



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Kaabong District

(Vote Code: 559)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	50%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	55%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	67%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	76%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	79%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	56%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the District implemented one project using DDEG funding and it was in use at the time of assessment.</p> <p>1. Renovation of Sidok administration block at Ushs 40,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 40. Approved Budget on page 101.</p>	<b>4</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>A copy of the result assessment provided by OPM indicated that the score for FY 2022/2023 was N/A while the score for current FY was 78%. Since there was no baseline results, the LG scores a zero.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 and was all completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>1. Renovation of Sidok administration block at Ushs 40,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 40. Approved Budget on page 101.</p>	<b>3</b>
3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 and was all completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>1. Renovation of Sidok administration block at Ushs 40,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 40. Approved Budget on page 101.</p>	<b>2</b>

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The project sampled was -2% within +/- 20% the acceptable variation and it therefore complied.  Project: Renovation of Sidok administration Block  Procurement Ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00015  Project:  Estimated cost: Ugx 40,000,000/=  Contract Cost: Ugx 39,200,000/=  Variation Ugx 800,000/=  % age variation (800,000/40,000,000) x 100% = 2%	2
---	--	--	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	A comparison of the LG staff list with the LLG staff lists for the 3 LLGs visited (Kathile Sub County, Lodiko Sub County and Kaabong Town Council) showed that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance the following staff were found in Kathile Sub County;  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abura Catherins- SAS</li> <li>2. Longoli Ignatious- Parish Chief</li> <li>3. Lokopu Micheal Jackson- Parish Chief</li> <li>4. Lokol MARY Jesca- Parish</li> <li>5. Nachiam Johnson- Parish Chief</li> <li>6. Odong James- Accounts Assistant</li> <li>7. Akitui Miriam Extension Worker</li> </ol>	2
4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.  <b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b>	There was no evidence of completion reports for the DDEG project implemented that was availed to the assessment team.	0

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;  If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs  score 4 or else 0  <b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b>	The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;  <table border="0" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">DLG IVA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Kathile South S/C</td> <td style="text-align: center;">87</td> <td style="text-align: center;">55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lodiko S/C</td> <td style="text-align: center;">94</td> <td style="text-align: center;">89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kathile T/C</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kaabong East S/C</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> <td style="text-align: center;">96</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> The performance of three LLGs was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.		DLG IVA		Kathile South S/C	87	55	Lodiko S/C	94	89	Kathile T/C	58	81	Kaabong East S/C	85	96	<b>0</b>
	DLG IVA																		
Kathile South S/C	87	55																	
Lodiko S/C	94	89																	
Kathile T/C	58	81																	
Kaabong East S/C	85	96																	

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	There was evidence the Kaboong District Local Government had a performance improvement plan for at least 30% of the lowest-performing lower local government. The activity was conducted on 29th September 2023, a collaborative effort between CAO's Office, Planning Unit and the members of assessment team.	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG implemented the PIP for the 30% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY. These LLGs were mentored in respective performance measures as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Functionality of parish Administrative Structures included Kathile, Labongia, Sidok, Lolelia and South Lotim. Proposed activity was functionalizing of the PDCs/WDCs.</li> <li>2. Planning and Budgeting included Lobongia, Lolila south, Kaabong West, Lotim, Kathile Town council, Sidok, Kalapata T/c, Timu, Kathile south, Kathile, Kaabong T/c, Loyoro and Kakamar. The proposed activity was to conduct annual planning and budgeting as per the guidelines and the modality was to disseminate the guidelines. Responsible personnels were CFO, Planner, CDO and SAS/T.C.</li> </ol> <p>General recommendations were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to prioritize this activity and ensure adequate transport facilities are provided to the teams.</li> <li>- LLG lead persons (SAS/TCs) need to be prepared early to ease interface with the assessors.</li> </ul> <p>The report was signed and acknowledged by the CAO.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide evidence that the LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide evidence that the District had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI)</p>	0

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had 9 Heads of Departments however only 3 appraisals were provided as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eladu Fredrick, DPO was appraised on 28th June 2023 by CAO Kiplangat Martin</li> <li>2. Ojok Jimmy, DCDO was appraised on 7th July 2023 by CAO Kiplangat Martin</li> <li>3. Nalibe Sharif Ag. DHO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by CAO Wamburu Soita Emmanuel</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. On 11th May 2023 the committee met and handled a number of cases including; Adupa Emmanuel- Enrolled Nurse at Kaabong General Hospital for abscondment, Obwor Bosco- Enrolled Nurse whose interdiction on rounds of mismanaging public drugs was lifted and Nayet Jolly Josephine a Deputy Head Teacher at Police Primary school who had been interdicted for abuse of office and food theft but also had the interdiction lifted.</p> <p>The LG's rewards and sanctions committee constituted;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shainen Nelson, Deputy COA- Chairperson</li> <li>2. Sangar Santana, Ag. DEO- Member</li> <li>3. Ojok Jimmy Ayen, DCDO- Member</li> <li>4. Nalibe Sharif, DHO- Member</li> <li>5. Nanyia Rebecca, HRO- Secretary</li> <li>6. Logira Sam, CFO - Member</li> </ol>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided by the HR department that the LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional.</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>100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY had accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. For instance on 1st July 2023, the LG had recruited 33 Head Teachers and they all accessed the payroll in August 2023.</p>	1

9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	The HR department did not provide evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. The Leeters showing the effective retirement date for the ritirees were not provided.	0
---	---	--	---	---

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

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;  Kaabong East received Ushs 19,115,370  Kaabong T/C received Ushs 24,940,224  Kaabong West received Ushs 19,115,370  Kakamar S/C received Ushs 16,169,598  Kalapata S/C received Ushs 17,432,073  Kamion S/C received Ushs 4,807,335  Kathile received Ushs 10,418,331  Kathile S received Ushs 24,165,258  Lodiko S/C received Ushs 13,784,925  Lolelia S/C received Ushs 9,997,506  Lotim S/C received Ushs 23,017,539  Loyoro S/C received Ushs 9,155,856  Sidok S/C received Ushs 11,821,077  Kalapata T/C received Ushs 2,258,367  Kathile T/C received Ushs 2,258,367  Lobongia S/C received Ushs 2,983,764  Lolelia South received Ushs 2,983,764  Morungole S/C received Ushs 2,983,764  Timu S/C received Ushs 2,983,764  The direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY were as follows:  In quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG  In quarter 2: Release was on 24th October, 2022.  In quarter 3: Release was on 18th January, 2023.  In quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.	2
----	--	--	--	---

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	There was evidence that the LG did Not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>Quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 25th October, 2022, warrant was made in 22 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January, 2023 and warranted on 23th January, 2023 which was 21 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.</p>	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done however it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 24th October, 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 18th January, 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4, LG didn't receive DDEG funds.</p>	
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	Evidence provided indicated that the LG did mentoring and supervision reports. However, the supervision report for quarter one was not on file.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Q 1 - Planner noted that she could trace on the computer. However, she was certain that it was conducted.</p> <p>Q 2 report was done from 22nd November 2022 to 24th November, 2022.</p> <p>Q 3 mentoring report was done from 27th March 2023 to 29th March 2023.</p> <p>Q 4 mentoring report was done from 13th June 2023 to 15th June 2023</p>	



11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the Chairperson Lokol Jino Jesmien</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one report was discussed on 15th October 2022 - TPC- MIN.06/DTPC/Oct/2022:Presentation of Q1 Monitoring report and Support supervision actions.</li> <li>2. Quarter two report was discussed on 11st February 2023- MIN.05/Feb/2023: Presentation of Q2 Monitoring report and Support supervision actions.</li> <li>3. Quarter three report was discussed on 25th April 2023- TPC- MIN.04/DTPC/2023: Presentation of Q3 Monitoring report and Support supervision actions implemented.</li> <li>4. Quarter four report was discussed on 17th June 2023- TPC- MIN.05/06/DTPC/2023:Presentation of Q4 support supervision report.</li> </ol>	2
----	---	---	---	---

### Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>A review of the assets register presented by the CFO indicated that the register did not conform to the requirements as set on page 167 of the Accounting Manual 2007 as indicated below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Motor cycle registration Nos. UG2601A and UG2604A did not have the date of acquisition, there was also no provision for recording chassis and engine Nos.</li> <li>2. - The register did not have any information on land and buildings recorded in it.</li> </ol>	0
----	---	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG provided the Board of Survey report dated 28th August 2022 with the evidence showing presentation for review during the assessment to show that assets management decisions like boarding off had been taken based on the report. The advert for the disposal of public assets under the public Bidding method was presented at the time of assessment and the planned disposal schedule were as follows;</p> <p>Publish bid notice was dated on 1st November 2021, Bid closing was dated on 19th November 2021, Evaluation was dated on 23rd – 25th November 2021, Display of BEB within 5 working days from contract committee approval of evaluation report.</p>	<b>1</b>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional physical planning committee and had produced and submitted four reports to zonal office as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 Minutes dated 29th July 2022 was submitted on 2nd January 2023 as per the stamp from Moroto zonal land office</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 minutes dated 30th December 2022 was submitted on 2nd January 2023 as per the stamp from Moroto zonal land office</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 minutes dated 30th March 2023 was submitted on 7th April 2023 as per the stamp from Moroto zonal land office.</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 minutes dated 27th June 2023 was submitted on 30th June 2023 as per the stamp from Moroto zonal land office.</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. The DDEG project was desk appraised on 13th July 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP, and availability of funds in the Approved budget.</p> <p>- Renovation of Sidok Administration Block at 40,000,000 and the project was recommended for field appraisal.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social customized design for investment projects. The project field appraisal was conducted on 18th July 2022 for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <p>- Renovation of Sidok Administration Block at 40,000,000 and the project was recommended for funding and implementation.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed in a meeting that was held on 13rd March 2023 at the Planning Unit Board under TPC Min 05/DTPC/2023 Presentation of Project Profiles for FY 2023-24 by District Planner.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG carried out screening for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures for the constructions however, monitoring using checklists was not adhered to. Below were some of the projects from the respective sectors that were screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Renovation of Sidok Administration block on 9th August, 2022</li> <li>2. Borehole drilling at Lopedo, Lodiko on 26th May, 2022</li> <li>3. Construction of a staff house at Lokwakaramoe primary school on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>4. Micro scale irrigation at Kaabong Town council on 15th March, 2023</li> <li>5. Construction of a general ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCII on 29th March, 2023</li> </ol>	<b>0</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a planned infrastructure project to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG funding, this was completion of the General ward at Kalapatta Health Centre III at Ugx 120M. This was as per the approved procurement plan that was signed on 30th June, 2023 by, CAO, Kiplangat Martin.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were Contracts committee minutes for the sitting on 21st March, 2023 that approved the evaluation report and contract award in minute 04/Nov/Dcc/2023-2024.</p>	<b>1</b>

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 evidence that a project implementation team had been properly established in a letter dated 28th October, 2022 ,signed by the CAO. The persons named to the team were;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marak Jenniffer Lomongin Planner - Contract manager</li> <li>• Ms Koriang Esther SAS- Project Manager</li> <li>• Lokwang Albine-Clerk of works</li> <li>• Lomongin Emmanuel - Environment officer</li> <li>• Mrs. Achii Christine Lodu – Senior Community Development Officer</li> <li>• Aree Francis Almedia- Labour officer.</li> </ul> This was as per sector guidelines	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence seen that the DDEG project implemented followed the technical design provided by the LG Engineer. This was observed at Sidok Administration block where the windows of the building were glazed steel casement of size 1.5 x 1.5 m, the doors 1.2 x 2.4 m made from partial glass and solid steel, while a ramp into the hall for disabled persons was also provided.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	A report dated 14th June, 2023 by the assistant engineering officer was seen that showed that supervision by the technical officers was done before verification and certification of works in the previous FY.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The LG verified, certified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract, as was in a claimed raised on 6th June, 2023 of Ugx 39,200,000/=, by Karamoja Trotters limited, this was verified and certified on 15th June, by the DE, CDO, Environment officer and payment was done on 28th June, 2023 of Ugx 33,163,200/= in voucher No 6432034.	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had a complete procurement file in place for the contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The file reviewed was;  Project: Renovation of Administration Block at Sidok sub-county  Procurement Ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00015, had these documents;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 18th February, 2023 with Karamoja Trotters limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 17th January, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 25th January, 2023..</li> <li>• PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, payment records among other documents on file.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.  Score: 2 or else score 0	The District i) designated Mr. Lolem Paul the Human Resource Officer with an appointment letter issued on 3rd March, 2022 to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) of members constituting of all Senior Assistant Secretaries and all Town Clerks with an appointment letter dated 3rd March, 2022.	<b>2</b>
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was a complaints log availed where complaints were recorded however, there was no complaint arising from project work that was recorded in the respective financial years of assessment.	<b>2</b>

