



LGMSD 2022/23

Gulu city

(Vote Code: 853)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 79% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 68% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 64% |
| Health Performance Measures | 58% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 0% |

**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 following infrastructure projects implemented using USMID funding were functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation works of 4.834km at a cost of Ushs 25,040,842,098 (ABPR page 61 and AWP page 12) on the roads below was done; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alur road (0.893km) - Okello Oken road (0.844km) - Queen Elizabeth road (0.722km) - Eden road (1.429km) - Samuel Doe road (0.946km) <p>The projects above were completed as per plan and functional and utilized for the purpose.</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>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment average score in FY 2021/2022 increased from 93% to 99% in FY2022/2023.</p> <p>Therefore, the average score increased by 6%</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>There was evidence that the USMID funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed. The City Council had planned to implement 2 projects under Administration sector which were completed 100% as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY 2022/2023 as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation works of 4.834km at a cost of Ushs 25,040,842,098 (ABPR page 61) on the roads indicated below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alur road (0.893km), Okello Oken Road (0.844km), Queen Elizabeth Road (0.722km), Eden Road (1.429km) and Samuel Doe road (0.946km) <p>The above planned projects were 100% completed by end of FY 2022/2023.</p> | 3 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City Council budgeted for Ushs 25,040,842,098 and spent Ushs 25,040,842,098 of the USMID for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the USMID grant, budget and implementation guideline as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation works of 4.834km at a cost of Ushs 25,040,842,098 (ABPR page 61) on the roads below was done; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alur road (0.893km), Okello Oken road (0.844km), Queen Elizabeth Road (0.722km), Eden Road (1.429km) and Samuel Doe Road (0.946km) <p>The City Council spend the entire budgeted USMID grant of Ushs 25,040,842,098 on eligible projects.</p> | 2 |

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 one project under USMID and no DDEG funded projects were included in the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the Deputy Town Clerk dated 21st July 2023.

The contract price variation for sampled USMID projects in the approved consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the Deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, were within +/-20% of the Engineer's estimates. For instance;

- For roads rehabilitation (USMID-AF) - Upgrading to class II standard paved roads with asphaltic concrete wearing course surface in Gulu City of Alur Road (0.893km), Okello Okeno Road (0.844km), Queen Elizabeth Road (0.722km), Eden Road (1.429km), Samuel Doe Road(0.946km). Total 4.834km, at a contract price of UGX 25,040,842,098 against the engineer's estimate of UGX 30,723,687,329 giving the price variation of +18.5%.

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

A review of staff list obtained from the Principal Human Resource Officer collaborated with the staff list found at the 2 sampled Divisions of Bardege Layibi and Laroo Pece Division. For instance;

At Bardege Layibi Division;

1. Oloya Gilbert- Ag. Division Town Clerk
2. Alanyo Grace-Office Attendant
3. Alanyo Jennifer-Human Resource Officer
4. Apiyo Irene Oyat-Stenographer Ag. Principal Town Agent
5. Labalpiny Francis-Senior Accounts Assistant
6. Ms. Monday Ruth Buckley-Senior Community Development Officer
7. Ogwang Patrick-Environmental Health Officer
8. Ojara Samuel Baker-Principal Town Agent
9. Ojok Peter-Asst. Enforcement Officer
10. Okumu Daniel-Health Assistant Ag. Senior Assistant Town Clerk.

At Laroo Pece Division

1. Opio A. Vincent- Deputy Division Town Clerk
2. Okongo Denis-Senior Assistant Town Clerk
3. Akwero Jane- Senior Human Resources Officer
4. Okello Benard- Driver
5. Akello Proscovia- Porter/Market Cleaner
6. Ayo Winnie-Principal Town Agent
7. Kidega Opio Richard-Principal Town Agent
8. Opiyo Cosmas- Principal Town Agent
9. Komakech W. Kelly -Principal Town Agent
10. Nyeko Ronald Bosco- Principal Town Agent

Therefore, the information on filled staff positions was accurate

| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the USMID were in place as per reports produced by the City Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation works of 4.834km at a cost of Ushs 25,040,842,098 (ABPR page 61) on the roads below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alur road (0.893km), - Okello Oken road (0.844km), - Queen Elizabeth Road (0.722km), - Eden Road (1.429km) and - Samuel Doe road (0.946km) <p>The above projects were 100% completed and in place as was reported the ABPR.</p> | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|---|---------|--|--------------------|----|----|-------------------|----|----|---|
| 5 | <p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p> | <p>The scores obtained from the two Divisions in the District assessment and from the LLG IVA outside the performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the assessment was not credible. The comparative analyzed data was as presented below;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="774 1012 1152 1155"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">DLG IVA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bardege-Layibi Div</td> <td>98</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lano-Pece Div Div</td> <td>99</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | DLG IVA | | Bardege-Layibi Div | 98 | 89 | Lano-Pece Div Div | 99 | 82 | 0 |
| | DLG IVA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bardege-Layibi Div | 98 | 89 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lano-Pece Div Div | 99 | 82 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | <p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence to show that Gulu City Council developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY.</p> | 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 | The Performance Improvement Plan was not implemented 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 | Gulu City Council consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the FY 2024/2025 inclusive of all budget estimates under ref. letter GCC/CR/214/4 dated 27th September 2023, on 29th September, 2023 with a copy to the respective MDAs and MOFPED as required. | 2 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0 | A review of the Staff attendance tracking reports from the Principal Human Resources Office indicated that staff were reporting for duty during the FY 2022/2023 as analyzed below; 1. In the month of April 2023, Ms. Alanyo Jennifer Principal Town Agent from Administration department was at 100% attendance; Ms. Awol Lilly Alice Treasurer from Finance department was at 76% attendance and Mr. Onen Cosmas the Health Inspector from Health department was at 33% attendance. 2. In the month of May 2023, Komakech Kelly the Principal Town Agent from Administration department was at 68%; Mr. Otim Ben Richard Assistant Treasurer from Finance department was at 0% attendance; Ms. Audo Jesca Suzan Health Assistant from Health department was at 34% attendance; 3. In the month of June 2023; Mr. Nyeko Justin the Enforcement Officer from Administration department was at 31.8% attendance; Mr. Odoko Kidim Godfrey Assistant Treasurer from Finance department was at 90%; Mr. Akiiki Samuel Health Assistant from Health Department was at 81% attendance. The analysis of staff attendance indicates there was better performance from administration and finance department compared to the health department | 2 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

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

FY: Score 1 or else 0

A review of personnel files obtained from the Principal Human Resources Office indicated that Gulu City Council had 9 HoDs namely; (City Engineer, City Planner, City Chief Finance Officer, City Commercial Officer; City Health Officer; City Education Officer; City Community Development Officer; City Physical Planner; City Production Officer) as per customized staffing structure. 2 HoDs out of 9 had been substantively appointed for instance the City Engineer and the City Health Officer. Their appraisal files were reviewed as follows;

1. Dr. Okello Daniel the City Health Officer was appraised by Mr. Godfrey B. Kisekka Town Clerk on 30th June 2023

2. Mr. Omara Christo Balmoyi the City Engineer was appraised by Mr. Godfrey B. Kisekka Town Clerk on 30th June 2023

However, the other 3 noted key staff were still at Principal level performing duties of HoDs for instance the Principal Veterinary Officer, Principal Treasurer and the Principal Commercial Officer were all appraised.

1. Mr. Alier Solomon Principal Veterinary Officer was appraised by Mr. Godfrey B. Kisekka Town Clerk on 30th June 2023

2. Mr. Komakech Nixon Atemo the Principal Commercial Officer was appraised by Mr. Isiah Tumwesigye on 30th June 2023

3. Mr. Okot Denis Rurwenger Principal Treasurer was appraised by Mr. Godfrey B. Kisekka on 30th June 2023.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

Gulu City Council had a functional rewards and sanctions committee in place constituting of 6 members who were appointed by the Town Clerk through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 dated 1st February 2021.

The members were as follows;

1. Mr. Irwenyo Richard-Principal Education Officer-Chairperson
2. Mr. Luwar John Charles (Senior Economic Planner)-Member
3. Mr. Okongo Denis-Senior Assistant Town Clerk-Member
4. Ms. Atim Fiona Grace (Inspector of Schools)-Member
5. Ms. Ajok Christine Onono (Agricultural Officer)-Member
6. Mr. Okot Richard (Senior Human Resource Officer)-Secretary

On 3rd March 2023, the committee presented a report on cases committed by two staff Mr. Opiyo Achiro Denis (Education Assistant) and Mr. Tokwiny David (Principal Town Agent).

The report findings

Mr. Opiyo Achiro Denis the teacher of Gulu public primary school enrolled on the payroll of government who got full time employment with Geneva Global a Ugandan Non-Governmental Organization during COVID 19 in 2020. He later went to teach at his former school. Information leaked that he was earning two salaries from both Government and from the organization. The case got to the Inspector General of Government who investigated the matter with the town clerk of Gulu City Council. Later Mr. Opiyo Achiro was invited to the committee for a statement, he accepted having committed the case and apologized to the committee. The Accounting Officer referred the matter to City Service Commission for further scrutiny and possible conclusion.

Committee recommendations

The town clerk gave Mr. Opiyo Achiro Denis a warning letter and requested him to write an apology for his action while Mr. Tokwiny David had a case of falsifying his academic papers which were all amicably solved by the rewards and sanctions committee.

| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The Consultative Committee was not in place at the time of assessment.</p> <p>However, efforts were made by Gulu City Council to establish the committee. The Principal Human Resources Officer through ref. letter GCC/CR/168/1 dated 27th March 2023 requested Gulu City Town Clerk to initiate the formation of the Consultative Committee.</p> | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|------------------|------|-------|------------|------------------|---|----------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|---|---------------|------------------|-----------|----------------|---|----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---|--------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|---|------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|---|---------------------|------------------|-----------|----------------|---|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---|
| 8 | <p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p> | <p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p> | <p>A review of the staff list of the newly recruited staff in Gulu City Council for FY 2022/2023 obtained from the Senior Human Resources Officer indicated a total of 8 out of 8 staff who accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after their appointment dates as below.</p> <p>Names of newly recruited staff for FY 2022/23 for Gulu City Council</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Name</th> <th>Title</th> <th>Appt. Date</th> <th>Processing Month</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Olanya Micheal</td> <td>Laboratory Assistant</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Akikki Samuel</td> <td>Health Assistant</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Onencan George</td> <td>Enrolled Nurse</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Akech Rose</td> <td>Enrolled Nurse</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Ocaya Sunday</td> <td>Laboratory Assistant</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Ajok Irene</td> <td>Deputy Head Teacher</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Akello Sukisa Alice</td> <td>Clinical Officer</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Atimango Eunice</td> <td>Enrolled Nurse</td> <td>28/6/2022</td> <td>September 2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It was evident that 100% of staff that were recruited during FY 2022/2023 accessed the staff payroll not later than two months after their appointment dates.</p> | No. | Name | Title | Appt. Date | Processing Month | 1 | Olanya Micheal | Laboratory Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 2 | Akikki Samuel | Health Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 3 | Onencan George | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 4 | Akech Rose | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 5 | Ocaya Sunday | Laboratory Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 6 | Ajok Irene | Deputy Head Teacher | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 7 | Akello Sukisa Alice | Clinical Officer | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 8 | Atimango Eunice | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | 1 |
| No. | Name | Title | Appt. Date | Processing Month | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Olanya Micheal | Laboratory Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Akikki Samuel | Health Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Onencan George | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Akech Rose | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Ocaya Sunday | Laboratory Assistant | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Ajok Irene | Deputy Head Teacher | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Akello Sukisa Alice | Clinical Officer | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Atimango Eunice | Enrolled Nurse | 28/6/2022 | September 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Pension Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

Score 1.

