recording their activities in the daily register.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	----------

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence to confirm the accuracy of the information regarding the installed and functioning micro-scale irrigation system.</p> <p>The DLG (District Local Government) had not Kept an inventory of the installed equipment for the two demonstration sites.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	----------

6

Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

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, the quarterly progress reports were compiled by Agric Officer and endorsed by the CAO dated 11th September 2023 (Quarter 4).

In addition, the Q4 report indicated that out of the 205 expression of interest (EOI) target, 77 farmers had expressed interest in the 11 LLG (Sub counties) by end of June.

2

6

Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0

There was an up to-date LLG information entry about the MIS. Report was submitted indicating that IRRITRACK was accessed.

Similarly, AO logged into Irri Track application and reports from the MIS file were retrieved. According to the MIS data, there were 134 attendees for the awareness session, and 47 individuals expressed their interest (EOI).

1

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that quarterly reports were prepared using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. Quarter 4 progressive report submitted by AO –and signed by the CAO on 11th September 2023 was presented with graph Data generated from the MIS dashboard. For example, on Page 09 showed a EOI summary report generated from MIS 17th August 2023. Quarter 3 progressive report by 3rd June 2023 and acknowledged by the CAO on 6th June 2023 showed certificate of Agricultural Officers who had completed the six modules.	1
	Maximum score 6			
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	No evidence presented showing a developed and approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs.	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	No evidence was presented on Implementing 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	There was evidence from the wage estimates for the FY 2022/2023 and staff list that the DLG budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The total budget was Ugx 692,193,000/=.	1
Maximum score 6				
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	From the staff list and the monthly attendance analysis reports, the LG had deployed 16 extension workers at the time of assessment. Some of the extension workers were;	1
Maximum score 6			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agricultural Officers: Musau Emmanuel, Siminyu Daniel, Sogot Brian, and Lomwal shadrack 2. Veterinary Officers: Esoku Daniel and Ssenyonjo Ronald 3. Assistant Animal Officer: Montos Stephen, Adoch Caroline, and Toto Esther 	
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed as per the staff list, monthly staff daily attendance analysis reports. These included;	2
Maximum score 6			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agricultural Officers: Musau Emmanuel, Siminyu Daniel, Sogot Brian, and Lomwal shadrack 2. Veterinary Officers: Esoku Daniel and Ssenyonjo Ronald 3. Assistant Animal Officer: Montos Stephen, Adoch Caroline, and Toto Esther 	

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	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 is no evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board.	0
Maximum score 6				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	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	There was no evidence that the District Production Coordinator conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and had submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY.	0
Maximum score 4				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that corrective actions were taken for some of the extension workers that were appraised the appraisals sampled were for Kimanai Robert- DPO, Apoo Gloria Bua- PE, Lodongokol Simon Peter- PAO, Marimoi Joseph- SAO. However the the DLG presented less than 10 appraisals of extension workers.	0
Maximum score 4				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There were training activities planned for extension workers at District Level as seen in the DLG training plan. It was evident that training was conducted such as training attendance lists and reports. Simiyu Daniel completed module 4 on 22nd December 202 and Brian Soget completed module 1 on 5th June 2023 and others.	1
Maximum score 4			There was evidence from the Capacity building training Plan and training report that the extension workers had training in Communication skills, Performance Management, Conflict and Stress management, Pre-retirement, and attitude change.	

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment evidence that training activities were documented in the training database in Irri Track and MIS data was captured. For example. Completion certificate of the 6 modules.</p>	1
---	---	---	--	----------