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 no record availed at the time of assessment that showed that the grievance redress mechanism was publicized for aggrieved parties to know where to report and get redress</p>	0
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>A review of the DDP III and AWP &amp; budget showed that Climate change and the environment are integrated in DDP III on page 18, AWP on page 13 and the approved budget on page 100 which included wetland management, tree planting, training farmers in smart agriculture, etc.</p> <p>Community and mindset change, reducing negative cultural practices and attitudes as an intervention on Social issues is also found on page 26 of LG DDP III, AWP on page 2, and Approved Budget on page 111.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines. A meeting held on 12th May 2023 in the Planning Unit Boardroom under MIN no 4/DTPC/05/2023: Dissemination of DDEG guidelines for FY 2023/24 to LLGs by the District Planner.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the renovation of Sidok Administration block a DDEG project which was also integrated into the BoQs at a total cost of UGX 39,260,000 with Bill No. 2 under Preliminaries, item 1 and Element 1 item A, B and D costed at UGX 2,000,000 as environmental and social safeguards.</p>	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 with costing of the additional impact from climate change that had been budgeted for in the financial years of assessment.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence for proof of land ownership for projects implemented using the DDEG funds.	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports as indicated in the reports below for example;  1. Inspection report for the small micro scale irrigation at Losera village, Kamion sub county dated 30th June, 2023  2. Monitoring report on the drilling and installation of 8 boreholes and 5 production wells conducted between 25th May to 13th June, 2023  3. Monitoring report on the construction of the general ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCII, staff house for health workers at Lolelia south, staff house with 2 stance latrine at Lobongia HCII, renovation of OPD at Meus HCII, renovation of doctor's staff house at Kaabong hospital dated 4th May, 2023.	<b>1</b>



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

The Environment Officer and CDO did not comply to completing and signing on all the certifications prior to payments of contractors invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example there were projects where they were compliant and others where they would not comply to signing as shown in the examples below;

1. Interim and completion payment certification forms issued on 20th June, 2022 and 14th December, 2022 respectively for the construction of a 4-unit staff house with a 2 stance latrine at Morulem HCIII were signed by both the Environment Officer and the CDO.
2. Completion payment certification forms issued on 16th June, 2022 for the construction of a kitchen with store at Lotim primary school was signed by only the CDO
3. Completion payment certificate issued on 18th May, 2023 for the hydrological surveys of 8 boreholes and 5 production wells was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO

## Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to the Assessment Team as detailed below;</p> <p>A/c name: Kaabong District UWEP Recovery</p> <p>A/c No: 9030013350271</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Ltd</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 4,524,050.</p> <p>A/c name: Kaabong District YLP Recovery</p> <p>A/c No: 9030009592147</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 5,372,700</p> <p>A/c name: Kaabong Direct General Fund</p> <p>A/c No: 9030005822482</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 61,470,242.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 15th October, 2022.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 15th January 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 15th May 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 30th July 2023.</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 LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC through the registry on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows:</p> <p>Quarter one report was received on 17th October 2022.</p> <p>Quarter two report was received on 16th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter three report was received on 16th May 2023.</p> <p>Quarter Four report was received on 1st September 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>The reports were submitted through the registry as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quarter 1 on 17th October 2022</li> <li>- Quarter 2 on 16th January 2023</li> <li>- Quarter 3 on 16th May 2023</li> <li>- Quarter 4 on 1st September 2023</li> </ul> <p>Only Quarter one and Quarter two reports were reviewed by PAC as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one was reviewed during PAC meeting held on 25th October, 2022 at District Production Office.</li> <li>2. Quarter two was reviewed during PAC meeting held on 31st January, 2023 in Production Office.</li> <li>3. Quarter three and Quarter four reports are not yet discussed by the LG PAC at the time of assessment.</li> </ol>	0

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 229,348,117 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 35) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 229,348,117 which gave a variance of Ushs 0 this indicate that District local Government collected actual revenue of what they had planned for.</p> <p><math>(0/229,348,117) \times 100\% = 0\%</math></p> <p>The LG corrected actual amount of revenue of what they had planned for.</p>	2
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 35was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 262,950,491</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 229,348,117</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 229,348,117- Ushs 262,950,491= Ushs (33,602,374)</p> <p><math>= (33,602,374)/262,950,491 \times 100= (12\%)</math></p> <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 decreased by 12% compared to the last year collection.</p>	0

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

The shareable revenue of Ugx 118,846,738 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:

Kaabong East received Ushs 2,600,000

Kaabong T/C received Ushs 84,832,238

Kaabong West received Ushs 1,000,000

Kakamar received Ushs 515,000

Kalapata received Ushs 2,000,000

Kamion received Ushs 1,050,000

Kathile received Ushs 1,500,000

Kathile South received Ushs 1,500,000

Lodiko received Ushs 2,500,000

Lolelia received Ushs 4,100,000

Lotim received Ushs 500,000

Loyoro received Ushs 3,607,000

Sidok received Ushs 3,822,000

Kalapata T/C received Ushs 5,000,000

Kathile T/C received Ushs 2,200,000

Lobongia received Ushs 500,000

Lolelia South received Ushs 600,000

Morungole received Ushs 500,000

Timu received Ushs 520,000.

## Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“BEST EVALUATED BIDDER</p> <p>Procurement Reference: Kaab839/SRVC/2023-2024/00004</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: Hydrological Survey of 9 Boreholes And 2 Production Wells At Selected Sites in Kaboong District</p> <p>Method of Procurement: Open Domestic Bidding</p> <p>Best Evaluated Bidder: Geobot group limited</p> <p>Total Contract Price: UGX 42,350,200/= V.A.T Inclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 6th November, 2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 20th November, 2023</p>	<b>2</b>
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A copy of LG performance assessment results dated 20th July 2023, labelled Notice board was availed during the assessment. The LG was ranked No. 76 with percentage score of 50%.</p>	<b>2</b>
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 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.</p>	<b>0</b>
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal dated 4th August 2023 on the notice board endorsed by the Deputy CAO Shaineh Nelson indicating the tax rates and charging policies.</p>	<b>1</b>

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

A review of various documents, including the communication file, the Minutes of Council, among others did not return evidence that the IGG made recommendation on alleged fraud and corruption cases during the previous FY.

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was 753</p> <p>Total absentees were 25</p> <p>Total that sat were (753 - 25) =728</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&amp;3) = 18+362+162 =542</p> <p>Pass rate =( 542)x 100 = 74.5%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">728</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 678</p> <p>Total absentees were =21</p> <p>Total that sat were (678 -2 1) = 657</p> <p>Total grades (1,2&amp; 3)= 10 +294 +150 = 454</p> <p>% pass rate= (454) x 100 =69.1%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">657</p> <p>% Change = 69.1 - 74.5 = -5.4 %</p>	<b>0</b>



1

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

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered was =  
206

Total absentees were =00

Total that sat were = 206

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 6 +31 +72 =  
109

Pass rate =  $109 \times 100 = 53\%$

206

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was =  
256

Total absentees were =04

Total that sat were (256 - 4) =252

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 12 +47+ 81  
=140

% pass rate=  $140 \times 100 = 55.5\%$

252

% change =  $55.5 - 53 = 2.5 \%$

2

2

N23\_Service Delivery  
Performance: Increase  
in the average score in  
the education LLG  
performance  
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

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

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

The average score of education LLG  
performance increased by 1%  
compared to the last year as per the  
computation below;

The average score for the current year  
was 79%.

The average score for the previous  
financial year was 78%

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

$= (0.79 - 0.78 / 0.78) * 100\% = 1\%$

The Education LLG performance  
assessment for the current year  
increased by 1% from the previous  
year's performance.

1

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

DLG did receive Sector Development  
Grant Ushs 1,267,803,000 for FY  
2022/2023. was used towards;

1. - Construction of a dormitory at Kakamar Primary School at Ushs 104,500,000.
2. - Completion of Toroi staff house at Ushs 19,000,000.
3. - Construction of kitchen and stores at Nariamaoi Primary School at Ushs 38,000,000.
4. - Construction of kitchen and store at Nachukunet Primary School at Ushs 38,000,000
5. - Construction of staff house at Loteteleit Primary School at Ushs 104,500,000.
6. - Construction of staff house at Lokwakaramoi Primary School at Ushs 114,000,000.
7. - Completion of dormitory at Pajar primary school at Ushs 38,000,000.
8. - Renovation of classroom block at Pajar primary school at Ushs 30,000,000.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DEO, Environment Officer, and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors.

1. - Voucher no 4243826 dated 9th March 2023 for Ushs 24,025,892; Certificate No 1, dated 1st February 2023; Contract No.Kaab839/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of Boys Dormitory at Kakamar Primary School was certified by DEO on 2nd February 2023, District Environment Officer on 2nd February 2023, district Engineer on 19th June 2023 and DCDO on 2nd February 2023, payment was initiated on 2nd February 2023 and payments were made on 9th March 2023 which was within the time frame.
2. - Voucher no 5132223 dated 3rd June 2023 for Ushs 34,339,986, Certificate No 1, dated 27th March 2023; Contract No.Kaab839/WRKS/2022-23/00003, Project; Construction of Staff House at Loteteleiet Primary School was certified by DEO on 30th March 2023, District Environment Officer on 27th March 2023, district Engineer on 27th March 2023 and DCDO on 27th March 2023, payment was initiated on 7th March 2023 and payments were made on 3rd May 2023 which was within the time frame.
3. - Voucher no 5903908 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 17,608,550, Certificate No 3, dated 23rd May 2023; Contract No.Kaab559/WRKS/2022-23/00002, Project; Construction of a Four Unit Staff House at Lokwakaramoe Primary School was certified by DEO on 30th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 26th May 2023, district Engineer on 23rd May 2023 and DCDO on 23rd May 2023, payment was initiated on 16th May 2023 and payments were made on 15th June 2023 which was within the time frame.

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

Three projects sampled were +1.44%  
within +/- 20% acceptable variation and  
therefore complied.