A review of the pension payroll for staff that retired within FY 2022/23 obtained from the Senior Human Resources Officer indicated a total of 8 out of 8 Staff that accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement as provided below;

List of staff that retired within FY 2022/23 for Gulu City Council

| No | Name | Date of Birth | Retirement Date |
|----|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Kidega Laboke | 11th November 1962 | 11th November 2022 |
| 2 | Luwoko Phillips | 12th December 1962 | 12th December 2022 |
| 3 | Owilli Phillip | 22nd December 1962 | 22nd December 2022 |
| 4 | Kamau Jimmy | 31st December 1962 | 31st December 2022 |
| 5 | Yeko George | 17th March 1963 | 17th March 2023 |
| 6 | Opakasi Samuel | 9th May 1963 | 9th May 2023 |
| 7 | Acire Alfred | 18th June 1963 | 18th June 2023 |
| 8 | Moro Sam Ojan | 30th June 1963 | 30th June 2023 |

It was evident that 100% of staff that retired during FY 2022/2023 accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after their retirement date

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 Divisions were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;</p> <p>Bardege Division received Ushs 225,602,705</p> <p>Laroo Pece Division received Ushs. 230,224,761</p> <p>The total transfers to all the LLGs in the City Council added up to Ushs 455,827,466 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two instalments dated:</p> <p>Q2 - Ushs 151,942,489 was transferred on 21st October 2022</p> <p>Q3 - Ushs 303,884,977 was transferred on 27th February 2023</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>There was evidence that the City Council did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as per copy of the warrant availed to the PAT;</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was done on 17th October 2022 while approval was on 17th October 2022 the same day approvals were done by MoFPED.</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was done on 20th January 2023 while approval was on 12th January 2023 which was 5 working days after the approval by MoFPED.</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>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The evidence indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs were done within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were uploaded on 14th October 2022 and the City Council invoicing and communicating to LLGs on 21st October 2022 which was 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were uploaded on 20th January 2023 and the City Council invoicing and communicating to LLGs on 25th February 2023 which was 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED</p> <p>From the above observation the City Council complied with the 5 days deadline as per the requirement.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no documentary evidence to prove that the City Council supervised or mentored all the Divisions at least once per quarter consistent with the guidelines. | 0 |
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up: Score 2 or else score 0 | There were no minutes for the CTPC quarterly meetings to prove that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed to make recommendations for corrective actions. | 0 |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0 | The City Council maintained an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual 2007, which clearly indicated the details of all assets as evidenced from the IFMIS Records of the Asset register. For example; Land/ Buildings; Date, Category, cost, Department, Location, Plot No, description of use, value etc. Vehicles particulars like Category, cost/donation, location, Engine No. Chassis No. Type, Model, Year of acquisition, condition and responsible person, particulars of maintenance. Furniture: Date, Tag No, condition, user title/name, cost Computers; Category, cost, location, department date of purchase, Model, serial No. Types, condition And assets acquired in the FY2022/2023 were recorded in the asset register. | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence to show that the City Council used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY 2021/2022 to implement the recommendations and rightly use it to make Assets Management decisions concerning procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of asset.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p> | <p>The City Council had a Physical Planning Committee as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref GCC/1200/1 dated 6th April 2023 signed by the Town Clerk. The committee was fully functional and held all the quarterly meetings in the FY 2022/23 as per the minutes of the meeting availed to the Assessment Team;</p> <p>Quarter 1 – meeting was held 19th - 20th September 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 – meeting was held 12st - 13th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 - meeting was held on 5th April 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 – meeting was held 4th & 5th June 2023.</p> <p>Minutes for 3 quarters were submitted to the MoLHU as below;</p> <p>1st quarter submitted on the 24th October 2022</p> <p>3rd quarter submitted on the 3rd May 2023</p> <p>4th quarter submitted on the 20th July 2023</p> <p>However, the minutes for 2nd quarter were not submitted to the MoLHUD as per the required..</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (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 no evidence to show that desk appraisals for all USMID projects implemented during the previous FY were prepared.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that Gulu City Council conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for USMID projects of the previous FY.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The City Council developed the project profiles with costing for all investments in the AWP for the current FY as listed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renovation of Aywee HCIII in Laroo Pece Division at Ushs 30,000,000 starting July 2023 – June 2024 (CDPIII page 116 and Approved Budget page 33) - Renovation/Rehabilitation of Gulu Primary School and Pece Primary School in Bardege-Layibi at Ushs 80,000,000 starting July 2023 – June 2024 (CDPIII page 116 and Approved Budget page 33) - Renovation of Street Lights in Laroo Pece and Bardege-Layibi at Ushs 290,000,000 starting July 2023 – June 2024 (CDPIII page 116 and Approved Budget page 30) - Upgrading Roads to Bitumen Standard (Eden Road, Alur Road, etc) in Laroo Pece and Bardege-Layibi at Ushs 22,397,057,000 starting July 2023 – June 2024 (CDPIII page 98-100 and Approved Budget page 42) <p>However, the CTPC did not discuss the project profiles as there were no minutes on record.</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 were no USMID projects planned in the current FY 2023/2024 therefore screening for projects was not applicable.</p> | 2 |
| 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>In the approved annual consolidated procurement plan for Gulu City Council for FY 2023/2024 by Godfrey B. Kiseka dated 22nd August 2023, there was evidence of inclusion of DDEG funded projects. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of Pawel Health Centre III indicated as item 7 at an estimated cost of UGX 30,000,000. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the projects to be implemented in FY 2023/2024 using DDEG were approved by the contracts committee. Noted procurement for these DDEG projects had not commenced by the time of assessment. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that Gulu City Local Government established a Project Implementation Team as specified in the sector guidelines | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was evidence that roads rehabilitation (USMID-AF) - Upgrading to class II standards paved roads with asphaltic concrete wearing course surface in Gulu City, followed the standard technical designs provided by the City Engineer. For instance; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alur Road (0.893km), the lane width was 3.5m plus a parking lane of 2.0m. • Okello Okeno Road (0.844km), the lane width was 3.5m plus a parking lane of 2.0m. • Queen Elizabeth Road (0.722km), the lane width was 3.5m with no parking lane. • Eden Road (1.429km), there was an island of 1.0m, the parking lane was 2.0m, and each driving lane was 3.5 as specified in the design drawing • Samuel Doe Road(0.946km). the lane width was 3.5m plus a parking lane of 2.0m. | 1 |

Procurement, contract management/execution
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the relevant technical officers conducted supervision of projects for FY 2022/2023 prior to verification and certification of works.

For instance;

- For road rehabilitation (USMID –AF), a request for payment of UGX 1,553,962,859 was dated 22nd December 2022. An interim payment certificate 02 was signed by City Engineer, Environment Officer, City CDO and City Town Clerk on 27th December 2022. Minutes of Site Progress Review Meeting No. 10 held on 28th October 2022 and attended by Eng. Omara, Robert Odongping the in-charge Environment and Social Safeguards in which the City Engineer asked the Resident Engineer to hold payments for safety until the contractor provides PPE at site were presented. Also, minutes of Site Progress Review Meeting No. 7 held on 29th July 2022 and attended by Oola Sunday the Assistant Engineer, Robert Odongping the in charge Environment and Social Safeguards in which the Assistant Engineer asked the contractor to improve the camp site was presented.

- For construction of two-unit staff house at Lapeta HC II, a request for payment by Pathway Technical Services Ltd for UGX 102,430,100 was dated 8th May 2023. A completion report by Eng. Omara Christo Balmoyi in which Item No. 2 Sub structure was reported as 100% complete was dated 18th May 2023. A certificate of environmental compliance for construction of staff house at Lapeta HC III signed by Ocan Micheal the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer was dated 15th May 2023. Payment certificate No. 1 was signed by the City Engineer and Environment Officer on 18th May 2023, City CDO, City Health Officer and CFO on 19th May 2023.

- For construction of girl's dormitory and matron's room at Mary Immaculate P/S, a request for payment upon completion of works by Regent Technical Services Ltd was dated 22nd June 2023. A completion report by Eng. Omara Christo Balmoyi in which item No. 3 Walls and Item No. 5 Roofing was reported at 100% complete was dated 26th June 2023. A certificate of environmental compliance for construction of construction of girl's dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S signed by Ocan Micheal Christopher the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer was dated 25th June 2023. Payment certificate No. 2 was signed by the City Engineer on 27th June 2023, Environment Officer on 18th July 2023, Education Officer on 26th July 2023, ACDO on 27th June 2023 and Town Clerk Layibi City Division on the 18th July 2023.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City Council verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames as per contract. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For road rehabilitation (USMID -AF), a request for payment of UGX 1,553,962,859 by China Railway Seventh Group Co. Ltd was dated 22nd December 2022. Interim payment certificate 02 was signed by City Engineer, Environment Officer, City CDO and City Town Clerk on 27th December 2022. Voucher No. 3136634 was effected on 6th January 2023. • For construction of two-unit staff house at Lapeta HC II, a request for payment by Pathway Technical Services Ltd for UGX 102,430,100 was dated 8th May 2023. Payment certificate No. 1 was signed by the City Engineer on 18th May 2023, Environment Officer on 18th May 2023, City CDO on 19th May 2023, City Health Officer on 19th May 2023 and CFO of 19th May 2023. Voucher No. 6436697 was effected on 28th June 2023 and acknowledged by Pathway Technical Services Ltd on 30th June 2023. • For construction of girl's dormitory with a matron's matron at Mary Immaculate P/S, a request for payment upon completion of works by Regent Technical Services Ltd was dated 22nd June 2023. Interim payment certificate No. 2 was signed by the City Engineer on 27th June 2023, Environment Officer on 18th July 2023, Education Officer on 26th July 2023, ACDO on 27th June 2023 and Town Clerk Layibi City Division on the 18th July 2023. Voucher 0048 in the names of Regent Technical Services Ltd was effected on 2nd August 2023 as per attached funds transfer form. |
|---|---|---|

13

Procurement, contract management/execution
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG had complete procurement files in place for each contract with all records as required by PPDA Law. For Example;

- For road rehabilitation (USMID -AF), procurement ref: Arua,Gulu,Kitgum/Wrks/USMID-AF/2021-2022/00001, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 8th November 2021 recommending award to M/S China Railway Seventh Group Co. Ltd at a contract price of UGX 25,040,842,098. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 16th November 2021 under minute number Min.4GCCCC/Nov 16th /2021 and the contract between the parties was signed on 16th December 2021. Clearance by the Solicitor General was dated 10th December 2021.

- For construction of two-unit staff house at Lapeta HC II procurement ref; Gulu603/WRKS/2022-2023/00006, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 8th March 20223 recommending award to M/S Pathways Technical Services Ltd at a contract price of UGX 102,430,100. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 8th March 2023 under minute number Min.4GCCCC/8th March/2023 and contract between the parties was signed on the 27th March 2023.

- For construction of one block of girl's dormitory and matron's room at Mary Immaculate P/S, procurement ref: Gulu603/WRKS/2022-2023/00007, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 8th March 2023 recommending award to M/S Regent Technical Services Ltd at a bid price of UGX 79,981,000. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 8th March 2023 under minute number .Min.4GCCCC/8th March/2023 and the contract between the parties was signed on the 27th March 2023.

Environment and Social Safeguards

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was a designated person to coordinate response to feedback.

REF GCC/CR/156/2, dated 2nd July 2020, Appointment as Chairperson/Focal Point Person for Complaints and Grievance Handling Committee, to Komakech Nixon Atemo the Senior Internal Auditor. The appointment was for 3 years' renewable only once. Some of the roles included: Chair all the meetings of the committee, handle all the complaints related to compensation, relocation, resettlements and any other issues raised by the community before, during and after construction etc. the letter was signed by Edward Kiwanuka Guavu - City Town Clerk.

There were three other members appointed to the committee making it four members.

1. "Appointment as Secretary of Complaints and Grievance Handling Committee." Dated 2nd July 2020, to Opio Edmond the Senior Procurement Officer. The appointment was for 3 years. Letter was signed by the City Town Clerk - Edward Kiwanuka Guavu.

2. Appointment as member of Complaints and Grievance Handling Committee." Dated 2nd July 2020, to Mr. Acaye Robert Nyero the Clinical Officer. The appointment was for 3 years. Letter was signed by the City Town Clerk - Edward Kiwanuka Guavu.

3. Appointment as Secretary of Complaints and Grievance Handling Committee." Dated 8th March 2021, to Akwero Jane the Senior Human Resource. The appointment was for 3 years. Letter was signed by the City Town Clerk - Edward Kiwanuka Guavu.