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services</p> <p>The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 176,895,084 of which UGX 132,671,313 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 44,223,771 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services</p>	2
---	---	---	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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.25,534,630</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.70,758,084</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.53,063,525</p> <p>15% farmer visits was Uhs26,534,263</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 co-funding 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>Not applicable since the LG were still under implementation stage one.</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>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented that the LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding e.g.,</p>	2
			<p>Signed Attendance Lists: Official attendance records were maintained for the awareness meetings held at Amudat Sub- County for example, the Attendance list for MSI sensitization in Amudat Town Council on 8th May 2023</p>	
			<p>Awareness creation meeting report for sub-county level on Ugift program acknowledged by DPMO on 31st January 2023.</p>	
			<p>Utilization of Ugift Banners and Teardrops: These visual aids were employed during awareness meetings to enhance the visibility and understanding of the Ugift Micro irrigation program.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p>	<p>Amudat DLG is in her first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of farmer field schools.</p>	0
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70-89% monitored score 1 		
		<p>Less than 70% score 0</p>		
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>Amudat DLG is in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects. The DLG completed awareness raising and is continuing with farm visits to farmers who have completed EOI application.</p>	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	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	There was evidence presented that LG had provided hands- on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines. For instance. - A report compiled by AO- on Beneficially hands on training submitted to DPMO and acknowledged by the DPMO on 27th June 2023. - A benchmarking visit / exchange visit report that was done to Nwoya DLG acknowledged by the DPMO on 16, May 2023. The purpose was to learn from phase one district on how they implemented their Microscale irrigation projects.	2
	Maximum score 8			
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Amudat DLG is in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.	0
	Maximum score 8			
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	The LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines for example, Q1 and Q2 2 report dated (15th April 2023) showed pictures of A.O- during LLG training in Karita TC, LCII C/P giving opening remarks during LLG training in Losidok sub-country. Awareness creation meeting report for sub- county level on Ugift program acknowledged by DPMO on 31st January 2023.	2
	Maximum score 4			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented about training of staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels, as no reports on awareness raising were seen during assessment.	0
----	---	---	---	----------

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY.	0
----	--	---	---	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	There was an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment. At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file, and were verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database and confirmed to be part of the data base	2
----	--	---	---	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	There is no documentation indicating an agreement to proceed with the quotation form. These forms will only be created after submission to the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC), provided that a farmer has paid the commitment fee of UGX 1,000,000, which has not been done yet.	0
----	--	---	--	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	Evidence was presented on keeping an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment. 1. At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file and verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database.	2
----	--	--	--	----------

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the microscale irrigation systems were incorporated into the consolidated approved LG procurement plan that was dated 29th August, 2023 signed by CAO, Oyuk Ocen Emmanuel.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MIS program had not started being implemented in the district at the time of the year under review FY 2022/2023</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MIS program had not started being implemented in the district at the time of the year under-review FY 2022/2023</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MIS program had not started being implemented in the district at the time of the year under review FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MIS program had not started being implemented in the district at the time of the year under review FY 2022/2023.</p>	0

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 no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App), or the approved workplan by MAAIF.	0
	Maximum score 18		This is because the DLG is in its first year of implementation, and for Ugift demonstrations, the DLG receives approved designs from MAAIF that they customize to fit site conditions.	
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	There was evidence that the LG conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers.	2
	Maximum score 18		Evidence / pictures of installation of the Demo schemes were found in the Q4 report endorsed by the CAO dated 11th September 2023 .	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that LG oversaw the irrigation equipment supplier during testing the functionality of the installed equipment- was presented.	0
	Maximum score 18		LG did not present supervision and monitoring report, no technical supervision report was presented.	
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	The handover had not been done yet since the contractor had not handed over the demo sites. The incomplete work included fixing the damaged drip lines, unclogging the main supply pipe and repair of the solar pump for Nabokotom site.	0
	Maximum score 18			

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	Not applicable since the LG were still under implementation stage one.	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There were no files to review since the MIS project had not started being implemented.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	There was no proof displayed on the notice board indicating that the LG had prominently showcased information about the nature of grievances and the available avenues to address them in various public areas.	0
	Maximum score 6		During the assessment, a letter was provided that outlined the appointment of various officers as members of the grievance committee.	

The DPMO and AO mentioned that they had not previously encountered or addressed grievances related to micro-scale irrigation since they had recently commenced their involvement in the program.

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of display of the details on the nature and avenues to address grievances at the sector department.	0
	Maximum score 6			

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> <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 	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of display of the details on the nature and avenues to address grievances at the sector department.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <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 	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of display of the details on the nature and avenues to address grievances at the sector department.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of display of the details on the nature and avenues to address grievances at the sector department.</p>	0

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Evidence was presented on the dissemination of Micro-irrigation guidelines for proper sitting, land access and safe disposal of chemical waste containers. For example, The report on the awareness raising and registration of interested farmers, by AO Daniel, and dated 08th May 2023, at the subcounty level, provided data regarding attendees from the six sub-counties. The DLG refers to the most recent grant guideline, specifically Version 3 April 2023. The LG established MOUs / Agreement with the host farmers for the demos.	2
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for micro-scale irrigation projects and the respective ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment for example, 1. Screening was done for the construction of Nabokotom micro scale irrigation demonstration site with the respective ESMP prepared on 17th May, 2023 at UGX. 2,099,000 2. Screening was done for the construction of Kaingenoi micro scale irrigation on demonstration site with the respective ESMP prepared on 17th May, 2023 at UGX. 2,099,000	1