The projects sampled were;

Project 1: Construction of a boys  
Dormitory at Kakamar primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-  
2023/00004

Project 2: Construction of a 4-unit staff  
house at loteteleit primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-  
2023/00003

Project 3: Construction of a 4-unit staff  
house at Lokwakaramoe primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-  
2023/00005

Project 1:

Estimated cost: Ugx 104,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 104,000,000/=

Variation: Ugx 0/=

%age variation 0%

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 104,500,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 103,000,000/=

Variation cost: Ugx 1,500,000/=

%age variation  
 $(1,500,000/104,500,000) \times 100\%$   
=1.44%

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 114,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 112,  
387,474/=

Variation cost: Ugx 1,612,526/=

%age variation (  
 $1,612,526/114,000,000) \times 100\% =$   
1.41%

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	From quarter four report on page 19 the expenditure for education infrastructure was at 91%, of the budgeted amount for development expenditure in the year 2022-2023.	1
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	Kaboong LG current primary Teacher’s staff list indicated a total of 334 teachers posted in the 32 UPE schools which was an average indicator as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines out of the budgeted teacher’s structure of 550.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	$334 \times 100$ $= 60.72\%$	
			This implied that the LG was 39.27% less of the required UPE teachers.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG Consolidated Assets register for Kaabong LG 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 32 registered primary schools and 2 secondary schools was in place consisting of the following ; 230 classrooms, 279 latrine stances , 2768 desks, 235 teachers houses and 9 laboratories’ prepared by the DLG education office	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	This implies that 15 of 32 schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format .	
			$15 \times 100$ $= 46.8\%$	

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p>	<p>The DLG teacher's deployment list from the DEO'S office dated 23rd July 2023 matched with that one found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>At Kalapata primary school taken as rural the list had 10 teachers listed on the list posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Mr. Kolong Jino Ambrose as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the DEO.</p>	
			<p>Kalongor Primary School taken as semi urban School the list indicated 12 teachers with Logwee Samuel Baker as head teacher also matched well with the DEO's list..</p>	
			<p>Komukuny Boys primary school taken as urban the list had 12 teachers and the head teacher being Ms. Aballo Christine. The list also matched well with that of DEO.</p>	
			<p>This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was at <math>34/34 \times 100 = 100\%</math>.</p>	
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>Evidence indicated that the DLG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 32 UPE schools as captured below from the sampled schools to confirm accuracy;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Komukuny Boys primary school taken as urban had 7 classrooms, 83 desks, 25 latrine stances though 10 were full therefore unusable and 6 teachers houses .</p>	
			<p>,kalongor primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms but 3 more are required, 21 latrine stances of which 5 were in bad shape, 155 desks though more 184 is required &amp; 6 teacher's houses.</p>	
			<p>kalapata primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 7 classrooms, 126 desks, 15 latrine stances &amp; 3 twin teachers houses.</p>	
			<p>All the verified assets infrastructures and equipment were also indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register</p>	

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:

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

There was no evidence from the education department the DLG that Head teachers in the UPE schools complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitting them to the DEO's office annually as required by January 30th.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.</p> <p>At the schools visited, there were reports that pointed out the various SIPs that had been implemented as discussed below;</p> <p>Komukuny Boys primary school</p> <p>There was increased pupil enrolment as a result of the back to school campaigns by the education department.</p> <p>- Functional school management committee.</p> <p>Kalongor primary school the LG education office supported in the following SIP areas;</p> <p>- Ensuring that all learners are registered with EMIS</p> <p>- Through the termly monitoring and supervision teachers performance was checked that increased efficiency.</p> <p>- Providing capitation grants in time.</p> <p>Kalapata primary school SIPs in place involved the following:</p> <p>Conducting back to school campaigns within the community thus increasing pupil enrolment.</p> <p>Training the school head on work plan making.</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the 32 primary registered schools from the previous FY. As per EPD/191/141/01 communication from the permanent secretary MoEs on the 14th December, 2022 the LG enrolled 33,872 learners for primary section and 1166 students for the secondary section. The %age of schools was;</p> $34 \times 100$ $34$ $= 100\%$	4



7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p>	<p>The evidence that the LG had 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 at Ugx 4,473,899,00/=</p>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>		
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p>	<p>The DLG deployed 334 primary school teachers for the 32 UPE schools which aligns with the education sector guidelines though still below the ideal number.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>According to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment, for instance:</p> <p>Komukuny Boys Primary School taken as Urban had 12 teachers.</p> <p>Kalongor Primary School taken as semi urban had 12 teachers.</p> <p>Kalapata Primary School taken as rural had 10 teachers.</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>	<p>The teacher deployment data had been publicized on the LG notice board as part of the general LG staff list.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>		

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>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>Some primary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO. For instance;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aballo Christine, Head Teacher Kamakuny Boys PS was appraised on 10th January 2023 by SAS Lolem Francis</li> <li>2. Okello Alfred Obonyo, Head Teacher Lokwakaramoe II s PS was appraised on 19th January 2023 by SAS- Lomer Daniel Longoli</li> <li>3. Mosobo Rashid, Head Teacher Pajal PS was appraised on 17th May 2022 by SAS- Engor Damian</li> <li>4. Lokika Paul Pelman, Head Teacher Lokwakaramoe I PS was appraised on 7th February 2022 by SAS- Achalei Kizito Sisto</li> <li>5. Atyang Jaquelinen, Head Teacher Kachikol PS was appraised on 26th October 2022 by SAS- Auma Grace</li> <li>6. Loteni John January, Head Teacher Naryamaoi PS was appraised on 26th October 2022 by SAS- Auma Grace</li> <li>7. Lokong Alfred, Head Teacher Narube PS was appraised on 18th November 2022 by SAS- Nachomin Nancy</li> </ol>	

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>One out of the two secondary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outa Yokosophat, Head Teacher Kabong Senior Secondary School was appraised on 12th December 2022 by Deputy CAO Shaineh Nelson</li> </ol>	

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Akileng Stephen, Sports Officer was appraised on 22nd July 2023 by DEO Sagar Santino</li> <li>2. Sire Celestin inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June 2023 by DEO Sagar Santino</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

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>The HR department did not provide evidence that the LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

**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 assessment team noted from DEO, that the LG was compliant as the CAO wrote to the permanent secretary on 14th December, 2022 on the updated enrolment of 33872 learners for primary and 1166 learners for secondary</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>According to evidence seen in an acknowledgement letter to the CAO by the Ag DEO Ms. Sangar Santina, Kaboong LG made allocations of UGX 4,000,000 for inspection and UGX 4,500,000 for DEO's monitoring for FY 2022/2023 which was in line with the sector guidelines</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 10th August, 2022 after 22 days.</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 25th October, 2022 after 22 days.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 23th January, 2023 after 21 days.</li> <li>• 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 28th April, 2023 after 17 days.</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 8th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 24th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 18th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 20th April 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>For the FY 2022/2023, the Education department prepared an inspection Plan dated 3rd October, 2023, the plan prioritized to inspect the Government Schools (32 Primary and 2 Secondary). Below were the dates on which the pre-inspection planning meetings were conducted</p> <p>Term III 2022 meeting was on 3rd October, 2022 planned to cover all the 45 schools minute number 06/3/10/22, the inspection was to be between 4th October to 6th ooctober, 2022</p> <p>Term I 2023 meeting was held on 3rd February, 2023 planned to cover 49 schools, in attendance were 12 members it was to be conducted between 14th February, 2023 -16th February 2023. 2 inspectors were allocated</p> <p>Term 2 pre- inspection meeting was held on 8th June, 2023 and it was planned to cover 33 schools between 12th - 14th June, 2023 in attendance were 5 inspectors. Minute on inspection was Min 2-08/6/2023.</p> <p>. <math>3/3 \times 100 = 100\%</math> compliant.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the previous Financial Year revealed that 100% Government Schools were inspected for term 3 2022, term I &amp; II 2023 consisting of 32 primary and 2 secondary schools. The term 3 2022 report was dated 10th October, 2022. It was handed to DES on 3rd January, 2023.</p> <p>Term one report was dated 20th February, 2023 and was submitted to DES on 4th April, 2023 32 UPE &amp; 2 USE schools were inspected.</p> <p>Term 2 report was dated 14th June, 2023 was submitted to DES on 29th June, 2023. 32 UPE &amp; 2 secondary schools had been inspected.</p> <p><math>34 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>34</p>	2
----	---	--	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment team noted that inspection reports were discussed especially at the DLG level as indicated in a report dated 7th October, 2022 for term 3 of 2022.</p> <p>There were no records presented for term one 2023 at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Term 2 report on inspection discussion was dated 6th June,2023, minute 6 - 6/6/2023.follow up on sips was conducted on 14th June,2023 compiled by Sire Celestin the DIS</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Head teacher of all the schools visited, revealed that the District Inspector of Schools (D.I.S) presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to them at a meeting convened at Police primary school minute 6/22/06/2023. All the 32 school heads of the UPE schools attended prepared by the Department of Education .among the schools was ;</p> <p>Komukuy boy's primary school, kalongor primary school &amp; kalapata primary schools among the schools sampled.</p> <p>Below is the evidence to DES submission of reports by the DIS</p> <p>The term 3 2022 report was dated 7thOctober 2022. It was handed to DES on 3rd January, 2023.</p> <p>Term one report was dated 20thFebruary,2023 and was submitted to DES on 4th April,2023</p> <p>Term 2 report dated 14thJune,2023 was submitted to DES on 29thJune,2023 32 UPE &amp; 2 USE schools had been covered.</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 the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 10th November 2022 at the District Health Office where at least 7 members were present. Under Min no MIN 3/CSS/10.11.2022. Recommendation for Kaabong SSS to consider day collars was raised.</p> <p>It was also noted that more group (youth livelihoods and UWEP) to be raised and the sub counties which have not benefited will be considered.</p> <p>Under the same minute number it was noted that the IK school conducted the meeting and the school has been considered for school feeding programme that no wrangles registered in the IK secondary school.</p> <p>All the above were geared towards improved education service delivery.</p> <p>A meeting held on 8th December 2022 at the District Health Office under MIN no 5/CSS/08.12.2022:Presentation of Q2 report 2022/2023.some of the issues that were raised included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of the governors in secondary schools, technical school and nursing school had expired. The action that was taken by the council committee was most boards have been constituted and council has approved some board members.</li> <li>- Threat of insecurity in some isolated health and education facilities. Action taken was that the security team of the district to plan and consider deployment in the affected facilities and units.</li> </ul>
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called "Go back to school" campaign from DLG education office.</p>

## Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed accurate reporting on the assets of 32 primary schools and 2 secondary schools

The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:

Komukuny Boys primary school taken as urban had 7 classrooms, 83 desks, 25 latrine stances though 10 were full therefore unusable and 6 teachers houses .

,kalongor primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms but 3 more are required, 21 latrine stances of which 5 were in bad shape, 155 desks though more 184 is required & 6 teacher's houses.

kalapata primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 7 classrooms, 126 desks, 15 latrine stances & 3 twin teachers houses.

All the verified assets infrastructures and equipments were also indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register.



Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 13th July 2022 for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs for eligible projects under education and all projects were derived from DDP III page 151 as follows;

1. The construction of a dormitory at Kakamar Primary School at Ushs 104,500,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.
2. Completion of Toroi staff house at Ushs 19,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.
3. Construction of kitchen and stores at Nariamaoi Primary School at Ushs 38,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.
4. Construction of kitchen and store at Nachukunet Primary School at Ushs 38,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.
5. Construction of staff house at Loteteleit Primary School at Ushs 104,500,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.
6. Construction of staff house at Lokwakaramoi Primary School at Ushs 114,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.

The Desk Appraisal report was endorsed by the Ag, Planner.

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0

There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and use of customized designs as per the examples;

1. Field appraisal Construction of a dormitory at Kakamar Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022.
2. Field appraisal Completion of Toroi staff house. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022
3. Field appraisal Construction of kitchen and stores at Nariamaoi Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022.
4. Field appraisal Construction of kitchen and store at Nachukunet Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022.
5. Field appraisal Construction of staff house at Loteteleit Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022.
6. Field appraisal Construction of staff house at Lokwakaramoi Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022.