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was a log book with a reference GM/CR/210/12 and titled "Grievance and Complaints Committee Complaints Register." In the book it had the columns for the date registered, mode of receipt, affected person, sex, village, complaint, accident, category of complaint, description of the complaint, receiver, action taken and remarks.</p> <p>The log book had many complaints registered from 2014 to date.</p> <p>For instance; on 16th September 2022, there was a complaint on Radio and the Chairperson was called by one of the community members. The complaint was on Nelson Mandela Road, there was a slow progress of USMID works blocking access to people's homes but also other people complained that the road encroached on their land. The City Engineer was notified. There was a meeting with politicians (Mayor's office), Surveyor and people involved and it was resolved. The case took one month to be resolved.</p> <p>The City had a frame work titled "Framework for Grievance and Complaints Handling. Period: 2019/2020-2024/2025. Prepared by the Grievance and Complaints Handling Committee.</p> <p>There were also monthly reports by the Committee submitted to the Town Clerk. For instance, letter dated 27th April 2023 to the City Town Clerk "Submission of reports for the month of March 2023" signed by Opio Edmon – Secretary GRC. The report included the complaints logged in during the month.</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 a notice/label on the wall of the Council Hall reading;</p> <p>"Gulu Municipal Council Complaints and Grievance Handling, Tel: 0782-142400, 0772-686065, 0784-908672.</p> <p>The GRC Chairperson said that the Council Hall was a better place to pass information since many different people came for meetings.</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>At the time of the assessment the Gulu City Local Government did not provide any evidence that they provided and integrated the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions into LGDP, AWP and budgets for the current FY.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence provided that the City Local Government disseminated the DDEG/USMID guidelines to the LLGs. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | (For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0 | There were no USMID projects initiated in 2022/2023 except for a project under completion, therefore there were no projects to verify costed ESMPs in the BoQs. | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0 | There were no projects under USMID initiated in the FY 2022/2023 to verify additional costings on impact of climate change. | 3 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0 | There were no USMID projects initiated in 2022/2023, therefore the assessment team could not verify for proof of land ownership by the City. | 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 were no USMID projects initiated in 2022/2023, therefore no monitoring reports were provided for verification. | 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 were no USMID projects initiated in 2022/2023 except for one project under completion. Interim payment certificate no.3 dated 13th June 2023, Construction works for selected Infrastructure Subprojects in cluster 1- Gulu City. Project (USMID), worth UGX 25,040,842,098. Signed by City Engineer, Chief Finance Officer, The Environment Officer, PCDO. Payment made on 28th June 2023, PV no. 6421038. | 1 |

Financial management

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 16 | LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the City Council made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to-date at the time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to PAT as detailed below; Reconciliation Previous FY 2022/2023 A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL General Fund A/c A/c No:90300017683917 Bank Name: STANBIC Bank - GULU Branch Reconciled up to 30th June 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 43,612,929 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 28th August 2023 Reconciliation Current FY 2023/2024 A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL General Fund A/c | 2 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

A/c No:90300017683917

Bank Name: STANBIC Bank – GULU Branch

Reconciled up to 31st October 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 39,634,484 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 8th November 2023

Reconciliation Previous FY 2022/2023

A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL UWEP A/c

A/c No: 229173912

Bank Name: KENYA COMMERCIAL Bank Ltd – GULU Branch

Reconciled up to 30th June 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 56,673,165 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 28th August 2023

Reconciliation Current FY 2023/2024

A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL UWEP A/c

A/c No: 229173912

Bank Name: KENYA COMMERCIAL Bank Ltd – GULU Branch

Reconciled up to 31st October 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 56,673,165 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 8th November 2023

Reconciliation Previous FY 2022/2023

A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL YLP A/c

A/c No: 01093658480673

Bank Name: DFCU Bank Ltd – GULU Branch

Reconciled up to 30th June 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 2,576,917 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 28th August 2023

Reconciliation Current FY 2023/2024

A/c Name: GULU CITY COUNCIL YLP A/c

A/c No: 01093658480673

Bank Name: DFCU Bank Ltd – GULU Branch

Reconciled up to 31st October 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 2,576,917 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 8th November 2023

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 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 City Council produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below.</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 28th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 10th February 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 27th April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 28th July 2023</p> <p>Form the observation the reports were timely produced to impact the improvement in financial management and reporting of the MG as per the report production dates stated above,</p> | 2 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The City Council provided information to the Town Clerk and CPAC on the status of the implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY 2022/23 as per letter Ref GCC/212/01 dated 22nd November 2023 signed by the Internal Auditor Mr, Oyoo Geoffrey and received by the Registry and Secretary to PAC on 22nd November 2023.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>From the stamped copies of the Internal Audit Reports, it was evident that the reports for the previous FY were submitted to City Accounting Officer, City PAC and that PAC has reviewed as follows;</p> <p>1st quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk and CPAC on 16th March 2023</p> <p>2nd quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk and CPAC on 16th March 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report submitted to the Town Clerk on and CPAC on 27th April 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report submitted to the Town Clerk and and CPAC on 2nd August 2023</p> <p>The minutes for the LGPAC indicated that the quarterly reports were reviewed, and issues followed up e.g;</p> <p>There was evidence in the Minutes for CPAC meetings to show that the quarterly Internal Audit reports for FY 2022/2023 were reviewed and discussed for recommendations.</p> | 1 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

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 City Council planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 5,500,000,000 and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 3,387,228,001 which gave a variance of Ushs 2,112,771,999 (Final draft A/cs 2022/2023-page 33)</p> <p>$(3,387,228,001 / 5,500,000,000) \times 100\% = 62\%$</p> <p>The City Council only managed to collect 62% of its planned revenue, leaving a balance of -38% not collected. The budget realization was above -10%.</p> <p>The failure to realize the planned revenue was because of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure of Revenue Tenderers to pay the revenue collection in advance. - Lack of Revenue collection equipment. | 0 |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. | <p>The ratio of OSR for the City Council the previous FY as compared to that the previous FY but one as per Final A/cs 2022/23 page 33 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/2022 Final Accounts FY2021/2022 page 33)</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 2,493,614,815</p> <p>OSR 2022/2023 Final Accounts FY2022/2023- page 33)</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 3,387,228,001</p> <p>Therefore, Revenue 2022/2023 less revenue 2021/2022</p> <p>Ushs 3,387,228,001 - Ushs 2,493,614,815</p> <p>= Ushs 893,613,186</p> <p>= 893,613,186/2,493,614,815) x 100 = 36%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/2023 increased by 36%.</p> <p>The increase in the OSR for the FY 2022/2023 was due to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the introduction and close monitoring of the IRA system regulated the revenue collection gaps hence the increase. | 2 |
| 20 | <p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p> | <p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>At the time of the assessment the City Council did not provide evidence to show that the local revenue collections for the FY 2022/2023 subject to be shared with the LLGs was remitted to the Division at 50%</p> | 0 |

Transparency and Accountability

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts for FY 2022/2023 were published.</p> <p>For Example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For road rehabilitation (USMID -AF), the best evaluated bidder notice was dated 16th November 2023 with best bidder as M/S China Railway Seventh Group Co. Ltd at a bid price of UGX 25,040,842,098. • For construction of two-unit staff house at Lapeta HC II, the best evaluated bidder notice was dated 8th March 2023 with best evaluated bidder as M/S Pathways Technical Services Ltd at a bid price of UGX 102,430,100. • For construction of girl's dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S, the best evaluated bidder notice was dated 8th March 2023 with best bidder as M/S Regent Technical Services Ltd at a bid price of UGX 79,981,000. | 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 no evidence to show that the City performance assessment results and implications for the FY 2021/2022 were disseminated or publicised.</p> | 0 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence to show that in the FY 2022/2023, the City Local Government conducted radio programs in various community dialogues. radio stations to provide feed-back on the status of activity implementation to the public.</p> | 0 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG displayed the tax rates on the notice board, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal on 30th September 2022 with contacts of the Senior Finance Officer; Tel 0772342960 as the focal person in case of appeal and was signed and stamped by the Chief Finance Officer.</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

There was no alleged fraud and corruption case raised by the IGG.

**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>For 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X were 5,121</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II & III = $1028+2729+663= 4,420$</p> <p>Percentage was $4,420/5,121 \times 100=86.2\%$</p> <p>For 2020(2021 not considered because of Covid 19 the UNEB in 2021 was dabbed 2020), total number of candidates excluding Division X were 3,296</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II & III = $570+1941+445= 2956$</p> <p>Percentage pass was $2956/3296 \times 100 = 89.7\%$</p> <p>Percentage change was $86,2\% - 89.7\% = - 3.5\%$</p> <p>Hence percentage decreased by 3.5</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>For 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X were 2,528</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II & III = $277+618+716= 1,611$</p> <p>Percentage was $1611/2,528 \times 100=63.7\%$</p> <p>For 2020(2021 not considered because of Covid 19 the UNEB in 2021 was dabbed 2020) total number of candidates excluding Division X were 2,284</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II & III = $212+605+679= 1,496$</p> <p>Percentage pass was $1496/2284 \times 100 = 65.5\%$</p> <p>Percentage change was $63.7\%- 65.5\%= - 1.8\%$</p> <p>Hence percentage decreased by 1.8</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> | <p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> | <p>The LLG performance results for Year 2022 was 100% and for Year 2023 was 100% therefore there was performance, therefore the City Local Government had a maximum possible points.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 2 points</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> | | |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> | <p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the education development grant of Ushs 180,873,322 had been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines, e.g.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 1 Block of 2-unit classrooms with an Office at Kweyo P/S at total cost of Ushs 79,746,052 (AWP page 19, Approved Budget page 34) • Renovation of 1 block of a 3-classrooms at Christ the King Demonstration P/s at a total cost of Ushs 58,689,750 (AWP page 19, Approved Budget page 34) • Procurement of 162pcs of 3-seater school desks to Kweyo and Pakwelo P/s at a total cost of Ushs 42,437,520 (AWP page 19, Approved Budget page 34) • The above were eligible expenses under the Education Grant as per page 14. | |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The verified certificates indicated that the CEO, CDO and Environment Officer certified the works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractor as per the certificates below;

Certificate No. 1 issued on 30th March 2023 for Ushs 33,103,018; Contract No. GULU603/WRKS/2022-2023/00002 Project; Construction of a 1 Block of 2-unit classrooms with an Office at Kweyo P/S by M/s LOAD Engineering Ltd was certified on 30th March 2023 by CEO; Environment Officer and CDO as per the guidelines; payments was done on 3rd May 2023.

Certificate No. 1 issued on 23rd May 2023 for Ushs 55,755,263; Contract No. GULU603/WRKS/2022/2023/000001 Project; Renovation of one block of -classrooms at Christ the King Demonstration P/s by M/s Dedol Logistics Ltd was certified by CEO; Environment Officer and CDO on 29th May 2023 as per the guidelines; payments was done on 28th June 2023.

Certificate No. 5 issued on 14th June 2023 for Ushs 476,819,826; Contract No. MoST/UGIFT/WRKS/2018/2019/00119 Project; Construction of Ogom Seed Secondary School by M/s Zeep Construction (U) Ltd was not certified by CEO; Environment Officer and CDO as per the guidelines; payments were done on 28th June 2023.

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

The variation in the contract price for all sampled education projects for FY 2022/2023 was within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates as per evidence provided.

For instance;

- For completion of 3 classroom block at Christ the king at a contract price of UGX 58,689,750 against the engineers estimates of UGX 60,000,000 giving the contract price variation 0.0%.

- For Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo P/S at a contract price of UGX 79,746,052 against the engineers estimates of UGX 80,000,000 giving the contract variation of 0.0%.