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of a monitoring reports for the construction of micro-scale irrigation sites that were for example, 1. UGIFT micro scale irrigation status report prepared on 22nd May, 2023 2. Monitoring report for the construction of micro-scale irrigation sites at Nabokotom and Kaingenoi prepared on 17th May, 2023	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	The environment Officer completed and signed on the payment certificate No. 1 issued on 16th June, 2023 for the supply and installation of solar systems at 3 selected demonstration sites for micro-scale irrigation system	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	The CDO completed and signed on the payment certificate No. 1 issued on 16th June, 2023 for the supply and installation of solar systems at 3 selected demonstration sites for micro-scale irrigation system	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	Welikhe David Ambrose was substantively appointed as Chief Finance Officer on 18th February 2021 under DSC Min. 4/ADSC/2021.	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.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Ojakol Jesca Margaret was substantively appointed as District Planner on 24th May 2021 under DSC Min. 65/ADSC/2021.	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.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The District Engineer position was neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff from Ministry of Works.	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	Deborah Ariong was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 17th March 2017 under DSC Min. 187/ADSC/2017.	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	Kimanai Robert Bwayo was substantively appointed as District Production Officer on 16 March 2017 under DSC Min. 168/ADSC/2017.	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	Longok Michael was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer on 29 August 2023 under DSC Min. 7(2)/ADSC/07/2023.	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	Sammy Nelson was substantively appointed as District Commercial Officer on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min. 38/ADSC/2021.	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.	Bogosi Losira was substantively appointed as Senior Procurement Officer on 3rd May 2019 under DSC Min. 6/ADSC/2019.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Lochoro Mark was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer on 17th May 2018 under DSC Min. 8/ADSC/2018.	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	Meheret Grace was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer on 31st March 2016 under DSC Min. 28/ADSC/2016.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Deborah Ariong was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 17th March 2017 under DSC Min. 187/ADSC/2017.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Olupot Godfey was substatively appointed as Senior Land Management Officer on 17th May 2017 under DSC Min. 13/ADSC/2018.	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	Kolemuk Stellah Cherop was substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 13th January 2012 under DSC Min. 5/5/NDSC/2012.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor nor was there a secondment from the Office of the Auditor General	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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The LG had not substantively appointment a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS,	0

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG has substantively appointed 4 out 9 Senior Assistant Secretaries. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kolemuk Stellah Cherop was appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary on 3rd May 2019 under DSC Min. 5/ADSC/2019. 2. Koryang Moses was appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary on 15th August 2008 under DSC Min. 53(b)/i//NDSC/2019. He was absorbed from Nakapiripirit when Amudat became a district. 3. Pkopus Dominic Kasinoi was appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min. 57/ADSC/2021. 4. For the 2 Town Clerks there was no evidence of substantive appointments. The roles are being filed on assignment of Duties by Koryang Moses and Pkopus Dominic Kasinoi 	0
---	---	---	---	---

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had substantively recruited 5 out 9 Community Development Officers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lotuw Pembee was appointed as Senior Community Development Officer on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min. 43/ADSC/2021. 2. Ruto Emmanuel was appointed as Community Development Officer on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min. 45/ADSC/2021. 3. Chuwai C. Suzan was appointed as Community Development Officer on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min. 44/ADSC/2021. 4. Lodin David was appointed as Community Development Officer on 17 March 2017 under DSC Min. 185/2016/ADSC/2021. 5. Christine Korobe was appointed as Community Development Officer on 15 August 2008 under DSC Min. 43/NDSC/2021. Was absorbed from Nakapiripirit when Amudat became a district. 	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

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

The LG had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants to all the 9 LLGs as follows;

1. Inyelle Jane Rose was appointed as Accounts Assistant on 17 May 2018 under DSC Min. 11/ADSC/2018.
2. Ichumar Mark was appointed as Town Treasurer on 31 March 2016 under DSC Min. 19/ADSC/2016.
3. Abdul Arem Shaban was appointed as Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min. 4 (c)/ADSC/09/2023.
4. Kasaja Justus was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.
5. Lomotor Zachary was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.
6. Loese Denis was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.
7. Among Florence was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.
8. Akasile L. Joseph was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 10 October 2023 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.
9. Lotai Fredrick was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 4 August 2011 under DSC Min.4 (b)/ADSC/09/2023.