All field appraisal forms were Signed by the District Planner, District Engineer, DCDO, DNRO, and District Environment Officer.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	The LG Education department had budgeted far and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The planned infrastructure included the construction of Sidok Seed Secondary School phase II, as per procurement plan that was signed on 30th June, 2023 , by CAO Kiplagat Martin	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There were Contracts Committee minutes for the sitting of 22nd September 2022 which approved the evaluation report and contract award in minute 05/sept/2022-2023, were the contract for Construction of boys' dormitory at Kakamar primary school and construction of a 4-unit staff house at lokwakaramoe primary school among the contracts approved.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines. This was in a letter dated 28th October, 2022 signed by CAO, Kiplangat Martin. The following persons were named on the team; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sangar Santina- DEO- as Contract manager</li> <li>• Enger Damian-SAS- as Project manager</li> <li>• Lokwang Albine- DWO- as- clerk of works</li> <li>• Lomongin Emmanuel -as Environment officer</li> <li>• Achii Christine Lodu- as CDO</li> <li>• Aree Francis- as labour officer</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES  <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the Mo ES, as was seen from the site visits done. For instance at Kakamar primary school the external dimension of the dormitory building were 7.7 x 25.3 m, with windows of 1.2 x 1.4 m made from solid steel metal, doors were 1.2 x 2.4m with PVO, with a ramp for the disabled persons put at the entrance	<b>1</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There were no records in form of monthly site minutes seen during the assessment, as no Seed Secondary school project had been implemented in FY year under review in the district.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was a report dated 30th June, 2023 signed by the DE, the DCDO, the DEO, DNRO and Environment officer to show that there had been joint technical supervision by the joint technical supervision team.	<b>1</b>

Procurement, contract management/execution g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;

1. - Voucher no 4243826 dated 9th March 2023 for Ushs 24,025,892; Certificate No 1, dated 1st February 2023; Contract No.Kaab839/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of Boys Dormitory at Kakamar Primary School was certified by DEO on 2nd February 2023, District Environment Officer on 2nd February 2023, district Engineer on 19th June 2023 and DCDO on 2nd February 2023, payment was initiated on 2nd February 2023 and payments were made on 9th March 2023 which was within the time flame.
2. - Voucher no 5132223 dated 3rd June 2023 for Ushs 34,339,986, Certificate No 1, dated 27th March 2023; Contract No.Kaab839/WRKS/2022-23/00003, Project; Construction of Staff House at Loteteleiet Primary School was certified by DEO on 30th March 2023, District Environment Officer on 27th March 2023, district Engineer on 27th March 2023 and DCDO on 27th March 2023, payment was initiated on 7th March 2023 and payments were made on 3rd May 2023 which was within the time flame.
3. - Voucher no 5903908 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 17,608,550, Certificate No 3, dated 23rd May 2023; Contract No.Kaab559/WRKS/2022-23/00002, Project; Construction of a Four Unit Staff House at Lokwakaramoe Primary School was certified by DEO on 30th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 26th May 2023, district Engineer on 23rd May 2023 and DCDO on 23rd May 2023, payment was initiated on 16th May 2023 and payments were made on 15th June 2023 which was within the time flame.

Procurement, contract management/execution  
*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, *score: 1, else, score: 0*

The LG had complete procurement files in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;

Project: Construction of a Boys dormitory at Kakamar Primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00004, had the following documents on file

- Signed works contract dated 27th December, 2022 with Ms.The Sure Deal 2004 General Traders
- Contracts Committee minutes of 22nd September, 2022.
- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and payment records.

Project: Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Loteteleit Primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00003, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 15th November, 2022 with Ms. Lina Constructors and Suppliers limited
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd September, 2022
- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and payment records

Project: Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Lokwakaramoe Primary School

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00005 with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 8th November, 2022 with Ms. Lat Enterprises
- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes of 22nd September, 2022.

PP1 form, call of bids, issue and receipt of bids record, supervision reports and payment records in place.

Procurement, contract

i) Evidence that the LG has a

The LG had complete procurement files

management/execution complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;

Project: Construction of a Boys dormitory at Kakamar Primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00004, had the following documents on file

- Signed works contract dated 27th December, 2022 with Ms. The Sure Deal 2004 General Traders

- Contracts Committee minutes of 22nd September, 2022 where the contracts were approved for award in Minute 05/Sept/DCC/2022-2023

- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022

- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and payment records.

Project: Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Loteteleit Primary school

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00003, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 15th November, 2022 with Ms. Lina Constructors and Suppliers limited

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd September, 2022

- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022

- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and payment records

Project: Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Lokwakaramoe Primary School

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00005 with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 8th November, 2022 with Ms. Lat Enterprises

- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes of 22nd September, 2022 where contracts were approved and awarded in minute 05/Sept/DCC/2022-2023.

PP1 form, call of bids, issue and receipt of bids record, supervision reports and payment records in place.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was a complaints log availed where complaints were recorded however, there was no complaint arising from project work within the education sector that was recorded in the respective financial years of assessment.</p>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no proof of dissemination of the education guidelines on environmental management to the respective schools of Komukuny Boys primary school, Kalongor primary school and Kalapata primary school.</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the completion of a staff house at Toroi primary school prepared on 29th September, 2022 at a cost of UGX 1,800,000 was integrated into the BoQs at a total cost of UGX. 18,386,000 under Bill No. 1 item A: environmental considerations costed at UGX 456,000.</p>	<b>2</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show proof of land ownership for projects in the education sector</p>	<b>0</b>



16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow-up on recommended corrective actions and prepared monthly monitoring reports. For example, a monitoring report dated 15th June, 2023 of the infrastructure development projects in the education sector below was availed which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a staff house at Lokwakaramoe primary school,</li> <li>2. Construction of a kitchen and store at Nariamaoi primary school,</li> <li>3. Construction of a staff house at Loteteleiet primary school,</li> <li>4. Completion a staff house at Toroi primary school,</li> <li>5. Construction of a kitchen and store at Nachukunet primary school</li> <li>6. Construction of a boys dormitory at Kakamar primary school</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO did not comply to completing and signing on all the certifications prior to payments of contractors invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example there were projects where they were compliant and others where they would not comply to signing as shown in the examples below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion payment certificate No 1 issued on 29th May, 2023 for the renovation/completion of a 4 unit staff house at Toroi primary school was signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO</li> <li>2. Completion payment certificate NO 1 issued on 16th June, 2022 for the construction of a kitchen with store at Lotim primary school was only signed by the CDO</li> <li>3. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 2nd January, 2023 for the construction of a boys dormitory at Kakamar primary school was signed by both the CDO and the Environment Officer</li> </ol>	0

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Kaabong District registered a percentage increase in utilization of Health services(focus on total deliveries) of more than 20%,comparing the the FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23.</p> <p>From the annual HMIS reports 107,the Annual deliveries of the 3 Health facilities: Kathile HCIII , Kaimese HCIII, Loyoro HCIII for the FY 2021/22 were:207,185 and 48 respectively.The Total Deliveries for the same facilities for FY 2021/22 was 440.</p> <p>The Annual deliveries for the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 were: 249,240 and 106 respectively. The total deliveries for the three above mentioned Facilities for FY2022/23 was 595.</p> <p>The Percentage increase in deliveries was 35.2%</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>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 84% as per the OPAMS.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>RBF program was incorporated in PHC as per the Letter from MOH to CAO dated 7th December 2022</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 400,000,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards. For instance;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Construction of staff house at lolelia south at Ushs 105,000,000.</li> <li>2. - Renovation of OPD meus health center at Ushs 25,000,000.</li> <li>3. - Renovation of DHO'S staff house at Ushs 36,221,000.</li> </ol>	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Voucher no 4769083 dated 18th April 2023 for Ushs 34,974,486, Certificate No 1, dated 22nd March 2023; Contract No.Kaabs559/Supls/2021-22/00003, Project; Construction of Staff House at Lolelia South was certified by District Health Officer on 22th March 2023, District Environment Officer on 27th March 2023, district Engineer on 22th March 2023 and DCDO on 22th March 2023.</li> </ol>	

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three projects sampled were +5.34% within +/- 20% of the acceptable variation and therefore complied.

The projects were,

Project 1: Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Lolelia South HCII

Procurement Ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00006

Project 2: Construction of General ward phase 1 at Kalapatta HCIII

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00017

Project 3: Construction of a staff house and a 2-stance VIP latrine at Lobongia HCIII

Project 1:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 105,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 103,580,500/=

Variation Cost: Ugx 1,420,000/=

%age variation

$(1,420,000/105,000,000) \times 100\% = 1.35\%$

Project 2:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 260,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 255,551,100/=

Variation cost: Ugx 4,448,900/=

%age variation

$(4,448,900/260,000,000) \times 100\% = 1.71\%$

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 120,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 113,588,420/=

Variation Cost: Ugx 6,411,580/=

%age variation (

$6,411,580/120,000,000) \times 100\% = 5.34\%$

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the district for the year under review	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	Kaabong LG had 7 HCIIIs with no HIV. At the time of assessment only 57 positions out 133 were filled at the time. To calculate the percentage; $57/133 \times 100 = 43\%$	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the district in the year under review.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for the 3 sampled health facilities; Kathile HCIII, Kaimese HCIII and Loyoro HCIII was accurate as indicated below.</p> <p><b>Kathile HCIII</b> had 9 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p><b>Kaimese HCIII</b> had 9 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the facility noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p><b>Loyoro HCIII</b> had 5 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no any Health facility that was upgraded in FY 2022/23.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the 3 sampled Health facilities: Kathile HCIII, Kaimese HCIII, Loyoro HCIII, submitted the Annual work plan and budget of the previous FY 2022/23 as per the planning and Budget guidelines. Their submission dated were as follow:</p> <p>Kathile HCIII Submitted on 30th March 2023</p> <p>Loyoro submitted on 30th March 2023</p> <p>Kaimese Submitted on 30th March 2023</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>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the 3 sampled Health facilities Kathile HCIII , Kaimese HCIII, Loyoro HCIII</p> <p>Health facilities prepared and submitted budget performance reports to the DHO as per the LG Planning Guidelines</p> <p>Kathile HCIII submitted the Report on 30th June,2023.</p> <p>Kaimese HCIII submitted on 30th June,2023.</p> <p>Loyoro HCIII submitted on 30th June,2023</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 have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the three sampled Health facilities Kathile HCIII , Kaimese HCIII, Loyoro HCIII, submitted their facility improvement plans as per below;</p> <p>Kaimese HCIII submitted its facility improvement plan on 30th June 2023.</p> <p>Loyoro HCIII submitted on the Facility improvement plan on 20th June 2023.</p> <p>Kathile HCIII submitted the Plan on 30th June 2023.</p> <p>The facility improvement plans incorporated issues identified in DHMT monitoring and assessment reports for example:</p> <p>Kaimese HCIII improvement plan incorporated issues like Community sensitization and male involvement, engagement of VHT to follow up mothers for ANC4 attendance. These came as recommended actions in response to issues of low ANC4 attendance at Kaimese HC III reported in the Annual progress health report 2022/23.</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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The three sampled Health facilities :Kathile HCIII, Kaimese HCIII, Loyoro HCIII submitted all monthly and Quarterly HMIS reports timely. The health facility report submission dates were as shown below:</p> <p><b>July 2022</b></p> <p>Kathile HCIII submitted on 4th August,2022</p> <p>, Kaimese HCIII submitted on 2nd August,2022</p>	2

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 5th August ,2022

### **August 2022**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 6th Sept, 2022

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 2nd September,2022

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th Sept, 2022

September 2022

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th Oct,2022

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 3rd Oct 2022

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 5th Oct ,2022

### **October 2022**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 2nd November, 2022

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 4th November,2022

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 7th November 2022

### **November 2022**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th Dec,2022

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 2nd Dec, 2022

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 7th Dec, 2022

### **December 2022**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th Jan,2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 4th Jan,2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th Jan 2023

### **January 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 4th Feb,2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 6th Feb, 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th Feb 2023

### **Feburary 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 4rd March ,2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 2nd March, 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th March, 2023



### **March 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th April, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 3rd April, 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 7th April, 2023

### **April 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th May, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 5th May, 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 5th May, 2023

### **May 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 6th June, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 5th June 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 5th June 2023

### **June 2023**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th July, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 3rd July 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th July, 2023

### **HMIS Quarterly Reports**

#### **Quarter 1**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th Oct, 2022

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 5th Oct, 2022

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 6th Oct, 2022

#### **Quarter 2**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th Jan, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 7th Jan 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 5th Jan, 2023

#### **Quarter 3**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 5th April, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 5th April, 2023

Loyoro HCIII submitted on 3rd April 2023

#### **Quarter 4**

Kathile HCIII submitted on 6th July, 2023

Kaimese HCIII submitted on 7th July, 2023

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>This indicator is N/A. All LGs to be scored zero.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>This indicator is N/A. All LGs to be scored zero.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>There was evidence provided that LG timely (by the end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one reports were submitted on 14th October 2022.</li> <li>2. Quarter two reports were submitted on 13th January 2023.</li> <li>3. Quarter three reports were submitted on 14th April 2023.</li> <li>4. Quarter four reports were submitted on 14th July 2023.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for developing an approved plan for Weak Health facilities. This plan was developed and approved on 3rd July 2023.</p> <p>The lowest performing Health facilities were Kopoth HC III which had the actual performance of 50.7%, Lochomomo had 53.5%</p> <p>The plan included activities like Pregnancy mapping by using VHTs and community sensitization and community dialogue meetings.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

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 evidence for implementation of any plan for Weak Health facilities Quarter 1 progress reports of these facilities dated 20 October 2023, indicated that the planned actions were implemented and were still going on.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

**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 LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. Kaabong LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 4,381,613,000 (Approved budget estimates for Kaabong LG 2023/24 page 55 of 140, vote 839). This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 where the provided wage rate was 4,381,612,544 as indicated on page 95 vote 839</p> <p>Therefore, Kaabong LG budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:  
ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

**Kathile HCIII** had 9 out of 19 required health workers for HCIII, giving 47.4% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed Staff list at Kathile HCIII noticeboard).