- For construction of Girl's Dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S at a contract price of UGX 79,981,000 against the engineer's estimates of UGX 80,000,000 giving the contract variation of 0.0%.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy Town Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Project.</p> | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | <p>A review of the staffing structure for schools obtained from the Principal Human Resources Officer indicated that Gulu City Council had a Staff ceiling of 1103 primary teachers and those in post were 777 teachers in their respective primary schools.</p> <p>Therefore;</p> $777/1103 \times 100 = 70\%$ <p>Gulu City Council met 70% school staffing and infrastructure standards as set up by the MoES</p> | 1 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | <p>The LG had 41 UPE schools, and 6 USE School. According to the consolidated assets register dated 27th March 2023, all the UPE schools meet the basic requirements and minimum standards. However, 2 USE school - Gulu Army and Gulu SSS have no teacher accommodation, hence only 4 secondary schools have the basic requirements.</p> <p>To calibrate the LG compliance, $(41+4)/47 \times 100 = 95.7\%$</p> | 3 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>The LG accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed. The staff lists provided by the DEO were compared with the lists at the visited schools (Vanguard, Pece and Pageya). The two lists were similar as verified from the staff lists posted at the head teachers' notice boards. For example;</p> <p>Vanguard P/S had 39 teachers displayed at the notice board as deployed the LG.</p> <p>Pece P/S had 27 teachers displayed at the notice board as deployed the LG.</p> <p>Similarly, Pageya P/S had 23 teachers displayed at the notice board as deployed the LG.</p> <p>Hence the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>Gulu City LG education department compiled an asset register accurately reporting on infrastructure in all registered schools as at 30th June 2023.</p> <p>For example;</p> <p>Vanguard, Pece and Pageya Primary Schools had 20, 21 and 14 classrooms respectively.</p> <p>Vanguard, Pece and Pageya Primary Schools had 11, 21 and 6 units for staff accommodation respectively</p> <p>Similarly, Vanguard, Pece and Pageya Primary Schools had 30, 24 and 10 latrine stances respectively.</p> <p>Hence the LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all the schools.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that Gulu City Council worked on the annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. All the three schools visited (Vanguard, Pece and Pageya primary schools) did not have the reports in the prescribed format. The schools instead had only budgets. Vanguard PS and Pageya PS had only budgets signed on 30th March 2023 and 31st March 2023 respectively. Pageya PS had only a budget which was not signed. Even at the City level the education department did not present these reports</p> <p>Hence percentage compliance was : $0/41 \times 100 = 0\%$</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 | <p>At the time of assessment Gulu City Council did not present evidence that they supported schools to make SIPs. At the 3 schools sampled, Vanguard PS, Pece PS and Pageya PS, they mistook work plans for SIPs. The LG did not provide the SIPs from schools either.</p> <p>Hence percentage of compliance is = $0/41 \times 100 =$</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | <p>The City Council collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all registered schools from previous FY as follows.</p> <p>41 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 31,334 pupils and 6 USE school with a total enrolment of 7,892 students.</p> <p>The approved budget for FY 2023/24 has these schools reflected on pages 35-37 in agreement with OTIMS</p> <p>To calculate level of compliance; $46/46 \times 100 = 100\%$</p> | 4 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | 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: | The City Council budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY year at UGX 5,594,060,000/-as reflected on page 33/65of the approved budget estimates for FY 2023/2024. | 4 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Score 4 or else, score: 0 | | |
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, | Gulu City Council deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY. According to staff lists of the three sampled primary schools, teachers were deployed as follows in the sampled schools; | 3 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Score 3 else score: 0 | <p>1. Vanguard primary school had 38 teachers and a head teacher. Attendance register between 18th and 20th September 2023 confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p> <p>2. Pece primary school had 26 teachers and a head teacher deployed. Attendance register between 21st and 25th September, 2023 confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p> <p>3. Pageya primary school had 22 teachers and a head teacher deployed. Attendance register between 21st to 22nd November 2023, confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p> <p>Hence deployment in the three sampled schools was also according to the guidelines since they were at least 7 in the P7 schools.</p> | |
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision | c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, | <p>Lists of deployment were displayed in head teachers' offices in the schools that were sampled and visited.</p> <p>At Vanguard primary school, the deployed list had 39 teachers. At Pece and Pageya primary schools, teacher deployment data were clearly displayed on the notice boards indicating 27and 23 government teachers respectively.</p> <p>The details displayed included; name, qualifications, and tittle among others. At the district, the deployment list was displayed the notice board of the education department.</p> | 1 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | score: 1 else, score: 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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>A review of staff files indicated all head teachers in Gulu City jurisdiction were appraised for calendar year 2022, but not in time per the guidelines, which is by 31st December 2022 . Below are the sampled files;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Toorach Simon Peter Wilfred head teacher of Sir Samuel Baker schools was appraised by Opio A Vincent on 30th June 2023 2. Olanya Lucy head teacher of Akonyibedo Primary school was appraised by Kilama Patrick of Unyama Sub county on 30th June 2023 3. Odongmon Polycarp head teacher of Gulu City Council Primary school was appraised by Odongo Denis on 30th June 2023 4. Lanyero Mary Winifred of Kasubi Primary school was appraised by Oloya Gilbert on 30th June 2023 5. Aciro Christine head teacher of St. Peters Primary school in Laroo Sub county was appraised by Okongo Denis on 30th June 2023 6. Kidega Walter Odongopiny head teacher Laroo pece division Primary school was appraised by Odongo Denis on 28th December 2023 7. Oynak Patrick head teacher of Gulu City Bardege Division was appraised by Oloya Gilbert by City town clerk on 30th June 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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided that Secondary School head teachers were appraised at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>During assessment time, only one appraisal report was availed for review as follows;</p> <p>1. Mr. Irwenyo the City Education Officer was appraised by Toni James the City Town clerk on 30th June 2023.</p> <p>The other appraisal reports of the other staff in the education department were not provided for review</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p> | <p>Gulu City education department prepared a training plan for 2022 signed by the CEO on 10th January 2023, to address gaps identified in the previous FY.</p> <p>Identified areas of training included; Training of new SMCs, PTA committees and capacity building of teachers on SNE.</p> <p>The training plan for 2023 dated 5th January 2023, targeted to training areas of, school project management committees and capacity building for teachers' discipline management in addition to those areas emphasized in 2022.</p> | 2 |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The City Town Clerk confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget 1st July 2022. However, the office of the PS had not acknowledged receipt of this letter at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Education department made allocation of UGX 41,591,000/- to inspection and monitoring under budget output 000023 Inspection and monitoring , which appears in the approved budget of FY 2022/23. Accordingly, Q4 report page 38/65 indicated that UGX 71,879,000/- was spent on inspection and monitoring.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | <p>The activities carried out included; Allowances, welfare and entertainment, printing, photocopying stationery and binding, small office equipment, fuel, lubricant and oil and travel inland. The extra amounts not budgeted came from local revenue.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City made timely submission of warrants for school's capitation grants for the last FY in accordance to the requirements of the budget the 3 quarters as per the dates from the IFMS. Quarter 3 warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 20th January 2023 which was 1 day after approval from MoFPED on 19th January 2023. Quarter 4 warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 25th April 2023 which was 1 day after approval from MoFPED on 24th April 2023 Quarter 1 (Current FY) warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 25th July 2023 which was 1 day after approval from MoFPED on 21st July 2023 Therefore, the City was compliant.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>While the City Council invoiced and communicated to schools about the capitation grant transfers, this was done outside the stipulated time as indicated below; Quarter 3 was invoiced and communicated on 20th February 2023 which was more than 3 days from the release of funds from MoFPED on 25th January 2023. Quarter 4 was invoiced and communicated on 17th May 2023 which was which was 3 days from the release of funds from MoFPED on 12th May 2023 The invoicing for quarter three was delayed hence not being compliant.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 | <p>There was evidence that education department prepared an inspection plan for 2022 dated 17th January 2022, and targeted activities in routine inspection and support supervision.</p> <p>The inspection plan for 2023 was dated 23rd January 2023.</p> <p>The meeting held on 18th September 2023 planned for inspection of term 3 of 2022. Six members attended the meeting and they planned to inspect 20 schools.</p> <p>The meeting held on 12th January 2023 was held to plan inspection for term 1 of 2023. This meeting planned to inspect all government schools and a few selected private schools.</p> <p>Another meeting held on 25th May 2023 and attended by 5 members, planned inspection in term 2 of 2023. It was highlighted that the tablet would not be used because it was under upgrade.</p> |
|----|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 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>UPE schools were inspected and monitored as follows;</p> <p>In quarter 3 (term 1 of 2023) the report down loaded on 23rd November, 2023, indicated that 15 government primary were inspected. Another 26 government aided schools were inspected using the traditional inspection method as per the report to the City Education Officer dated 26th April 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4 (term two 2023) inspection report was down loaded on 24th July 2023. The report indicated that 45 primary schools were inspected electronically including all the 41 government schools.</p> <p>Quarter 1 (term 3 of 2022) inspection was carried throughout the term. A total of 18 government primary schools were inspected between 15th to 29th October 2022.</p> <p>Average number of schools inspected = $(15+26+41+18)/3 = 33$</p> <p>Hence compliance was $33/41 \times 100 = 80.5\%$</p> <p>Therefore, inspection percentage based on the three terms seen averaged to 80.5</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

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

There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions.

In a monthly head teachers' coordination meeting held on 8th August 2022 the city inspector of schools gave feedback to head teachers on previous inspections findings. One of the findings was that schools were teaching during holidays, there was also lack of supervision by head teachers and poor management of school facilities eg toilets.

In a departmental meeting held on 10th August 2023, the inspectorate reported that there is low level of teacher preparation for lessons, high level of indiscipline and teachers sneaking out of school during working hours

In another departmental meeting held on 26th May 2023, the inspectorate reported the following issues for discussion: Poor structures in some schools and conflict with community at Pece Pawel PS.

At Vanguard PS inspectors discussed reports with the head teacher on 20th June 2023 and 14th April 2023.

At Pece PS inspectors discussed inspection reports with the head teacher on 1st July 2023, 3rd March and 23rd October 2022.

At Pageya PS inspection reports were discussed on 4th August 2023.

Hence the LG ensured that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Gulu City LG submitted inspection reports to DES.</p> <p>DES acknowledged receipt of inspection reports for term 1 and 2 of 2023 on 8th August 2023</p> <p>Quarter 2 FY 2022/23(term 3) inspection:</p> <p>The report was dated 14th November 202 and DES acknowledged receipt of this report 13th December 2022.</p> <p>At the school level, inspectors presented reports from inspection and monitoring to head teachers. For example:</p> <p>At Vanguard PS inspectors presented reports to the head teacher on 20th June 2023 and 14th April 2023.</p> <p>At Pece PS inspectors presented inspection and monitoring reports to the head teacher on 1st July 2023, 3rd March and 23rd October 2022.</p> <p>At Pageya PS an inspection report presented to the head teacher on 19th October 2022, 20th April 2023 and 4th July 2023.</p> <p>In all the three schools, the inspectors signed in the visitors' book.</p> | 2 |
| 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 education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LGPAC reports etc. during the previous FY as pe the minutes below;</p> <p>The minutes for the Council Committee meeting held on 2nd November 2022 under Min 3/02/11/2022/2023 the monitoring and inspection reports and deliberated upon by the committee and the following recommendations to the issues were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen the inspection of schools in the City Council and ensure that teachers are at schools. - SMC and PTA should be oriented on their roles in the management of schools. - Payment of contractors should be done promptly. - Immunization of children should be taken to pre-primary schools and prior consent to be obtained from parnets. - <p>The minutes for the Council Committee</p> | 2 |

meeting held on 2nd March 2023 under Min 3/02/11/2022/2023 the monitoring and inspection reports and deliberated upon by the committee and the following recommendations to the issues were made;

- Best performing schools and pupils in PLE should be recognized and rewarded.

- The CEO and the Education committee should meet with the Headteacher and Founder Members of schools without land titles and encourage them to sign MOUs for the land.

-

The minutes for the Council Committee meeting held on 24th April 2023 under Min 3/24/04/2022/2023 the monitoring and inspection reports and deliberated upon by the committee and the following recommendations to the issues were made;

- Contractor should complete the supply of desks to Layibi P/s.

- The sports budget should be increased to cover the numerous sports activities in the schools.

- The City Education Department should prioritize the supply of desks, ICT equipment and renovation classrooms in poor state.

11

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, *score: 2 or else score: 0*

Gulu City LG produced evidence

that they mobilized parents to attract learners. For example, a report by Senior Education Officer – Lakony Janan to the City Education Officer, he indicated that parents had been mobilized in a radio talk show on Mega 102.1 FM . The officer emphasized the importance of reporting back to school early.

Another talk show was reported by the City Education Officer to the City Town Clerk on 5th December 2022. This show was also on Mega 102.1 FM . In the interaction on the show, the listeners raised concerns affecting learners including: Child headed families and domestic violence.

Pictures taken while in the studios were attached to both reports.

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>Gulu City had an up to-date assets register setting out facilities and equipment in schools relative to basic standards. The information in the assets register in the CEO's office, was in agreement with that at the sampled schools.</p> <p>For example, Vanguard, Pece and Pageya Primary Schools had 550, 420 140 desks respectively at the time of compiling the consolidated assets register which agreed with what was found on the ground.</p> <p>Hence the assets register for Gulu City was up to-date.</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 no evidence that desk appraisals for the Education Development implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were conducted.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was no evidence that field appraisals for the Education Development implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were conducted. for technical feasibility; ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs.</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>In the consolidated procurement plan for Gulu City LG for FY 2023/2024 by Godfrey B. Kisekka dated 22nd August 2023, there was no evidence of inclusion of Seed Secondary School project.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure projects in FY 2022/2023 were approved by the Contracts Committee. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of 3 classroom block at Christ the King was approved by the Contracts Committee on 19th January 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/19th January/2023 and awarded to M/S Dedol Logistics Ltd at a contract price of UGX 58,689,750. • Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo P/S was approved by the Contracts Committee on 19th January 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/19th January /2022-2023 and awarded to M/S Load Engineering Ltd at a contract price of UGX 80,000,000. • Construction of Girl's Dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S, was approved by the Contracts Committee on 8th March 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/8th March/2023 awarded to M/S Regent Technical Services Ltd at a contract price of UGX 79,981,000. | 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>A letter by Isaiah Tumwesigye the Ag City Clerk dated 10th February 2023 to Eng. Omona Christo Balmoyi appointing him as the project manager for Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom at Kweyo Gulu P/S and Renovation of 1 block of 3 classroom at Christ the King Demonstration was presented.</p> <p>Appointment of the Contract Manager, Environment Officer, Community Development Officer, Labour Officer and the Clerk of Works was not presented.</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>In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Project.</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>In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Project.</p> | 1 |

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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 *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was evidence of monthly joint technical supervision at critical stages of the planned sector infrastructure projects at by the relevant officers.