Environment and Social Requirements

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0

The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for Natural Resources as per the computations below;

Funds released by MoFPED to the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 727,376,638 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13). Funds realised by the LG to the department was UGX 727,376,638

Percentage release; (UGX 727,376,638/727,376,638)*100=100%

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 100% for community based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	Amount received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 71,104,202 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13). Amount released was UGX 71,104,202	
		score 2 or else 0.	(UGX 71,104,202/UGX 71,104,202)*100=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,	While screening forms for the construction of Karita Seed Secondary School were availed at the time of assessment, the forms did not have the dates when screening was done.	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	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),	The projects that were implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are 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.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	There was no evidence that the LG did a costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using DDEG.	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	The audit opinion for the LG for FY 2022/2023 was unqualified.	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		

6	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).	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),	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 07th December 2022. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.		

7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 22nd June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		

8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year maximum score 4 or else 0	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year, score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 30th July 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.	4
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year Maximum score is 4	If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year, score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below; Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 13rd February 2023 Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 20th February 2023 Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 21st April 2023 Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 30th July 2023 From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.	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	The LG had no substantively appointed District Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoES at the time of assessment.	0
<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 approved and customized staff structure for Amudat LG provides for 2 Inspector of schools. They were substantively appointed as follows; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Benton Luke Logiel was appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 4 August 2011 under DSC Minute No. 31/NDSC/5/2011. 2. Mr. Ling'aa Emmanuel was appointed as Inspector of Schools on 18 April 2017 under DSC Minute No. 189/NDSC/5/2017. 	40
<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. 	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all education sector projects that is the construction of Katabok and Achorichor pit latrines on 24th October, 2022	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 are 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	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

**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.	Sagaki Patrick was substantively appointed as District Health Officer on 10th October 2023 under DSC Min No. 9/ADSC/09/2023.	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>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	This position was neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff from MoH at the time of assessment.	0
1	New Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Eliu Simon was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, on 5th January 2023 under DSC Min No. 92/ADSC/2022.	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.	There was neither a substantive appointment for the role of Principal Health Inspector nor a seconded staff from MoH at the time of assessment.	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.	There was neither a substantive appointment for the role of Senior Health Educator nor a seconded staff from MoH at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	There was neither a substantive appointment for the role of Biostatistician nor a seconded staff from MoH at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Cherotich Amusa was substantively appointed as District Cold Chain Technician on 1st June 2021 under DSC Min No. 26/ADSC/2021.	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The position is vacant. There was no evidence of appointment for Medical Officer of Health Services.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The position is not on the approved and costed staff establishment for the LG since they do not have a District Hospital.	20

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>	<p>There was evidence that Ms Achipa Rebecca was appointed as Health Educator on 27 March 2004 under DSC Min No. 61/NDSC/2003. She was absorbed from Nakapiripiriti when Amudat became a district.</p>	20
---	--	---	--	-----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence of screening from the health sector of projects for the current FY in spite of the fact that a profile project list for 2023/4 was available and had been approved.</p>	0
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>From the 2023/4 projects profile list that was availed from the planning unit, the projects that were approved in the health sector for the current FY do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, as projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures and minimal level of impacts hence only require screening plus 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	<p>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</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The position of Senior Agricultural Engineer was neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment. The justification was that there is no wage and there is a current ban on recruitment by MoPS.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>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.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for micro-scale irrigation projects and the respective ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment for example,</p> <p>1. Screening was done for the construction of Nabokotom micro scale irrigation demonstration site with the respective ESMP prepared on 17th May, 2023 at UGX. 2,099,000</p> <p>2. Screening was done for the construction of Kaingenoi micro scale irrigation on demonstration site with the respective ESMP prepared on 17th May, 2023 at UGX. 2,099,000</p>	30

**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.	Otako Tony was substantively appointed as Water Officer on 4th March 2016 under DSC Min No. 22/ADSC/2016.	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.	Chepundon Mary was substantively appointed as Assistant Water Officer for mobilization on 10th October 2023 under DSC in No. 09/ADSC/09/2023.	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.	The position of Borehole maintenance Technician was neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff from MoWE at the time of assessment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The position of natural Resources Officer was neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff from MoWE at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Amutale Yeko Newton was substantively appointed as Environment Officer on 18th April 2017 under DSC in No. 190/ADSC/2017.	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 neither substantively filled nor was there a seconded staff by MoPS 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.	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following water sector; 1. construction of Chepkukim borehole on 22nd August, 2022 2. drilling of a borehole at Loro seed secondary school on 22nd August, 2022 3. construction of a bore hole at Chuwat on 22nd 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.	The water sector projects reviewed in the project list from the planning unit for the current FY did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, as projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures and minimal level of impacts hence only require screening plus 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.	Abstraction permits were not availed at the time of assessment.	0