**Kaimese HCIII** had 9 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 47.4% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Kaimese HCIII noticeboard).

**Loyoro HCIII** had 5 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 26.3% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Loyoro HCIII noticeboard).

Therefore, all the 3 sampled health facilities didn't have at least 75% of staff required hence Kaabong LG did not deploy the health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

**Kathile HCIII:** 6 out of 9 health workers deployed to Lokopo HCIII were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Lokope James; Senior Clinical Officer was present on duty on 23rd November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 22 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Lemu Andrew Tom; Health Information Assistant was present on duty on 23rd November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 11 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Acok Moses; Askari was present on duty on 23rd November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 26 days in the month of October 2023.

*(Kathile HCIII staff attendance book 23rd November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

**Kaimese HCIII:** 5 out of 9 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Odong David Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 23rd November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 19 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Achoyo Florence Enrolled midwife was present on duty on 23rd November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 22 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Lonio Isaac Laboratory Assistant was present on duty on 23rd November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023.

*(Kaimese HCIII staff attendance book 23rd November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

**Loyoro HCIII:** 2 out of 5 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Lomongin Peter Laboratory Assistant was present on duty on 24th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 16 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Lokol Simon Peter; Porter was present on duty on 24th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 22 days in the month of October 2023.

The monthly attendance analysis for health personnel for October 2023 indicated that both Irwata Anna and Okwir Tonny. Enrolled Nurses were present on duty for 20 and 22 days respectively in the month of October 2023. Whereas Nakiru Ann Grace was on maternity leave during the said month.

*(Loyoro HCIII staff attendance book 23rd November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that Kaabong DLG publicized health worker deployment. Lists of health workers were found displayed on the noticeboards and walls at the three facilities visited.

The displayed lists of staff at both Kathile and Kaimese HCIII walls had a total of 9 staff each whereas for Loyoro HCIII had 5 staff. (Kathile HCIII Kaimese HCIII and Loyoro HCIII noticeboards and health facility walls). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

The DHO 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. For instance;

1. Ayolo Peter Incharge of Lomeris HC III was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
2. Akol Anna Grace Incharge of Kopos HC III was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
3. Angom Dorcus Pamela Incharge of Lodiko HC II was appraised on 5th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
4. Odongo David Incharge of Kakamar HC II was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
5. Lokol Gabriel Massimo Incharge of Lokolia HC III was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
6. Alok Solina Incharge of Kakamar HC II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
7. Awor Florence Okech Incharge of Nariamaoe HC II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
8. Ayugi Hellen Mercy Incharge of Morukori HC II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
9. Lokiru Ali Incharge of Morulem HC II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
10. Lodukui Robert Incharge of Kamacharikol HC II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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. For instance;

1. Ekoom Robert Health Inspector at Kaboong Town Council was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
2. Idet Regina Enrolled Nurse at Kaboong General Hospital was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Echuka Denis- Senior Nursing Officer
3. Akol Mary Immaculate Assistant Nursing Officer at Kaabong General Hospital was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
4. Lokori John Bosco Senior Clinical Officer at Kalapata HCIII was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Naribe Sharif the DHO
5. Lobolia David Enrolled Nurse at Lokanayona HC II was on 15th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
6. Lemu Andrew Tom Health Information Assistant at Kathile HC III was appraised on 2nd June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
7. Lokol Lino Health Inspector at Kathile Town Council was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
8. Apio Faith Enrolled Nurse at Lodiko HC II was appraised on 4th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
9. Nakoli Lina Loyce Enrolled Midwife at Lomeris Health Center II was appraised on 13th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital
10. Adong Florence Enrolled nurse at Kaabong General Hospital was appraised on 15th June 2023 by Lopoi Don John Bosco Medical Superintendent at Kaabong General Hospital



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>The LG had taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports and these included Data analysis, basic skills in safe male circumcisions, basic nursing care on management of tuberculosis, pediatric nursing, tear and laceration repair, solid waste management and Computer skills.</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>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Kaabong conducted training for Health workers.</p> <p>There was a Training Data base with training schedule for several trainins both Long term and short term trainings.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were Training reports in DHO's office for example:</p> <p>There was a training on IPCs submitted by Dr. Muto MO</p> <p>On 27th May 2023. They were 8 Staff that attended this training.</p> <p>There was another training Report on Sexual and Gender based violence that took place 28th May 2023.</p> <p>There was a training on Population Connectedness across boarder and zoonotic Connectedness.</p> <p>It took place on 28th-30th March 2023 . Was attended by one staff Lopeyok Moses.</p> <p>There was a training on Target setting for Environmental Health Professionals in Local government. It took place on 17th Dec 2022, It was Coducted by MOH and attended by Kibwota Godfrey ADHO EH)</p>	1

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

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that CAO Kaabong wrote a letter to MOH, confirming the list of Health facilities (GOU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants).</p> <p>This letter was written on 21st September 2023 indicating that 25 out of 25 Health facilities were to benefit from PHC fund in the current financial year. It even revised Kalapata HCIII to be HCIV</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the approved budget showed that on page 54 supervision &amp; monitoring were allocated UGX 61,839,000 and on (page 50) , PHC non - wage was allocated UGX 767,861,000.</p> <p>As per the computation  <math>61,839,000/767,861,000 \times 100 = 8\%</math>.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 10th August, 2022 after 22 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 25th October, 2022 after 22 days.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 23th January, 2023 after 21 days.</li> <li>• 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 28th April, 2023 after 17 days.</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities was not within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 8th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p>	
			<p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 24th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p>	
			<p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 18th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	
			<p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 20th April 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence to show that ,Kaabong Health department conducted and implemented actions recommended by DHMT quarterly performance review meetings. The quarterly performance review meetings took place on the following dates:

Quarter 1 performance review meeting took place on 3rd October 2022.

The quarter 2 meeting took place on 31 st January 2023.

Quarter 3 meeting took place on 27th - 28th April ,2023.

Quarter 4 meeting took place on 15th Agut 2023

There was evidence to show that Kaabong district implemented the recommendations of the performance review meetings, for example:

Quarter 1 performance review meeting 2022/23 raised an issue Knowledge gap among health unit in charges in filling HMIS 105 forms.

This was implemented by mentoring Health units in charges on Data capture. (Progress report on performance review meeting dated 31st January 2023.

Quarter 2 performance review meeting 2022/23 raised an issue of some facilities deviating from the Test and treatment policy for TB . and high loss to follow up of TB case s

This was implemented by revitalising TB contact tracing system in all Health facilities by using VHTs.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments as indicated by the attence of one of Quartery 3 performance review meetings 2022/23 which took place on 27th and 28th April 2023 was attended by th following pople:</p> <p>Health facilities incharges that attended included:</p> <p>Okwel Alex I/C Lotim HCII</p> <p>Agwer Stephen I/C Narenge pak HCII</p> <p>Lodukui Robert I/C Kamacahrikol HC II amont others.</p> <p>Other Departmetal staff that attended included :</p> <p>Arem L Andrew TC Kalapata Town Council</p> <p>Didas Gabriel SAS Lorelia South</p> <p>Santana S District Education Officer etc.</p> <p>Development Partners that attended included:</p> <p>Lokwi Kaneth from NAFOPHANU</p> <p>Joyfrey Munye S USAID_ SBCA</p> <p>Abuko Mary CUAMM</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPS receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Kaabong District did not have a health Centre IV,however has a General Hospital known as Kaabong General Hospital.</p> <p>Kaabong DHMT supervised Kaabong General Hospital on the dates listed below:</p> <p>On 30th September 2022.</p> <p>On 02nd January 2023</p> <p>On 17th April 2023</p> <p>On 24 th June 2023</p> <p>Support supervision reports were available in DHO's office at the time of assessment.</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"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>Kaabong District did not have any sub-district . However the DHMT carried out Integrated support supervisions and covered 10 Health Centres and Kaabong Hospital. This took place 24th - 28th November 2022. Another DHMT support supervision was done 6th Dec 2022.</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 Kaabong used results of the DHMT support supervision on Kaboog Hospital and of the integrated support supervision done on other Health Facilities to make recommendations. And there was implementation of these recommendations observed for example;</p> <p>The Support supervision on Kaaboog Hospital on 30th September 2022, recommende that the Hospital provides Clients Charter in Local language and displayed.</p> <p>This was implemented by providing a Clients Charter in Karamajong language and put on the walls in different place in the (Quarter 3 support supervision Report, dated 17th April 2023)</p> <p>In the support supervision Report done on 6th Dec 2022 recommended that the EPI focal person should update vaccine material control book</p> <p>This was implemented by providing well updated vaccine control book .( Support supervision Report 4thAugust ,2023 .)</p> <p>A support supervision done on Kaimese HCIII and Kakamara HCII on 6th December on identified high drop out rate of DPT 3.</p> <p>This was implemented by UHA suppoting these facilities with Counter books to be provided to VHTs to do linelisting of the missed out opportunities.(Progress Report 13th June 2023)</p>	1

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	There was no evidence to show that Kaabong provided Support supervision to Health facilities on Management of Medicine . No MMS reports available at DHO's Office at the time of assessment	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	A review of the performance report showed that DHO was UGX 61,839,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 17,458,890 was spent on Health promotion on page 31 of the approved budget.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		Expressed as a % = $19,045.000 / 61,839,000 \times 100 = 31\%$ .	
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that Kaabong DHT led</p> <p>Disease prevention , Health promotion and Community mobilization activities as indicated below:</p> <p>There was Community Dialogue done on Malaria prevention on 20th _24th April 2023.</p> <p>It was done in Sidok Subcounty and it involved 64 participants. It was also done inKaabong West (Akekeroi Village) and Lolelia Subcounty . It covered a total of 89Participants.</p> <p>There was a community level Advocacy and Dialogue meetings that took place on 20th _24th September 2022 on ANC service utilization .</p> <p>Thes meetings took place inin Kalapata and Kaabong Town councils. A total of 40 participants</p> <p>Attended .</p>	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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 no evidence to show that the DHMT did a follow up on Health promotion and disease prevention.</p> <p>No follow up Reports on Health Promotion and disease Prevention were present in the DHO's office at the time of assessment</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**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>Kaabong District had assets register for Health facilities dated July 2023.</p> <p>The district also had an electronic asset register.</p> <p>It included items of different Health facilities including medical equipment for each facility. These included the Vaccine Fridge, the weigh scales, the diagnostic equipments, Laboratory equipment, the Nursing and midwifery equipment, sterilization equipment's like Auto craves etc.</p> <p>The register also included a physical infrastructure for Health facilities for example the OPD, Maternity ward, General ward.</p>	<b>1</b>
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived DDP III page 143 and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Construction of staff house at Ilolelia south at Ushs 105,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.</li> <li>2. - Renovation of OPD meus health center at Ushs 25,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.</li> <li>3. - Renovation of DHO'S staff house at Ushs 36,221,000 and recommended for field appraisal.</li> </ol> <p>All the projects were appraised on 13th July 2022 by the District Planner, Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.</p>	<b>1</b>