For instance;

For Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo P/S, a technical progress report by Eng. Omara Christo dated 27th March 2023 in which the progress was reported as substructure -85%, Superstructure -85% was presented. Another progress report as at 22nd May 2023 in which progress was reported as Substructure - 100%, superstructure - 100%, roofing - 60%, Door & Windows - 100% and fittings & other finishes were at 30% was also presented. A certificate of environmental compliance to Lords Energy Limited for Construction of one block of two class rooms at Kweyo P/S signed by Ocan Michael the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer was dated 20th March 2023

For construction of Girl's Dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S, a technical progress report for the month of May dated 8th May 2023 by Eng. Omara Christo Balmoyi in which the percentage progress was reported as; walling - 20%, substructure - 95% and preliminaries - 80% was presented. Another progress report for the month of June 2023 by Eng. Omara in which the progress of walling and roofing was reported to be 100% was also presented. A Certificate of Environmental Compliance to M/S Regent Technical Services Ltd for construction of girl's dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S signed by Ocan Michael the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer was dated 25th June 2023.

For completion of 3 classroom block at Christ the king, A technical progress report as of 29th May 2023 in which progress was reported as 100% complete was presented. Work was done within a month. A certificate of environmental compliance to M/S DE DOLLS & Logistics Construction Co. Ltd for construction of one block of three class room at Christ the king demonstration signed by Ocan Michael the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer dated 28th March 2023 was presented.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | The sector infrastructure projects were properly executed, however payments to contractors were not made within the specified timeframes and contract terms. For example; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voucher no. 5118532 dated 3rd May 2023 for Construction of Office and Classroom Block at Kweyo P/s at Ushs 31,116,837 by M/s Load Engineering Ltd Invoice was raised on 24th March 2023 and payment process was initiated on 25th March 2023 and paid on 3rd May 2023 which was more than 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms. • Voucher no. 6441868 dated 28th June 2023 for Construction a block of 3 classrooms at Christ the King P/S at Ushs 55,168,365 by M/s Dedol Logistics Co. Ltd ; Invoice was raised 22nd May 2023 and payment process was initiated on 22nd May 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was above the recommended 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms. • Voucher no. 6431565 dated 28th June 2023 for Supply of 162 pcs of 3-seater school desks to Kweyo and Pakwelo P/S at Ushs 39,891,269 by M/s Jonako Investments Ltd . The invoice was raised on 2nd June 2023 and payment process was initiated on 7th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | The City Council Education department submitted its procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 to PDU on the 15th April 2022. This was within the timelines as per the guidelines. | 1 |

13

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

There was evidence that the City Council had complete procurement files for each school infrastructure contract with all records required by the PPDA law. For example;

- For completion of 3 classroom block at Christ the king; procurement ref: GULU603/WRKS/2022-2023/00001, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 16th January 2023 recommending the award to M/S Dedol Logistics Ltd at a bid price of UGX 58,689,750. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 19th January 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/19th January/2022-2023 and agreement between parties was signed on the 10th February 2023.

- For Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo P/S, procurement ref: Gulu603/WRKS/2022-2023/00002, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 16th January 2023 recommending the ward to M/S Load Engineering Ltd at a bid price of UGX 79,746,052. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 19th January 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/19th January/2022-2023 and agreement between the parties was signed on the 10th February 2023.

- For construction of girl's dormitory at Mary Immaculate P/S, procurement ref: Gulu603/WRKS/2022-2023/00007, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 8th March 2023 recommending award to M/S Regent Technical Services Ltd at a bid price of UGX 79,981,000. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting dated 8th March 2023 under minute number Min4GCCCC/8th March/2023 and the agreement between the parties was signed on the 27th March 2023.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

There was no grievance raised/reported under Education sector. The Log book did not have any complaints under Education.

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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green schools and energy and water conservation were disseminated. Though the head teachers at Vanguard and Pece Primary Schools had these guidelines.</p> <p>Hence the LG did not satisfy the requirement fully.</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>There was evidence that the costed ESMPs were incorporated into the BoQ documents as indicated in the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00007, Construction of one block of Girls Dormitory with Matrons room at St. Mary Immaculate School. Under preliminaries, there was Health, safety, Environmental and Social Mainstreaming which had a total cost of UGX 1.050,000. 2. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00001, Renovation of classroom block at Christ the King Demonstration School. In the BoQ element H and element I -Safety, Health and welfare for the work had a total cost of UGX 338,200. 3. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00002, Construction of I block of two classrooms at Kweyo primary school. Under preliminaries, Health, safety, Environmental and social mainstreaming had a total cost of UGX 1,350,000. | 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>There was no proof of land ownership for the school construction projects below;</p> <p>Construction of one block of Girls Dormitory with Matrons room at St. Mary Immaculate School.</p> <p>Renovation of classroom block at Christ the King Demonstration School.</p> <p>Construction of I block of two classrooms at Kweyo primary school</p> | 0 |

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, *score: 2, else score:0*

Environmental and social Compliance Joint Monitoring report projects under Health and Education for FY 2022-2023. The monitoring was conducted on 30th March 2023 with the objective of ensuring that the projects remain compliant with the existing Environmental and safety regulations and protocols, assess likely impacts of the project on environment and recommend the possible remedial measures. A team of 3 members conducted the monitoring which included; the Environment Officer, the City Engineer, Staff Surveyor and Principal Community Development Officer. The report was prepared by Ocan Michael Christopher - Environment Officer.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence that the E&S certification was approved and signed as indicated in the certificates below:

1. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Construction of two classrooms at Kweyo primary school, dated 20th March 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures.

Certificate (IPC) no.1 dated 30th March 2023 for the Construction of one block of two classrooms within the office of Kweyo primary school, worth UGX 79,746,052 and signed by City Engineer, Education Officer, CDO, Chief Finance Officer, Internal Audit, Environment Officer.

Payment was made on 3rd May 2023, PV. no. 5118532.

2. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Construction of one block of 3 classroom block at Christ the King Demonstration primary school, dated 28th March 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures.

Certificate no.1 dated 23rd May 2023 for the Renovation of one block of three classrooms at Christ the King Demonstration primary school, worth UGX 58,689,750, and signed by City Engineer, Education Officer, CDO, Chief Finance Officer, Internal Audit, Environment Officer.

Payment was made on 28th June 2023, PV. no. 6441868.

3. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Construction of Girls Dormitory at Mary Immaculate primary school, dated 25th June 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures.

Certificate (IPC) no.2 dated 27th June 2023, for the Construction of one block of Girls dormitory with a matron's room at Mary Immaculate primary school worth 79,981,000. Signed by City Engineer, Environment Officer, PCDO, CFO, Internal Audit.

Payment voucher no. 0048 dated 2nd August 2023 for the Construction of the Dormitory with matron house at Mary Immaculate primary school.

**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>The HMIS 107 reports were not available for review at the time of assessment. However, summaries from HMIS 105 reports for the three sampled health facilities – prepared by the Biostatistician and signed by the City Health Officer (CHO), Dr Okello Daniel on 23 November 2023 – indicated the number of deliveries as follows:</p> <p>For the FY before assessment (2021/2022), the numbers of deliveries were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardege HC III = 199 deliveries • Layibi Techo HC III = 168 deliveries • Aywee HC III = 72 deliveries <p>Total = 439 deliveries</p> <p>For the FY under assessment (2022/2023), the numbers of deliveries were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardege HC III = 123 deliveries • Layibi Techo HC III = 172 deliveries • Aywee HC III = 80 deliveries <p>Total = 375 deliveries</p> <p>The percentage in the utilisation of health care services was:</p> <p><u>Total deliveries in FY under assessment - Total deliveries in FY before assessment X 100</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total deliveries in FY before assessment</p> <p><u>375 - 439 X 100 = -14.6%</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">439</p> <p>Therefore, the LG registered a decline in the utilisation of health care services, as measured by the percentage difference in total number of deliveries.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 | <p>The average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for Year 2022 was 100% and for FY 2023/2024 was at 100%. Average Performance was above 70%.</p> | 2 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 | <p>There was a letter from the Ministry of Health, dated 7th December 2022, addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</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>From the provided evident the City Council budgeted and spent all the health development grant of 215,362,264 for the previous FY on eligible activities as the health grant and budget guidelines e.g;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement of 3 Motorcycles Yamaha for the Health Department at Ushs 44,615,931 (Approved budget page 23; AWP page 4) • Renovation of OPD Block at Unyama HCII at Ushs 22,693,524 (Approved budget page 23; AWP page 4) • Renovation of OPD Block at Oitino HCII at Ushs 22,837,500 (Approved budget page 23; AWP page 4) • Renovation of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Layibi Techno HCIII at Ushs 22,785,210 (Approved budget page 23; AWP page 4) • Construction of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Lapeta HCII at Ushs 102,430,100 (Approved budget page 23; AWP page 4) <p>The above projects were completed and were eligible activities as per the health grant guidelines page 14.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines. | b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0 | The verified certificates indicated that the CHO, City Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified the works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example; | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | Certificate no 2; dated 29th May 2023 for Ushs 21,645,950: Contract no. GULU603/WRKS/22-23/00005 Project; Renovation of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Layibi Techno HCIII by Odens Brick Co Ltd was certified by CHO, City Engineer and CDO on 29th May 2023; Environment Officer certified 30th May 2023 and payment effected on 28th June 2023. | |
| | | | Certificate no 1; dated 11th April 2023 for Ushs 20,325,375: Contract no. GULU603/WRKS/22-23/00003; Project; Renovation of OPD Block at Oitino HCII by M/s Jokello 1976 Holdings Ltd was certified by CHO on 18th April 2023 and City Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO on 11th April 2023 and payment effected on 17th May 2023. | |
| | | | Certificate no 2; dated 18th May 2023 for Ushs 30,090,989: Contract no. GULU603/WRKS/22-23/00002 Project; Construction of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Lapeta HCII by M/s Pathways Technical Services Ltd was certified by City Engineer and Environment Officer on 18th May 2023; CHO and CDO 19th May 2023 and payment effected on 28th June 2023. | |
| 3 | Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines. | c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0 | The variation in the contract price for sampled health infrastructure investments were all within +/-20%. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | <p>For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two units staff house at Lapeta HC II at a contract price of UGX 102,430,100 against the engineers estimates of UGX 104,000,067 giving the contract price variation of +0.005%. • Rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi HC II, at a contract price of UGX 22,693,524 against the engineers estimates of UGX 25,000,000 giving the contract price variation of +0.01%. • Rehabilitation of OPD at Oitino HC II at a contract price of 22,835,500 against the engineers estimates of 28,000,781 giving the contract price variation of UGX +0.02%. | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines. | d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY | In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the Deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards | a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure | A review of the staffing structure of Gulu City Council obtained from the Human Resources Office indicated that the City did not have any HC IV under its jurisdiction. Health Centres III were considered, which were 4 in number. There were 73 staff in place against the 220 per the staffing structure. | 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 | 73/220X100=33% | |
| | | | Therefore, the percentage of health facility workers was 33%. | |
| 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. | In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III. | 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

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

The Assessor reviewed the staff list from the CHO's office (dated 1st July 2023) and checked the staff lists, duty rosters and work attendance registers at each of the three sampled and visited health facilities.

It was established that the staff list from CHO's office was inconsistent with records of health workers at all the three health facilities. The results were as follows:

1. Bardege HC III: The DHO's staff list had 18 health workers while the health facility staff list (dated 23rd February 2023, signed by Nono Joyce – in-charge) had 19 health workers.

It is noteworthy that Audu Jesca Susan (health Assistant) was not on CHO's list but was on the health facility staff list. Surprisingly, Onencan George (Enrolled Nurse) was appearing on both lists but not on the duty roster for November 2023, and was not working at the health facility as established from the attendance register. From the interaction with the in-charge, it was revealed that Onencan was working at Alokolum HC II.

2. Layibi Techo HC III: The CHO's staff list had 17 health workers while the health facility staff list (not dated) had 16 health workers.

It was noted that Adiyoy Filder Loyce (Enrolled Midwife) was on CHO's list but not on health facility staff list, and was not working there. From the interaction with the in-charge, it was established that Adiyoy was working at CHO's office.

3. Aywee HC III: The CHO's staff list had 19 health workers while the health facility staff list (dated 15th February 2022) had 15 health workers (but the duty roster indicated 16 staff).