12

Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and use of customized designs as per the examples;

1. - Field appraisal for Construction of staff house at Lolelia South. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, and DCDO.
2. - Field appraisal for Renovation of OPD Meus Health Center. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, and DCDO.
3. - Field appraisal for Renovation of DHO'S staff house. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 18th July 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, and DCDO

1

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklists. Below were the projects screened for the previous FY;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a staff house at Loleia South HCII on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>2. Construction of a general ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCII on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>3. Renovation of 8 staff houses at Kaabong hospital quarters on 28th August, 2022</li> <li>4. Renovation of 8 OPD at Meus HCII on 28th August, 2022</li> <li>5. Construction of 8 staff house units, 2 stance latrine at Lobungie HCII on 11th August, 2022</li> <li>6. Renovation of OPD at Meus HCII on 28th August, 2022</li> <li>7. Renovation of DHO's staff house at Kaabong hospital on 28th August, 2022</li> <li>8. Construction of staff house with a 2 stance latrine at Lobongia HCIII on 11th August, 2022</li> <li>9. Construction of a 2 stance latrine with a urinal at Kamacharikol HCII on 9th August, 2022</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department timely by April 30, for the current FY, submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan. This was done on 18th April, 2023. The projects planned for implemented were completion of general ward at Kalapata HC III at Ugx 120M and Renovation of staff house at Lokanayona HCII.</p>	<b>1</b>

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>The LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1), to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY on 18th April, 2023. The procurement request was for completion of construction of General ward and renovation of staff house at Lokenayona HCII.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee sitting on 22nd March 2023 approved the award of the contracts in minute 08/March/2022-2023. The contracts were for construction of General ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCIII and construction of staff house with a 2-stance VIP latrine at Lobongia HCIII.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for health construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines. This was in a letter dated 28th October, 2022 and signed by CAO in which he named the following persons were appointed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nalibe Sharif- DHO- as Contract Manager</li> <li>• Enger Damian-SAS- as Project Manager</li> <li>• Lokwang Albine- DWO- as- Clerk of Works</li> <li>• Lomongin Emmanuel -as Environment Officer</li> <li>• Achii Christine Lodu- as CDO</li> <li>• Aree Francis- as Labour Officer</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MOH, as was observed at Kalapata HCIII, where there was construction of a General ward. It was noted that the external dimensions of the pediatric ward were 7.5 x 7.1 m with the entrance door of 1.5 x 2.4 m made from steel casement with an entrance ramp for the disabled persons also constructed.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records of minutes by the clerk of works seen during the assessment, as there was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the FY 2022/2023 under review.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were minutes of site meeting held on the 15th May, 2023 the attendance of the members included the DE, ag. DHO, CDO, Environment officer among the members in the meeting.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was a supervision report dated 30th June, 2023 that had been signed by the team after the inspection. Members of the inspection team included the CAO, Ag. DHO, DE among the members.</p>	1

13

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

No payment vouchers for health projects were sampled at the time of assessment. It was noted by the Assistant Accountant that the vouchers were misplaced by the Auditors in the field and promised to locate them before the assessment was concluded. However, it never happened.

0

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 to show that the LG had complete procurement files for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The procurement files reviewed were;

Project: Construction of a staff house and a 2-stance VIP latrine at Lobongia HCIII

Procurement ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00018, had the following documents there in;

- Signed works contract dated 12th April, 2023 with Ms. Omax General Services limited
- Evaluation report dated 21st March, 2023
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd March, 2023.

Project: Construction of a staff house at Lolelia South HCII

Project ref: Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00006 with these documents therein

- Signed works contract dated 27th December, 2022 with ATODUKO Enterprise
- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd September, 2022.

Project: Construction of General ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCIII had these documents

- Signed contract dated 12th April, 2023 with Ms. Malanyo (U) limited
- Evaluation report dated 21st March, 2023
- Contracts committee minutes dated 22nd March, 2023.
- A letter from Solicitor General dated 5th April, 2023 signed by Magomu David Andrew clearing the contract.

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complaints log availed where complaints were recorded however, there was no complaint arising from project work within the health sector that was recorded in the respective financial years of assessment.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>There was evidence of a health care / medical waste management titled "National Guidelines for WASH in Health Care Facilities, Uganda dated 2022 that was disseminated to the respective health units and acknowledged by the respective in-charges in the letters dated as below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 20th June, 2023 the health in-charge of Kamion HCIII,</li> <li>• On 12 June 2023 the health in-charge of Merengei HCII</li> <li>• On 7th June, 2023 the health in-charge of Loyoro HCIII</li> </ul>	2
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a functional medical waste management system of coded bins for waste assortment and dug out pits for burning non-wet generated waste in all health units, placenta pits and incinerators.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of reports dated 4th May, 2023 and 17th December, 2022 on waste management assessment, formation and training of waste management committees in health facilities using the WASH guidelines and for the implementation of environmental health activities in the second quarter of FY 2022/2023 using the Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) guidelines respectively were availed.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence of a costed ESMP for the construction of a general ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCIII prepared on 28th August, 2022 at UGX 1,900,000 with a total BoQ costed at UGX. 255,551,100 and under Bill No. 3 General Ward element no. 1, items 1.01, 1.03, 1.07 costed at UGX. 1,712,000 for safeguard measures.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show proof of land ownership for projects in the health sector.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports on the construction of the general ward phase 1 at Kalapata HCII, staff house for health workers at Lolelia south, staff house with 2 stance latrine at Lobongia HCII, renovation of OPD at Meus HCII, renovation of doctor's staff house at Kaabong hospital in the reports dated 4th May, 2023	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			



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

The Environment Officer and CDO did not comply to completing and signing on all the certifications prior to payments of contractors invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example there were projects where they were compliant and others where they would not comply to signing as shown in the examples below;

1. Interim and completion payment certification No. 1 issued on 20th June, 2022 and 14th December, 2022 respectively for the construction of a 4-unit staff house with a 2 stance latrine at Morulem HCIII were signed by both the Environment Officer and the CDO.

2. Interim payment certificate No.2 issued on 13th June, 2023 for the construction of a general ward phase 1 at Kapalapata HCIII was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Kaabong DLG in the previous FY (2022/2023) was 82%.</p>	<b>1</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Kaabong DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 93%</p>	<b>2</b>
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"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current FY was 81% as per the results viewed in the OPAMs.</p>	<b>2</b>

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 86% were:-

Drilling of 1 production well, drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump and rehabilitation of 1 borehole in Lodiko S/C with a safe water coverage of 70%, rehabilitation of 1 boreholes and drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump in Kathile S/C with a safe water coverage of 85% and drilling of one deep borehole and rehabilitation of 1 boreholes in Kaabong East S/C.

The projects that were implemented during the year under review as captured in pages 12 to 14 of the annual report were:-

Drilling of 8 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, rehabilitation of 15 boreholes, and drilling of 5 production wells.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 26 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 28 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was  $26/28 \times 100\% = 93\%$

2

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling and installation of 8 boreholes in various Lower Local Government:

Engineer's estimate = UGX 192,000,000

Contract Sum = UGX 191,678,600

Various = UGX 321,400

Percentage variance =  $321,400/192,000,000 \times 100\% = 0.2\%$

2). Drilling of 5 production wells in various LLGs.

Engineers estimate = UGX 248,000,000

Contract price = UGX 154,727,500

Variation = UGX 93,272,500

Percentage variation =  $93,272,500/248,000,000 \times 100\% = 2.9\%$

2

2

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 as captured on page 3 of the annual work plan and as reported in page 12 to 14 of the annual budget performance report included the following:-

Drilling of 8 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps in various Sub-Counties, drilling of 5 production wells in different LLOGs, rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in various LLGs. The total planned projects were 16 however, two of the boreholes were not successfully completed. The completed projects were 28 in number, therefore the percentage of the completed projects as per the annual work plan was:

$28/28 \times 100\% = 100\%$ .

2

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 81% and FY 2022/2023 was 82% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage increase was <math>82\% - 81\% = 1\%</math></p>	<b>2</b>
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 92% and 93% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage increase therefore was <math>93\% - 92\% = 1\%</math></p>	<b>1</b>

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY (2022/2023) as captured in pages 12 to 14 of the annual budget performance report 2022/2023, where the following facilities below were sampled from;

1). Drilling of deep borehole in Kitelore village in Kakamar sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 88272 and completed on 10th June, 2023.

2). Drilling of a production well in Kotome village in Lodiko sub-county, funded under UGIFT, with a DWD number 87762 and completed on 6th May, 2023.

3). Drilling of deep borehole in Sokodu village in Kaabong East sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 88274 and completed on 30th March, 2023.

These projects were completed as per the plan,

Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and completed, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 8th November, 2022, on page 23, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments in summary table.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 9th March, 2023 on page 23; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties of the District.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 2nd June, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on pages 21.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 11th August, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 20.</p> <p>Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 11th August, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form4 which had summaries of the status of all the water facilities per sub-county.</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment, the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 65%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the least performing LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff as follows;</p> <p>Civil Engineer (Water) at Ugx 48,000,000/annum</p> <p>Engineering Assistant (Water) at Ugx 18,720,000</p> <p>Borehole Maintenance Technician at Ugx 4,253,916=</p> <p>The positions of Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene) were not budgeted for because they were not on the approved and customised staff structure.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>Environment and Natural resources Office budgeted for the following positions in FY 2023/2024 as follows;</p> <p>Environment Officer and Forestry Officer were each budgeted for at aUgx 48,000,000/=</p> <p>However, the Natural Resources Officer position was not budgeted for because it was not appearing on the approved staff structure at the time of assessment.</p>	2



7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no appraisals presented by the LG HR department for the District Water Staff at the time of assessment.</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>There was no appraisals presented by the LG HR department for the District Water Staff at the time of assessment.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DWO allocated over 60% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 86%.</p> <p>The water stressed sub-counties were;</p> <p>Kaabong East S/C with safe water coverage of 65% was allocated rehabilitation of 3 boreholes, Kakamar S/C with a safe water coverage of 69% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 3 boreholes, Lodiko S/C with safe water coverage of 70% was allocated drilling of 2 boreholes, feasibility studies and design of a piped water system and rehabilitation of 4 boreholes, Lotim S/C with a safe water coverage of 55% was allocated drilling of 2 boreholes, Kathile S/C with a safe water coverage of 85% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole.</p> <p>The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 324,800,000</p> <p>The total annual development budget for Kaabong DWO for the current FY was UGX 504,144,677</p> <p>Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =  <math>324,800,000/504,144,677*100\% = 64\%</math>.</p>	1
---	---	--	--	---

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

In this file there was a letter dated 25th August, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Lodiko, Kaabong East, and Kakamar, Kathile, and Lotim; a copy of the same notification was seen on the DWO notice board.

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

The DWO also made a presentation during the district advocacy which was held on 19th September, 2023 in slides number 4 and 5 in his presentation where the allocations were summarized.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and a monitoring plan which was covering a period from July 2022 up to June 2023, together with quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 19th September, 2022, it was noted that there was a summary table in the report which showed that 251 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 26th December, 2022, a total of 334 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 28th March, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 318.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 27th June, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 354.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was =  $251 + 334 + 318 + 354 = 1,257/4 = 315$ .

Kaabong DLG had a total of 364 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was  $315/364 * 100\% = 87\%$

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

There was evidence that the DWO did not conduct the DWSCC all the quarterly meetings per the requirements. At the time of assessment, the DWO presented only two sets of minutes implying as opposed to four per the guidelines.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 87% as per the letter dated 5th September, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties;</p>	2
			<p>Lodiko, Kaabong East, Kakamar, Kathile, and Lotim</p>	
			<p>The letter detailed the projects allocated to these LLGs together with their budgeted amounts.</p>	
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Kaabong DLG water sector was UGX 79,173,673. The DWO allocated UGX 36,618,123 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was <math>36,618,123 / 79,173,673 * 100\% = 46\%</math>.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&amp;M. The DWO presented a training report dated 24th June, 2023. The training period spanned from 8th to 18th June, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&amp;M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others. Under O&amp;M emphasis was put on identification of faults, preventive maintenance and minor and major repairs</p> <p>The trainers were; Aree Francis Almedia ADWO in charge mobilization, Owili Michael the Health Assistant and Lokwang Albine the DWO.</p>	3

## Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were included in the register as they were detailed in form 1 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 11th August, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>The evidence showed that LG's DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer, and DCDO conducted desk appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget. It was established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage). The desk appraisals were conducted and discussed on 12th June 2023. The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 152, and Approved Budget pages, 104.</p> <p>Projects appraised were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Borehole drilling at Lolobae at Ushs 28,000,000 was recommended for field appraisal.</li> <li>2. Borehole drilling at Lobatae at Ushs 28,000,000 was recommended for field appraisal.</li> <li>3. Borehole drilling at Kakutatom at Ushs 28,000,000.</li> <li>4. Borehole drilling at Morunyang at Ushs 28,000,000</li> <li>5. Borehole drilling at Pudapud at Ushs 28,000,000</li> <li>6. Borehole drilling at Tulelo South at Ushs 28,000,000</li> <li>7. Borehole drilling at Usake Centre at Ushs 28,000,000.</li> <li>8. Borehole drilling at Kagiro at Ushs 28,000,000 was recommended for field appraisal.</li> </ol>	4

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

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

1). Application from Kaloris village in Sidok S/C, the application date was 13th April, 2023, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 13th April, 2023. The application was endorsed by the SAS, Koriang Esther.

2). Application from Morulem village in Kalapata S/C, the application was dated 15th March, 2023, and was endorsed by the SAS, Auma Grace.

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

3). Application from Usake Centre in Morungole S/C, this application was dated 20th February, 2023 and was endorsed by the SAS, Mr. Lomer Daniel Longoli. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 20th February, 2023 by the District Water Officer.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that field-based appraisals were conducted for WSS projects to determine whether they are technically feasible, environmentally, and socially acceptable and the designs have been customized in case of any technical issues</p>	2
			<p>Field appraisals were conducted between 16th June 2023 and reports were signed off by District planner, District engineer, District Water Officer, DCDO and Environment Officer.</p>	
			<p>The following projects were sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Borehole drilling at Lolobae.</li> <li>2. Borehole drilling at Lobatae.</li> <li>3. Borehole drilling at Kakutatom.</li> <li>4. Borehole drilling at Morunyang.</li> <li>5. Borehole drilling at Pudapud at.</li> <li>6. Borehole drilling at Tulelo South.</li> <li>7. Borehole drilling at Usake Centre.</li> <li>8. Borehole drilling at Kagiro.</li> </ol>	
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>Water infrastructure projects for the current FY were not screened for environmental and social risks/impacts because the bidding process had not been completed therefore no project approvals and implementation were carried out. These were the investments from the procurement report for current FY 2023-24</p>	2
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling, Test Pumping and Installation of 9 Boreholes and 2 Production Wells at selected sites in Kaabong district at a cost of UGX 288,000,000</li> <li>2. Hydrological Survey of 9 Boreholes and 2 Production Wells at selected sites in Kaabong district at a cost of UGX. 44,000,000</li> <li>3. Design of Piped Water System at Lochom RGC in Kaabong District at a cost of UGX. 30,000,000.</li> </ol>	

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan, which was approved by the CAO, Kiplangat Martin on 30th June, 2023. The investments planned included Drilling, pump testing and installation of 2 production wells and 9 boreholes in Kaboong district at Ugx 288 M and construction of a 2-stance latrine at Lotim primary school at ugx 17M.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done on 22nd September, 2022 when the committee sat and approved the contracts for Drilling, pump testing, casting and installation of 8 boreholes with hand pump and cattle troughs in selected subcounties in Kaboong district in minute 05/Sept/2022-2023.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG did not establish a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines. This was in a letter dated 28th October, 2022 signed by CAO, Kiplangat Martin in which he named the following persons on the PIT;</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. • Lokwang Albine Ag. DWO- as Contract manager</li> <li>2. Lokong Daniel- Ag. DE as Contract supervisor</li> <li>3. • Lomongin Emmanuel -as Environment officer</li> <li>4. • Achii Christine Lodu- as CDO</li> <li>5. Aree Francis- as labour officer</li> </ol>	
			<p>The clerk of works was not included on the team.</p>	



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example a boreholes in Kitelore village of Kakamar S/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm, respectively as prescribed on the designs that were obtained from the DWO.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as noted in reports dated 17th M ay, 2023 and 18th May, 2023 by the Ag. DWO.</p>	2

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

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

There was evidence that the DWO did verify works and payments were initiated and paid the contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts for example;

1. - Voucher no.5859036 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 47,047,000 with certificate no. 1 Dated 18th May 2023; contract no. Kaab839/SRVCS/2022-23/00001; Hydrological Survey of Eight Boreholes and Five Production wells by Geobot Group Limited was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 18th May 2023, payment was initiated on 18th May 2023 and made on 15th June 2023 which was within 30 days.
2. - Voucher no.5877630 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 155,703,728 with certificate no. 1 Dated 18th May 2023; contract no. Kaab839/wrks/2022-23/00002; Drilling and Installation of Eight Hand Pumps by Dharani Boreholes Limited were certified and verified by the District water Officer on 18th May 2023, payment was initiated on 18th May 2023 and made on 15th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

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

Project: Drilling, pump testing and installation of 5-production wells in selected rural growth centres

Procurement ref; Kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00001 had these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 29th November 2022 with Ms. Icon Projects Limited
- Evaluation report dated 9th September 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd September 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue of and receipt of bids, offer and acceptance letters among the documents on file.

Project: Drilling, pump testing, casting and installation of 8 boreholes in selected sub counties

Procurement Ref: kaab839/wrks/2022-2023/00002; with the following documents;

- Signed works contract dated 21st December, 2022 with Ms. Dharani Boreholes limited
- Evaluation report dated 9th September, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 22nd September, 2023
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record, offer and acceptance letters, supervision reports, payment records among the documents on file.

## 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>Complaints were recorded on 21st April, 2022 for rehabilitation of a boreholes at Lomilip-Lodiko HCII as well as at Kasimeri parish and Kakamar sub county on 18th October, 2022 and forwarded for consideration on 21st October, 2022 for assessment and a status report availed with recommendations for actions to be taken.</p>	<b>3</b>
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated Water Sources and Catchment Protection guidelines as of the minutes that were availed from the meeting held at the production hall dated 14th February, 2022 with CDOs under "Min 04/03/2022 dissemination of the water and catchment protection guideline".</p>	<b>3</b>

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0

There was evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented for example,

1. Borehole drilling at Natipem, Morungole on 30th August, 2022

2. Borehole drilling at Moruita on 30th August, 2022

3. Borehole drilling at Kidebore, Kakamar on 29th August, 2022

4. Production well at Timu, on 6th August, 2022

5. Production well at Lochom on 5th August, 2022

6. Production well at Usake, Morungole on 5th August, 2022

7. Production well at Kotome, Lodiko on 5th August, 2022

As well as the ESMPs as listed below;

1. Drilling of production well at Timu prepared on 11th November, 2023 at UGX 1,800,000

2. Drilling of production well at Lolellia centre prepared on 11th January, 2023 at UGX 1,800,000

3. Drilling and installation of borehole at Sokodou prepared 11th January, 2023 at UGX 1,800,000

4. Drilling and installation of borehole at Kitelore prepared 11th January, 2023 at UGX 1,500,000

5. Drilling and installation of borehole at Lopedo prepared 11th January, 2023 at UGX 1,800,000

And these followed the borehole allocation plans for the respective sub counties dated 6th January, 2023 and 25th August, 2023.

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <p>1). Land agreement signed on 19th April, 2023 between Lokol Largo and the community of Nariwere North village of Sidok S/C. This agreement was signed by Meri Quirino the LCI on behalf together with Loiki Alice, Nakuripo Lemu and Longole on behalf of the community.</p> <p>2). Land agreement signed on 15th April, 2023 between Lokudupo Peter and the community of Napetaaba village of Kathile S/C, and was signed by Lokwara Lokong the LCI with Lokol Zacharia, Lolem Veronica, and Lokong Abraham on behalf of the community.</p> <p>3). Land agreement signed on 6th April, 2023 between Longora Zacharia and the community of Kapelimen village of Lodiko S/C, it was also signed by Nyanga Marcello the LCI with Lowos Martia, Lemu Nailio and Komol Lobok on behalf of the community.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Environment and Social Compliance Certification(E &amp; S) were availed as seen below;</p> <p>1. Environment and Social Compliance Certification (E &amp; S) for the Survey and drilling of 8 Boreholes and 5 Production wells in Kaabong District was signed by District Environment Officer on 27th June 2023. However DCDO didn't sign on the form.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officer carried out monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the drilling and installation of 8 boreholes and 5 production wells conducted between 25th May to 13th June, 2023.</p>	2

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG presented data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>A report dated 27th June 2023 titled "Summary of Micro Scale Irrigation Acreage for 2021/2022 and 2022/2023" submitted by SAO to the DPO showed the summary below;</p> <p><b>2021/2022</b></p> <p>Kalapata Sub-County: 15.3 acres</p> <p>Morungole Sub-County: 2.5 acres</p> <p>Timu Sub-County: 4.5 acres</p> <p>Kamaion Sub-County: 21 acres</p> <p>Kalapata Town Council: 28.4 acres</p> <p><b>Total: 71.7 acres</b></p> <p><b>2022/2023</b></p> <p>Kalapata Sub-County: 27.2 acres</p> <p>Morungole Sub-County: 6.6 acres</p> <p>Timu Sub-County: 8.1 acres</p> <p>Kamaion Sub-County: 35.4 acres</p> <p>Kalapata Town Council: 47.4 acres</p> <p><b>Total: 124.7 acres</b></p> <p>MOUs were presented for the two (2) UgFIT Demo sites that were established in Ogor Seed Sec School (1.5 acres), Ogor S/C, signed on 23rd of June 2023 and a host farmer in Otuke T/C (1.5 acres) signed on 23rd of June 2023.</p>	2

1

Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land

Maximum score 4

Maximum 20 points for this performance area

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

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

This district LG had 71.7 acres of irrigated land in FY 2021/2022.

In the FY 2022/ 2023, the LG had installed three Demo sites and other installations by support partners covering a total of 124.7 acres

**Increase in acreage.**

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

Percentage Increase=(53 / 71.7) X100

Percentage Increase ≈ 0.7395 X100

Percentage Increase ≈ 73.95%

Therefore, the percentage increase in acreage from FY 2021/2022 to FY 2022/2023 was approximately 74%.

2

2

N23\_ Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4

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

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

The average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 85% as per the OPAMS.