Notably, Labongo William Kenneth (Senior Clinical Officer) Omal James (Health Assistant) Faida Khadimala (Health Information Assistant) and Oniang Susan (Nursing Assistant) were on CHO's list but not on health facility's list. However, while Faida was not on the health facility's staff list, she was appearing on the duty roster. Moreover, from the review of the attendance register, it was noted that Omal and Faida were working at the health facility while Labongo and Oniang were not.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>From CHO's office, it was noted that there was no upgraded or constructed health facility in FY 2022/2023. This information was collaborated with the Annual PBS report for FY 2022/2023 (signed by the City Clark on 27th July 2023) and the information was confirmed as correct and accurate.</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>The Annual Work plans and Budgets for the FY 2023/2024 for the three sampled health facilities were reviewed and the submissions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardege HC III: submitted to the CHO on 10th July 2023. Work plan and budget was prepared by Nono Joyce (in-charge) on 5th July 2023 and endorsed by the Chairperson HUMC (Onyuta Albert Fill) on 5th July 2023. • Layibi Techo HC III: Submitted to the CHO on 5th May 2023. The work plan was prepared by Akello Alice (in-charge) on 16th February 2023 and endorsed by the Chairperson HUMC (Kitara Michael West) on 16th March 2023. • Aywee HC III: Annual WorkPlan and Budget was not available at the time of assessment. <p>It was established that only two out three health facilities submitted their Annual Work plans and Budgets to the CHO, albeit late, after March 31st of this year, contrary to the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that health facilities prepared and submitted to the CHO their Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY.</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 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

From the review of the health facility improvement plans for the sampled health facilities, it was noted one of the health facilities (Aywee HC III) did not submit a performance improvement plan (PIP).

Only two health facilities submitted their PIPs. These PIPs were reviewed and findings were as follows:

- **Bardege HC III:** submitted to the CHO on 10th July 2023. Work plan and budget was prepared by Nono Joyce (in-charge) on 05th July 2023 and endorsed by the Chairperson HUMC (Onyuta Albert Fill) on 5th July 2023.

The identified bottlenecks were low number of deliveries, low attendance for 4th ANC visit, low ART retention and poor TB contact tracing.

For each bottleneck, the plan indicated identified immediate, underlying and root causes, proposed solutions and activities to address the challenge.

- **Layibi Techo HC III:** Submitted to the CHO on 5th May 2023. The work plan was prepared by Akello Alice (in-charge) on 16th February 2023 and endorsed by the Chairperson HUMC (Kitara Michael West) on 16th March 2023.

The bottlenecks identified were low percentage of children completing immunization at one year, low number of deliveries at health facility and low PNC attendance.

The plan indicated identified immediate, underlying and root causes, proposed solutions and activities to address the challenge (page 35).

- **Aywee HC III:** PIP was not available at the time of assessment. The CHO could not provide an plausible explanation as to why the in-charge did not submit the PIP.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that health facilities submitted (100%) up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely.

The Assessor sampled three health facilities and reviewed all the monthly and quarterly HMIS reports (HMIS 105 and HMIS 106a respectively) for the FY 2022/2023.

The submissions of the three sampled health facilities were as follows:

Bardege HC III: HMIS 105:

- July 2022: 07/08/2022
- Aug 2022: 06/09/2022
- Sept 2022: 07/10/2022
- Oct 2022: 07/11/2022

- Nov 2022: 07/12/2022
- Dec 2022: 06/01/2023
- Jan 2023: 07/03/2023
- Feb 2023: 07/03/2023
- Mar 2023: 11/04/2023 (submitted late)
- April 2023: 08/05/2023 (submitted late)
- May 2023: 07/06/2023
- June 2023: 07/07/2023

Layibi Techo HC III: HMIS 105:

- July 2022: 16/08/2022 (submitted late)
- Aug 2022: 13/09/2022 (submitted late)
- Sept 2022: 06/10/2022
- Oct 2022: 07/11/2022
- Nov 2022: 07/12/2022
- Dec 2022: 05/01/2023
- Jan 2023: 06/02/2023
- Feb 2023: 07/03/2023
- Mar 2023: 06/04/2023
- April 2023: 05/05/2023
- May 2023: 06/06/2023
- June 2023: 07/07/2023

Aywee HC III: HMIS 105:

- July 2022: 07/08/2022
- Aug 2022: 07/09/2022
- Sept 2022: 06/10/2022
- Oct 2022: 07/11/2022
- Nov 2022: 07/12/2022
- Dec 2022: 06/01/2023
- Jan 2023: 07/02/2023
- Feb 2023: 07/03/2023
- Mar 2023: 05/04/2023
- April 2023: 05/05/2023
- May 2023: 12/06/2023 (submitted late)
- June 2023: 06/07/2023

Bardege HC III: HMIS 106a:

- Quarter 1: 06/10/2022
- Quarter 2: 07/01/2023
- Quarter 3: 12/04/2023 (submitted late)
- Quarter 4: 07/07/2023

Layibi HC III: HMIS 106a:

- Quarter 1: 06/10/2022
- Quarter 2: 06/01/2023
- Quarter 3: 06/04/2023
- Quarter 4: 07/07/2023

Aywee HC III: HMIS 106a:

- Quarter 1: 07/09/2022
- Quarter 2: 06/01/2022
- Quarter 3: 07/04/2023
- Quarter 4: 06/07/2023

Note: The City did not have the revised HMIS 104. HMIS 104 is NTDS MDA implementation report but not quarterly report as reflected in the assessment manual. The quarterly report was HMIS 106a, which is the old version.

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was a letter from the Ministry of Health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.

Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 6e) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.

0

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a letter from the Ministry of Health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 6f) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The City Council did not provide documentary evidence to show that they timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports to the Planner as required.</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>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the City developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the City implemented the Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City budgeted for health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.</p> <p>According to the City approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2023/2024 (page 27), it was noted that the city recurrent salary for health workers was UGX 1,505,054,000. This budgeted salary was for 113 health workers, including CHO's office (83.7%, see staff list dated 1st July 2023) out of 135 staffing norm as per the Health Sub Programme Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines for LGs, FY 2023/ 2024 (pages 72-84).</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>According to the deployment list dated 1st July 2023 (signed by the CHO, Dr. Okello Daniel), the City had 04 HC IIIs and 4 HC IIs. The City had deployed a total of 101 health workers out of 256 staffing norm as per the Health Sub Programme Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines for LGs, FY 2023/ 2024 (pages 80-84).</p> <p>Hence, $\frac{101}{256} \times 100 = 39.5\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">256</p> <p>Therefore, the deployed health workers were at 39.5%, which is below the scorable 75%.</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

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

The Assessor reviewed the deployment list from the CHO's office (dated 1st July 2023) and checked the staff lists, duty rosters and work attendance registers at each of the three sampled and visited health facilities.

It was established that the staff list from DHO's office was inconsistent with records of health workers working at each of the visited health facilities. The results were as follows:

1. Bardege HC III: The CHO's deployment list had 18 health workers while the health facility staff list (dated 23rd February 2023, signed by Nono Joyce - in-charge) had 19 health workers.

It is noteworthy that Audu Jesca Susan (health Assistant) was not on CHO's list but was on the health facility staff list. Surprisingly, Onencan George (Enrolled Nurse) was appearing on both lists but not on the duty roster for November 2023, and was not working at the health facility as established from the attendance register. From the interaction with the in-charge, it was revealed that Onencan was working at Alokolum HC II.

2. Layibi Techo HC III: The CHO's deployment list had 17 health workers while the health facility staff list (not dated) had 16 health workers.

It was noted that Adiyoy Filder Loyce (Enrolled Midwife) was on CHO's list but not on health facility staff list, and was not working there. From the interaction with the in-charge, it was established that Adiyoy was working at CHO's office.

3. Aywee HC III: The CHO's deployment list had 19 health workers while the health facility staff list (dated 15th February 2022) had 15 health workers (but the duty roster indicated 16 staff).

Notably, Labongo William Kenneth (Senior Clinical Officer) Omal James (Health Assistant) Faida Khadimala (Health Information Assistant) and Oniang Susan (Nursing Assistant) were on CHO's list but not on health facility's list. However, while Faida was not on the health facility's staff list, she was appearing on the duty roster. Moreover, from the review of the attendance register, it was noted that Omal and Faida were working at the health facility but Labongo and Oniang were not.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City had publicized health worker's deployment and disseminated this, as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities' notice boards.</p> <p>In each of the three sampled and visited health facilities (i.e Bardege HC III - staff list dated 23 February 2023, Layibi Techo HC III - staff list not dated and Aywee HC III - staff list dated 15th February 2022), the displayed lists, albeit not updated, indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, telephone numbers and gender.</p> | 2 |
| 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>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The reviewed staff files for In-charges indicated they were not appraised for FY 2022/2023.</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. 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>The reviewed staff files of health workers indicated they were not appraised for FY 2022/2023</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>There was no evidence provided that corrective actions were done based on the gaps identified during the appraisal sessions.</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 the City conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plan.</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 the Gulu City Council carried out training activities and documented these activities 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>From the CHO's office, a copy of the letter (dated 24th August 2023) from the City Clerk (Tolit James) to the Permanent Secretary, MoH on "Validation and reconciliation of health facilities in Gulu City for the generation of local government IPFs FY 2024/2025" was availed. The letter was received at the MoH registry on 29th August 2023. It was copied to the, RCC, Mayor and CHO. A list of 19 health facilities (both GoU and PNFP) receiving PHC NWR grants was attached.</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>The documentary evidence indicated that the City Council allocated 15% towards monitoring service delivery and management of City health services which was in line with the health sector grant as per the guidelines as per the computations below;</p> <p>The CHO's budget as per the Approved budget page 24 was Ushs 44,000,000 and the allocation was Ushs 6,650,500 which was 15%.</p> $6,650,500/44,000,000 \times 100 = 15\%$ | 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>There was evidence that the City Council made timely submission of warrants to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget the 4 quarters. as per the dates from the IFMS;</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrants direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 11th August 2022 which was 1 working day after MoFPED approved on 5th August 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 17th October 2022 which was the same day after MoFPED approved.</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 20th January 2023 which was 5 working days after MoFPED approved on 12th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 25th April 2023 which was 1 working day after MoFPED approved on 24th April 2023.</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>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>There was evidence that the City Council invoice and communicated PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities as per the verified transfer vouchers below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 was invoiced and communicated on 15th August 2022 after the release of funds from MoFPED on 12th August 2022 which was 1 working day.</p> <p>Quarter 2 was invoiced and communicated on 25th October 2022 after the release of funds from MoFPE 20th October 2022 which was 3 working days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 was invoiced and communicated on 20th January 2023 after release of funds from MoFPED on 17th January 2023 which was 3 working days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 was invoiced and communicated on 28th April 2023 after release of funds from MoFPED on 25th April 2023 which was 3 working days.</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>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City Council publicized on the notice boards all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED as below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 was publicised on 15th August 2022 which was more than 5 working days after the release of expenditure limits from MoFPED on 8th July 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 was displayed on 20th October 2022 which was 3 days after the release of the expenditure limits from MoFPED on 17th October 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 was publicized on 4th January 2023 which was 3 working days from the release of expenditure limits from MoFPED on 29th December 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 4 was publicized on 21st April 2023 which was 3 working days from the release of expenditure limits from MoFPED on 17th April 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>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 City Health Department implemented action (s) recommended by the CHT Quarterly performance review meeting(s).</p> <p>For example, review of Quarters three and four (combined) Performance Review Meeting minutes, dated 2nd August 2023, the meeting noted that St. Mary's Lacor Hospital catchment area for outreaches was not demarcated. The meeting recommended that St. Mary's Lacor Hospital should have its catchment area demarcated (Minute No. 7, recommendation No. 2, page 9). The minutes were recorded by Achan Christine (Stastician) and approved by Dr Okello Daniel (CHO).</p> <p>As a result, an Expanded Programme for Immunisation (EPI) micro-plan for St. Mary's Lacor Hospital FY 2023/2024 (dated 7th September 2023) was developed. It was prepared by Ojok Godfrey Kingston (Deputy Medical Director, Community Health Services) and approved by Dr. Odong Eminton Ayella (Medical director, St. Mary's Lacor Hospital). The micro-plan spelt out the outreach catchment areas for the hospital.</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>Review of the quarterly performance review meeting attendance lists indicated that health facility in charges and other key stakeholders like Deputy SAS, Mayor, Senior Planner, DISO, PHRO, CDOs, Deputy City Clark, City Secretary for Health, implementing Partners e.g Malaria Consortium among others.</p> <p>The meetings were held as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 meeting: held on 16th December 2022 (minutes prepared CHO on 19th December 2022). • Quarter 2 meeting: held on 24th March 2023 (minutes approved by CHO 27th April 2023 and received by the City Clark on 10th May 2023). • Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 meeting (combined): held on 6th July 2023 (minutes approved by CHO on 4th August 2023 and received by the City Clark on 5th August 2023). | 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>This indicator is not applicable. The City had no General hospital or HC IV.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score | <p>This indicator is not applicable. The City had no HSD to supervise lower level health facilities.</p> <p>However, it is worth noting that the City Health Office supervised these facilities in the previous FY (2022/2023) as follows.</p> <p>Quarter 1: Report not available at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Quarter 2: Report dated 13th December 2023 to the City Clark (not received) was compiled by the CHO (Dr Okello Daniel).</p> <p>Quarter 3: Report dated 30th March 2023 to the City Clark (not received) was compiled by the CHO (Dr Okello Daniel).</p> <p>Quarter 4: Report dated 4th July 2023 was compiled by Acaye Robert Nyero (Senior Clinical Officer), approved by the CHO (Dr Okello Daniel) on 6th July 2023 and received by the City Clark on 10th July 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>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 evidence that the City used results/ reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits.</p> <p>For example, in quarter four support supervision report (dated 4th July 2023), findings showed that new HUMC at Aywee HC III was not yet sworn in and trained. The supervision team recommended that the new HUMC should be sworn in and trained (page 3).</p> <p>To this end, a training was conducted from 24th to 25th October 2023, involving 36 participants. This evidence was established from a report (dated 28th October 2023) on "training of HUMC for HC III in Gulu City". The report was prepared by Topiny Geoffrey Onutta (Senior Health Educator) on 6 November 2023 and approved by the CHO (Dr Okello Daniel) on 6th November 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>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 the City provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies.</p> <p>The evidence was established from the activity reports. For example, in Quarter four report (dated 4th July 2023) on integrated supervision on Essential Medicines and Health Supplies (EMHS) Supervision Performance Assessment and Recognition Strategy (SPARS) conducted in HC IIIs indicated that health workers would rush in dispensing drugs, without paying due attention to the patients'/ clients' needs and concerns. The City Medicines Management supervisor guided health workers on how to dispense drugs and advised that they need to spend adequate time on prescription counselling.</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>The documentary evidence indicated that the City Council allocated 34% towards promotion and prevention activities which was in line with the health sector grant as per the guidelines as per the computations below;</p> <p>The CHO's budget as per the Approved budget page 27 was Ushs 44,000,000 and the allocation was Ushs 15,078,000 which was 30%.</p> <p>$15,078,000/44,000,000 \times 100 = 34\%$</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 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 the CHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.</p> <p>For example, from the review of minutes dated 07th November 2022, prepared by Adiyio Filder Loyce (AG. ACHO-MCCH) for the “second coordination meeting on round two polio campaign” held on 03rd November 2022, it was noted that CHT discussed issues relating to health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilisation (Min. 3/11/2022). The meeting agreed to have a radio talk show and a “road drive” on 04th November 2022 on prevention of polio campaign (Min. 4/11/2022).</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>There was evidence of follow up actions taken by the CHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues.</p> <p>The evidence was established from an activity report (dated 05th November 2022) on “radio talk show on Radio Choice on polio round two campaign”, aired on 04th November 2022 from 2:00pm to 3:00pm. From the report, it was noted that the importance of immunisation to young children and the need for school administrators to support polio campaign in schools, were discussed during the talk show. The Senior Health Educator (Topiny Geoffrey Onyuta) compiled the report.</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|----------|

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>At the time of assessment, there was no updated Assets register, which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to the basic standards.</p> | 0 |
|----|--|--|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that desk appraisals for the prioritized investments in the health sector implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were conducted</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that field appraisals for the prioritized investments in the health sector implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were conducted for technical feasibility; ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the health facility investments were screened for Environmental and Social risks and mitigation measures put in place for the FY 2023/2024.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>For FY 2023/2024, the health department submitted its procurement plans to PDU on the 20th April 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 no evidence that The LG health department submitted procurement request forms for FY 2023/2024 to PDU at the time of assessment. It was noted that the user department was still preparing the BOQ for the projects.</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>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investment for FY 2022/2023 were approved by the contracts committee. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two units staff house at Lapeta HC II, was approved by the Contracts Committee on 8th March 2023 under minute no Min.4GCCCC/8th March/2023 and awarded to M/S Pathways Technical Services Ltd at a contract price of UGX 102,430,100. • Rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi HC II, was approved by the Contracts Committee on 19th January 2023 under minute Min.4GCCCC/19th January 2023 and awarded to M/S DIN Engineering Ltd at a contract price of UGX 22,693,524. • Rehabilitation of OPD at Oitino HC II, was approved by the Contracts Committee on 19th January 2023 under minute No. Min.4GCCCC/19th January/2023 awarded to M/S JOkello 1976 Holdings Ltd at a contract price of UGX 22,835,500. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0 | A letter by Isaiah Tumwesigye the Ag City Clerk dated 10th February 2023 to Eng. Omara Christo Balmoyi appointing him as the project manager for Renovation of OPD at Oitino HC II and Renovation of OPD at Unyama HC II was presented. | 0 |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | If there is no project, provide the score | Appointment of the Contract Manager, Environment Officer, Community Development Officer, Labour Officer and the Clerk of Works was not presented. | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0 | In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III. | 1 |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | If there is no project, provide the score | | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0 | No evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the City Health Officer for each health infrastructure project was presented. | 0 |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | If there is no project, provide the score | | |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | 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 | In the amended consolidated annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 by Tolit James the deputy City Clerk dated 21st July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | If there is no project, provide the score | |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

There was evidence that the City Council carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly by relevant Officers.

For instance;

- For construction of two units staff house at Lapeta HC II, a progress report as of 18th May 2023 by Eng. Omara in which progress was reported as substructure-100, Preliminary-100% and superstructure - 0% was presented. A Certificate of Environmental Compliance to M/S Pathways Engineering Ltd for construction of Staff house at Lapeta HC III signed by Ocan Micheal the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer dated 15th May 2023 was presented.

- For rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi HC II (Project done in 1 month), a completion report by Eng. Omara dated 26th May 2023 in which progress was reported as 100% was presented. Minutes of site meeting no. 1 for renovation of one block of two units staff house attended by Oola Sunday the Assistant Engineer, Godfrey B Kisekka the City Town Clerk, and Dr. Okello Daniel the City health Officer in which the Assistant Engineer asked the contractor to make corrections to the door lock before handover was presented. A Certificate of Environmental Compliance to M/S ODENSBRIK Company Limited for Rehabilitation of Staff House at Layibi HC III signed by Ocan Micheal the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer dated 20th March 2023 was presented.

- For rehabilitation of OPD at Oitintimor HC II (Project was done in a month), a completion report dated 6th June 2023 by Eng. Omara in which progress was reported as 100% was presented. Minutes of site meeting no. 1 for renovation of one block of OPD at Oitintino Health Centre II held on 28th March 2022 and attended by Dr. Okello Daniel the City Health Officer, Oola Sunday the Assistant Engineer, Acan Joyce the Incharge Oitino HC in which the representative to the Assistant Engineer Sunday Oola instructed all the window fasteners to be corrected was presented. A Certificate of Environmental Compliance to M/S JOKELLO 1976 Holdings Limited for Rehabilitation of OPD at Oitintino HC II signed by Ocan Micheal the Environmental Officer and Geoffrey Lakwonyero the City Community Development Officer dated 2nd April 2023 was presented.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The sampled payment vouchers indicated that the DHO verified and initiated payments for contractors within the specified time frame (within 2 weeks or 10 working days after receiving payment requests) as indicated below;

Voucher Payment Vouchers 6430003 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 20,265,317: Contract no. GULU603/WRKS/2022/2023/00004; Project; Renovation of OPD at Unyama HCII by M/s DIN Engineering Co. Ltd. Invoice was raised on 29th May 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by DHO on 5th June 2023 which was 4 working days after receipt of payment request.

Voucher 6442118 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 20,347,193: Contract no. GULU603/WRKS/2022-2023/00005 Project; Renovation of 2 units Staff houses at Layibi Techo HCII by M/s Odens Brick Co Ltd invoice was raised on 24th May 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by DHO on 29th May 2023 which was 2 working days after receipt of payment request.

Voucher 5314913 dated 17th May 2023 for Ushs 20,393,887: GULU603/WRKS/2022-2023/00003 Project; Renovation works of OPD at Oitino HCII by M/s Jokello 1976 Holdings Ltd invoice was raised on 31st March 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by DHO on 5th April 2023 which was 2 working days after receipt of payment request.

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the procurement file for each health infrastructure contract was complete with all records required by the PPDA. For example;

- For construction of two units staff house at Lapeta HC II, procurement ref No: GULU603/WRKS/2022-2023/00006, the file had an evaluation report signed by Evaluation Committee on 8th March 2023 recommending award to M/S Pathways Technical Services Ltd at a contract price of UGX 102,430,100. The Contracts Committee approved the Evaluation Report on 8th March 2023 under minute Min.4GCCCC/8th March/2023 and contract between the parties was signed on 27th March 2023.

- Rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi HC II, Procurement ref: Gulu603/WRKS/2022-2023/00004, the file had an Evaluation Report dated 16th January 2023 recommending award to M/S Din Engineering Ltd at a contract price of UGX 22,693,524. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report on 19th January 2023 under minute Min.4GCCCC/19th January/2023 and contract between the parties was signed on 10th February 2023.

- For rehabilitation of OPD at Oitinotimor HC II, Procurement ref: Gulu603/Wrks/2022-2023/00001, the file had an Evaluation Report dated 16th January 2023 recommending award to M/S JOkello 1976 Holdings Ltd at a contract price of UGX 22,835,500. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report on 19th January 2023 under minute Min.4GCCCC/19th January/2023. The contract between the parties was signed on 10th February 2023.

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 a public health complaint.

Complaint reported on the 21st October 2022, by Robert a resident in Panyagira village. That there was too much dust affecting their businesses and homes from the USMID road construction. Many people were getting sick and they needed help. The complaint was reported to the Chairperson Grievance and he involved the committee. The committee then informed the Engineer and the Contractor. The contractor was tasked to keep sprinkling water on the road to reduce the dust which was done by the Contractor.

2

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a distribution list titled “Dissemination of Medical waste management guidelines to In-Charges” dated 25th May 2023. There were 8 In-Charges who received the guideline.</p> | 2 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Layibi Techo Health centre III had no incinerator and their medical waste was transported to the main hospital for further management. However, the HC had the rubbish pits and containers and a placenta pit. They had Annual work plan for FY 2023/2024 signed by the Town Clerk, prepared by the In-charge and endorsed by the Chairperson HUMC. They had budgeted for the compound maintenance at UGX1,282,000 and deep pit digging for rubbish at UGX 300,078.</p> <p>Oitino Health Centre II, had no incinerator but had the rubbish bins and pits for managing the rubbish and a placenta pit for emergency deliveries. There was a work plan “FY2023/2024 Work plan and Budget” this was signed by the City Health Officer, endorsed by the Chairperson – HUMC and prepared by Health Facility In-charge. The Health Centre budgeted for compound maintenance at a cost of UGX 150,000/</p> <p>Lapeta Health Centre II Had an incinerator for managing the medical waste and rubbish bins and the pits for burning the rubbish. The Health Centre had Annual comprehensive work plan FY 2023/24, signed by the City Health Officer, endorsed by Chairperson HUMC and prepared by the In-Charge. They had budgeted for the compound maintenance at UGX 960,000, health promotion and sanitation at UGX 1, 520,000</p> <p>There was no service provider for the medical waste management.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>A Report following training of Health Care Workers on proper health care waste management in the different Facilities, dated 16th January 2023. There were 4 Health centres III trained on waste management. The training was conducted between 4th to 13th of January 2023. One of the objectives of the training was to equip learners on the different types of waste management containers available in the health care system and equip participant with adequate knowledge on importance of source segregation of health care points to major collection points. The report was prepared by Ogwang Patrick – Ag. PHO-Environmental Health.</p> | 1 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the ESMPs were incorporated into the BoQ documents as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00006, Construction of one block of 2 units Health Staff house at Lapeta Health Centre II. In the preliminaries, item f – prepare proper land scaping, g – plant selected trees, h – Gender and HIV awareness and labling the project at a total cost of UGX 450,000. 2. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00003, Renovation of OPD at Oitino Health Centre II. In the preliminaries, Health, Safety, Environmental and Social Mainstreaming I tem g screening, f –provision of safety, g –Covid 19 sensitization, h – HIV/AIDs sensitization, I – seedlings and J - waste management, all had a total cost of UGX 1,464,000. 3. Gulu 603/Wrks/2022-2023/00004. For the Renovation of the two units’ staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III. under preliminaries, Health, safety, Environmental and Social Mainstreaming (E, F, G, H, I and J) had a total cost of UGX 16,600,000. | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment that the City had proof of land ownership where the following projects were implemented;</p> <p>Construction of one block of 2 units Health Staff house at Lapeta Health Centre II,</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Oitino Health Centre II,</p> <p>Renovation of the two units’ staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III.</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.

Environmental and social Compliance Joint Monitoring report projects under Health and Education for FY 2022-2023. The monitoring was conducted on 30th March 2023 with the objective of ensuring that the projects remain compliant with the existing Environmental and safety regulations and protocols, assess likely impacts of the project on environment and recommend the possible remedial measures. A team of 3 members conducted the monitoring which included; the Environment Officer, the City Engineer, Staff Surveyor and Principal Community Development Officer. The report was prepared by Ocan Michael Christopher - Environment Officer.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that certification forms for all the Health sector projects were completed and signed.

1. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Renovation of OPD at Oitino Health Centre II, dated 2nd April 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures. Payment Certificate (IPC) no.1 dated 11th April 2023, for the Renovation works of OPD at Oitino Health Center II. Certificate worth UGX 22,837,500. Signed by the City Engineer, City Health Officer, Internal Audit, The Environment Officer, PCDO, Town Clerk and CFO.

Payment was made on 17th May 2023, PV no. 5314913.

2. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Construction of staff house at Lapeta Health Centre II, dated 15th May 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures. Payment Certificate no.1 dated 18th May 2023, for the Construction of two-unit staff house at Lapeta Health Centre II. certificate worth UGX 102,430,100. Signed by the City Engineer, City Health Officer, Internal Audit, The Environment Officer, PCDO, Town Clerk and CFO.

Payment was made on 28th June 2023, PV no. 6436697.

3. Certificate of Environmental Compliance for the Construction of Renovation of two units' staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III, dated 20th May 2023 and signed by Environment Officer and City Community Development Officer. However, there was certificate initiated by the Engineer bearing all signatures. Payment Certificate (IPC) no.1 dated 29th May 2023, for the Renovation of two units' staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III. certificate worth UGX 22,785,210. Signed by the City Engineer, City Health Officer, Internal Audit, The Environment Officer, PCDO, Town Clerk and CFO. All signed on 30th May and 2nd June 2023.

Payment was made on 26th June 2023, PV no. 6442118.

**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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 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>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | <p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 | | | |
| 8 | <p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 | | | |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 | | | |
| 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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 | | | |
| <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</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>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| Investment Management | | | | |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>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>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 0 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA.</p> | 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 | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 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 | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0 | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0 | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |

15

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

Gulu City
Council Water
Sector was
being
managed by
National
Water &
Sewerage
Corporation
and therefore
ineligible for
the LGPA.

0

**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>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</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>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 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 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6 | c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6 | d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6 | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 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 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers | ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------|
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | 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 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 10 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | 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 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 10 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------|
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 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>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>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</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>Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 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 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of Principal Treasurer was substantively filled by Mr. Ojok Edward. He was appointed on 1st July 2007 through ref. letter CR/115/2 as was directed by DSC / EXT 3/2007 (F) | 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 | The position of Senior Planner was substantively filled by Mr. Luwa John Charles. He was appointed on promotion to Senior Economist on 12th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC 14/24/12/2022 (001) R. | 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 position of City Engineer was substantively filled by Mr. Omara Christo Balmoyi. He was appointed to the position on 1st March 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min.14/24/122022/022 (P) | 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. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Ocan Michael. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 /002 (P). | 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 | The position of Senior Veterinary Officer was substantively filled by Dr. Alikor Solomon. He was appointed on 25th July 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 29/30/06/2023/007 (I) | 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 | The position of Principal District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Onyango Richard. He was appointed on 23rd December 2010 through ref. letter CR/1001/2 as was directed by DSC Min 4/2010 (D). | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of Principal Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Komakech Nixon Atemo. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/035 (P) | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0. | The position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Obita Godfrey Joe. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/015 (P) | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Opio Edmond. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/016 (P) | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Okot Richard. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/044 (P). | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Ocan Michael. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 /002 (P). | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Senior Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Mukonyezi Evelyn. She was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/003 (P) | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Accountant was substantively filled by Mr. Otika Bob P Obwoya. He was appointed on 12th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 (021) (S) | 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 position of Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Mr. Otema Bosco. She was appointed on 25th July 2023 through GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 25/30/06/2023/001 (R) | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0 | The City Council had no substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary CSC) nor were there a seconded staff | 0 |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15 | a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure). | Gulu City Council had 2 Divisions namely; Bardege Layibi Division and Laroo Pece Division in the FY 2022/2023. All two positions of Senior Assistant Town Clerks were substantively recruited as below; 1. Mr. Oloya Gilbert appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/010 (P) for Bardege Layibi Division. 2. Mr. Opio Anthony Vincent appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/009 (P) for Laroo Pece Division. | 5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 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>Gulu City Council had 2 Divisions namely; Bardege Layibi Division and Laroo Pece Division in the FY2022/2023. The review of the staff files indicated that only 1 Community Development Officer was substantively recruited and posted to Bardege Layibi Division as below;</p> <p>1. Ms. Monday Ruth Buckley was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/029 (P) for Bardege Layibi Division</p> | 0 |
| 2 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p> | <p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p> | <p>Gulu City Council had 2 Divisions namely; Bardege Layibi Division and Laroo Pece Division in the FY2022/2023. It had 4 substantively recruited Senior Account Assistants (SAA) as follows:</p> <p>1. Mr. Labalpiny Francis was appointed on 3rd May 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 (005) (R) and posted to Bardege Layibi Division</p> <p>2. Mr. Ocen Mark Francis was appointed on 3rd May 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 (013) (R) and posted to Gulu City Council headquarters</p> <p>3. Mr. Ajore Andrew was appointed on 12th January through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 (009) (R) and posted to Gulu City Council headquarters</p> <p>4. Mr. Odaki Benson was appointed on 3rd May 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022 (009) (R) and posted to Laroo Pece Division.</p> | 5 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the City Council released 53% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;</p> <p>The budgeted amount was Ushs 436,044,000 amount released was Ushs 232,792,000 (Final A/cs FY 2022/23-page 16), thus leaving a balance of the planned amount of Ushs 203,792,900. Therefore, the % released was;</p> $(232,792,000 / 436,044,000) \times 100 = 53\%$ <p>The City Council did not release all the funds as planned hence being compliant.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the City Council released 78% for Community Based Services as per the computation below.</p> <p>The budgeted amount was Ushs 386,360,880 amount released was Ushs 300,633,143 (Final A/cs FY 2022/23-page 14) leaving a balance of Ushs 85,727,737. Therefore, the % released was;</p> $(300,633,143 / 386,360,880) \times 100 = 78\%$ <p>The City Council did not release all the funds as planned, hence not being compliant.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>There were no USMID projects screened for Environmental, Social and Climate Change in the FY 2022/2023 or even initiated except for completion, for instance</p> <p>Ref no. Arua, Gulu, Kitgum/wrks/USMID-AF/2021-2022/00001, Civil work for construction of Go down Road (0.893km) in Gulu, which commenced on 25th January 2022.</p> | 4 |
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0</p> | <p>No ESIA report was required since there were no projects initiated in the FY 2022/2023 except for completion.</p> | 4 |
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p> | <p>There were no USMID projects with costed ESMPs in the FY 2022/2023, the project that was seen was under completion.</p> <p>For instance, there was one project Ref no. Arua, Gulu, Kitgum/wrks/USMID-AF/2021-2022/00001, Civil work for construction of Go down Road (0.893km) in Gulu, which commenced on 25th January 2022.</p> | 4 |

Financial management and reporting

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----------|
| 5 | <p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p> | <p>The LG's audit opinion for FY 2022/2023 was unqualified.</p> | 10 |
| 6 | <p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>The evidence provided indicated that the City Council provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY as the submission letter dated 7th March 2023 was received by MoFPED on 29th March 2023.</p> <p>The submission date was far beyond the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p> | <p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | <p>The City Council submitted the annual performance contract on 4th July 2023 which was before August 31st of the current FY. Hence being compliant.</p> | 4 |
| 8 | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | <p>The City Council submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on 27th July 2023, which was before the mandatory time frame of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p> | 4 |

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

Maximum score is 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

The City Council submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below.

Quarter 1: the QBPR was submitted on 3rd January 2023

Quarter 2: the QBPR was submitted on 26th September 2023

Quarter 3: the QBPR was submitted on 31st May 2023

Quarter 4: the QBPR was submitted on 27th July 2023

From the above submission dates the City Council submitted the 4th QBPR before the mandatory date of August 31 of the current Financial Year.

**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 position of City Education Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Irwenyo Richard. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/023 (P) | 30 |
| <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | | | | |
| 1 | New Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | The position of Senior Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Ms. Atim Grace Fiona. She was appointed Senior Inspector of Schools on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/025 (P). | 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: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | <p>There was evidence that Gulu City carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for Education Projects. 3 projects were sampled as below:</p> <p>1. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo primary school, dated 25th March 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.</p> <p>Commencement date 14th March 2023</p> <p>ESMP for Construction of one block of two classrooms at Kweyo primary school. This had a total cost of UGX 300,000 for awareness creation on dangers of child labour, gender based violence/HIV/AIDs, proper waste management etc.</p> <p>2. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Completion of three classroom block at Christ the King Demonstration school, dated 15th February 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.</p> <p>Commencement date 10th February 2023.</p> | 15 |
| <i>The Maximum score is 30</i> | | | | |

ESMP for Completion of three classroom block at Christ the King Demonstration primary school. This had a total cost of UGX 300,000 for awareness creation on dangers of child labour, gender based violence/HIV/AIDs, proper waste management etc.

3. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Construction of Girls Dormitory at Mary Immaculate primary school, dated 20th April 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.

Commencement date 30th March 2023.

ESMP for Construction of Girls Dormitory at Mary Immaculate primary school. This had a total cost of UGX 300,000 for re-vegetation, awareness creation on dangers gender based violence/HIV/AIDs, proper waste management etc.

2

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

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

According to the NEMA guidelines annex 2c or A guide to the Environment Impact Assessment Process in Uganda by Kenneth Kakuru Annex 1 – September 2001, these projects were not in the list of those that required ESIAs, therefore no ESIAs was done.

Also the projects did not envisage any adverse social and irreversible significant environmental impacts.

The Maximum score is 30

15

**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. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0 | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0. | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place 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 of City Health Officer was substantively filled by Dr. Okello Daniel. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/037 (P) | 30 |
| 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 of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Ocan Michael Christopher. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/002 (P). | 20 |
| 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> | j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0 | The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Mr. Topiny Geoffrey Onyutta. He was appointed on 10th January 2023 through ref. letter GCC/CR/156/2 as was directed by CSC Min 14/24/12/2022/038 (P) | 20 |

Environment and Social Requirements

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that Gulu City carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for all the Health sector projects. The following are the 3 sampled projects:

1. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Rehabilitation of OPD at Oitino Health Centre II, dated 23rd February 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.

Commencement date 14th March 2023.

ESMP for Rehabilitation of OPD at Oitino parish, Badege – Layibi Division (Oitino Health Centre II). This had a total cost of UGX 330,000 for awareness creation on teenage pregnancy, proper waste management etc.

2. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Construction of two units' staff house at Lapeta Health Centre III, dated 15th February 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.

Commencement date 14th March 2023

ESMP for the Construction of two units staff house at Lapeta Health Centre II.. This had a total cost of UGX 300,000 for awareness creation on teenage pregnancy, proper waste management, revegetation etc.

3. Environment and Climate Change Screening Form for the Rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III, dated 25th February 2023. This was signed by Ocan Michael Christopher – Environment Officer and Lakwonyero Geoffrey – Acting Principle Community Development Officer.

Commencement date 1st April 2023

ESMP for the Rehabilitation of staff house at Layibi Techo Health Centre III. This had a total cost of UGX 300,000 for awareness creation on HIV/AIDs, waste disposal Re-vegetation etc.

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

Maximum score is 30

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

According to the NEMA guidelines annex 2c or A guide to the Environment Impact Assessment Process in Uganda by Kenneth Kakuru Annex 1 - September 2001, these projects were not in the list of those that require ESIAs, therefore no ESIAs was done.

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|---|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i> | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i> | If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0. | Gulu City was not eligible for MSI projects implementation. | 0 |

**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. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0. | Gulu City Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for the LGPA. | 0 |

Environment and Social Requirements

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