4



3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. E.g.</p> <p>Approved annual work plan and budget FY 22/23 prepared by the DAO, verified by the DPMO and approved by the CAO, Lokol Jino Jesmein on 6th September 2022. The work plan reveals that.</p> <p>i). Awareness raising of leaders at the parish, LLG, and LG was costed at Ugx 47,172,000 (15% Max).</p> <p>ii). Awareness raising for farmers 125,792,000 (40% of the budget)</p> <p>iii). Farm visits cost UGX 47,172,000 (15% Min).</p> <p>iv). Demos, equipment, and machinery cost UGX 93,344,000 (30% Max).</p> <p>The annual budget performance report for the financial year 2022/2023, dated 28th June 2023 summarized the following expenditures.</p> <p>i). Amount spent on awareness raising among local leaders = UGX 47,172,000</p> <p>ii). Amount spent on awareness of farmers = UGX 125,792,000</p> <p>iii). Amount spent on farm visit and data collection = UGX 47,172,000</p> <p>iv). Amount spent on Demos, equipment, and machinery = UGX 93,344,000</p>	2
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	No evidence was provided, and no approved Farmer Acceptance Forms were signed by farmers. The CFO noted that the LG is still in the first year of implementing micro-scale irrigation.	1
Maximum score 6	Maximum score 6			

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Variations in the contract price were within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates excluding the cost of agricultural inputs was calculated as follows.	1
	Maximum score 6		Senior Agricultural Engineer costed figure = UGX 93,344,000	
			Contractor's costed figure = UGX 93,985,112	
			Percentage Contract Variation = ((Contractor's Costed Figure - SAE Costed Figure)/SAE Costed Figure)X100	
			Percentage Contract Variation = ((93,985,112-93,344,000)/93,344,000)X100	
			Percentage Contract Variation ≈ 0.687%	
			In this case, it was a relatively small variation of about 0.687%, which indicated that the contractor's cost was within a reasonably close range (+/-20%) of the Agriculture Engineer's estimate.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	The Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation completion rate was 100% completed. That is to say; four sites (Lobulio demo garden, Kaabong bridge site- Kaabong Town Council, Ik secondary school site- Kamion Subcounty, and Kaabong East Min scheme were completed with the financial year 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	A signed supplier contract (Part 4 section 9 contract form), ref: KAAB839/SUPLS/22-230007 dated 29th May 2023, with Fadaisy General Services Ltd and Kaabong DLG.	
			percentage completion = 4/4X100 = 100%	
			A system-generated payment voucher of Ugx 93,985,112 that was approved by the CAO on 15th June 2023 was presented.	
			Completion certificates dated 12th November 2023.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	The LG had deployed 12/35 extension workers=34%.	0
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>		

Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF

- If 100% score 2 or else score 0

The irrigation demonstration sites across different LLGs did not meet the 100% standards defined by MAAIF. Visits were conducted to three sites: Farmer demo site in Kalapata Sub-county dated 15th June 2023, Farmer demo site in Kaabong East Sub-county dated 15th June 2023, and Farmer demo site in Kakamar Sub-county dated 15th June 2023.

**The following aspects adhered to standards:**

Site acreages aligned with MAAF standards, namely Farmer demo site in Kalapata Sub-county (1.5 acres), Farmer demo site in Kaabong East Sub-county (1.5 acres), and the host farmer in Farmer demo site in Kaabong East Sub-county (2.0 acres).

Upon scrutiny of the Asset Register, it was revealed that on June 12, 2023, the Inventory Management Office received Solar micro-scale irrigation systems, as specified in the Bill of Quantities (BOQs), for the three sites, with a total cost of UGX 93,985,112.

Reservoir tanks for the three sites were 5000L.

**However, the following did not meet the standards:**

Only two micro-irrigation technologies were demonstrated on the three farms: Drag hose and sprinkler.

Tank stands, constructed with brickwork, were less than 2 meters high, leading to low pressure in the systems.

Sprinkler rise pipes were not standard, measuring less than 1/2".

The drag hose on two sites was less than 25 meters, falling short of the required standards.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation at the three sites were not fully functional.</p> <p>The Asset Register revealed that on 12th June 2023, the Inventory Management Office received solar micro-scale irrigation systems, as specified in the Bill of Quantities (BOQs), inclusive of all listed items.</p> <p>However, during site visits, it was discovered that some of the components and system accessories were not installed. These included improper sizing of components, absence of manholes and manhole covers, and no drip irrigation system installed on the three sites.</p> <p>UGIFT demonstration site posts were not installed on the three sites that were visited.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information on positions of extension workers filled was accurate. For instance;</p> <p>Kaabong Town Council had an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</p> <p>Loyolo sub-County had an Agriculture Officer- Lokong John Robert</p> <p>Kathile sub- County had a Veterinary Officer- Awilli Evaline Akello</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the information provided on micro-scale irrigation systems installed was functioning accurately. Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation at the three sites were not functioning accurately.</p> <p>The Asset Register revealed that on 12th June 2023, the Inventory Management Office received solar micro-scale irrigation systems, as specified in the Bill of Quantities (BOQs), inclusive of all listed items.</p> <p>However, during site visits, it was discovered that some components and system accessories were not installed. such as; No manholes and manhole covers, and no drip irrigation technology was demonstrated.</p>	0

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services, and farmer EOI. Quarterly supervision and monitoring reports were not presented by the MSI program focal person.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Lower Local Government (LLG) information had not been entered into the Management Information System (MIS) on time. Additionally, the hard copy Expression of Interest (EOI) application files submitted by farmers were unavailable, hindering the verification of the information displayed in the MIS Database.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a lack of evidence indicating that the Local Government (LG) had prepared quarterly progress reports utilizing information compiled from Local Level Governments (LLGs) in the Management Information System (MIS). Furthermore, the quarterly reports, which were prepared by DAO but not submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry, and Fisheries (MAAIF), failed to present or capture any essential statistics generated from the MIS dashboard.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had developed and an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).</p>	0

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

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG had budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms at Ugx 483,482,000/=	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	The LG had deployed extension workers as below;  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Egaru Daniel, Veterinary Officer at Kaabong Town Council</li> <li>2. Samanya Samule, Agriculture Officer Kathile Sub county</li> <li>3. Awino Moureen, Agriculture Officer Kaabong East Sub County</li> <li>4. Chesol Tom, Agricultural Officer, Kakamar Sub County</li> <li>5. Mugaba Ronald, Assistant Veterinary Officer</li> <li>6. Akitui Miriam, Assistant Agricultural Officer</li> <li>7. Okot Hillary Ben, Assistant Agricultural Officer</li> <li>8. Akao Sarah, Assistant Agricultural Officer</li> <li>9. Lokong John Robert, Agriculture Officer</li> <li>10. Kamaka Irene, Assistant Agricultural Officer at Loyoro Sub County</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed. This was verified by comparing the list of extension workers obtained from DPO and the attendance books and displayed lists at visited LLGs per the below;

1. Hillary Okot, Assistant Agriculture Officer - Lodiko
2. Samanya Samule, Agriculture Officer - Kathile Sub county
3. Akitui Miriam, Assistant Agricultural Officer- Kathile Sub county
4. Egaru Daniel, Veterinary Officer at Kaabong Town Council

2

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

There was evidence that extension workers' deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice boards for instance;

1. Hillary Okot, Assistant Agriculture Officer - Lodiko
2. Samanya Samule, Agriculture Officer - Kathile Sub County
3. Akitui Miriam, Assistant Agricultural Officer- Kathile Sub county
4. Egaru Daniel, Veterinary Officer at Kaabong Town Council

2

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. However the LG failed to provide a sample of at least 10 appraisal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Egaru Daniel, Veterinary Officer at Kaabong Town Council was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the Town Clerk Loem Francis</li> <li>2. Awilli Evaline Akello, Veterinary Officer was appraised on 19th June 2023 by Eladu Fredrick the District Production Officer</li> <li>3. Okot Hillary Ben, Assistant Agricultural Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Eladu Fredrick the District Production Officer</li> <li>4. Akao Sarah, Assistant Agricultural Officer was appraised on 15th June 2023 by Eladu Fredrick the District Production Officer</li> <li>5. Lokong John Robert, Agriculture Officer was appraised on 6th June 2023 by Eladu Fredrick the District Production Officer</li> <li>6. Kamaka Irene, Assistant Agricultural Officer at Loyoro Sub County was appraised on 15th June 2023 by Eladu Fredrick the District Production Officer</li> </ol>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator took corrective actions from the appraisals which included; project planning and management, project monitoring and evaluation, computer skills, livestock management</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a training plan in place for extension workers and certificates were awarded to the extension workers who attended module 1 to 6 of the Micro Scale Irrigation Training Program which began in April 2023. Ten extension workers attended and they included Samanya Samule- AO, Akitui Miriam -AAO, Akao Sarah-AAO, Lokong John Robert-DAO, Okot Hillary Ben-AAO, Awili Evaline-AHO, Egaru Daniel, AHO, Losirex Abrahm-AAO, Kamaka Irene-AAO, and Mugaba Ronald-AAHO.</p>	1



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

Maximum score 4

ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0

Evidence from attendance lists and training reports indicated that training activities were documented in the training database. Examples of online training completion by some extension officers include:

Samanya Samuel - Senior Agricultural Officer (SAO): Completion of module 6 on 22nd June 2023.

Lokong John Robert - Agricultural Officer (AO): Completion of module 6 on 5th May 2023.

Dr. Eladu Fredrick - District Production and Marketing Officer (DPMO): Completion of modules 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5a on 20th May 2023.

Akitui Miriam - Assistant Agricultural Officer: Completion of Modules 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5a, b on 27th June 2023.

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum score 10

a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0

The LG had appropriately allocated the micro-scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro-scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services. The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 314,480,000 of which UGX 235,860,000 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 78,620,000 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG which was in phase 2 ,100% micro scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.11,793,000.</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.31,448,000.</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.23,586,000</p> <p>15% farmer visits was Ushs 11,793,000.</p> <p>According to Page 7 Of Sector Grant guidelines.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of co-funding planned as per the current budget. Kaabong DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that the LG used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant since Kaabong DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects</p>	2
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>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>There was evidence that the Local Government (LG) had disseminated information on the use of farmer co-funding. The LG submitted reports on the following:</p> <p>Linking farmers with agro-inputs dealers under the Micro-scale irrigation program dated 22nd October 2023.</p> <p>Sensitization and awareness for farmers on micro-scale irrigation at the parish level dated 5th October 2023.</p> <p>Sensitization and awareness-raising for stakeholders on Micro-scale irrigation dated 23rd August 2023 (Lately done).</p> <p>Environmental, social screening, and inspection report for small Micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites dated 30th June 2023.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the DPO had monitored the installed Micro-scale irrigation equipment monthly.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kaabong DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the Local Government (LG) provided hands-on support to the Local Local Government (LLG) extension workers during the implementation of complementary services in the previous financial year. Supervision reports were not on file, and minutes of field meetings were also not documented.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Kaabong DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Local Government (LG) conducted activities to mobilize farmers in accordance with guidelines. For instance, the awareness-raising report for District local leaders and farmers included the following:  1. Linking farmers with agro-inputs dealers under the Micro-scale irrigation program dated 22nd October 2023. 2. Sensitization and awareness for farmers on micro-scale irrigation at the parish level dated 5th October 2023. 3. Sensitization and awareness-raising for stakeholders on Micro-scale irrigation dated 23rd August 2023. 4. Environmental, social screening, and inspection report for small Micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites dated 30th June 2023.	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented about the training of staff and political leaders at the District and LLG levels in the financial year 2022/2023. These trainings were done in the current financial year for example; reports on awareness creation and sensitization of district councilors, DTPC, and Micro-scale irrigation programs dated 20th July 2023.	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>There was evidence that LG had kept an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY under Ugift Demos. This was captured from the District Asset register dated 12th June 2023.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment revealed a lack of an up-to-date database of applications. Additionally, during the assessment, no hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were available for cross-verification with the entries in the Irri Track application and the Management Information System (MIS) database, indicating a gap in documentation and data management practices.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no information found on the LLG noticeboards publicizing eligible farmer approval.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the micro-scale irrigation systems were not incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY that was approved on 30th June, 2023 by the CAO, Kiplangat Martin.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence to show that the LG did not request for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). They requested for quotations from a list of prequalified suppliers dated 5th April, 2023 signed by the CAO and had been approved by the Contracts Committee.	<b>0</b>
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	The LG concluded the contract with M/s Fadaisy general services Limited at Ugx 93,985,112/= who had a lower quote than Canopy wood Furniture who had quoted Ugx 116,449,480/=, therefore complied with the requirement of signing contract with the lowest bidder.	<b>2</b>
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	The Contracts Committee sitting on 9th may, 2023 in minute 05/May/DCC/2022-2023 approved the award of contract for supply and installation of irrigation systems at selected sites in Lolelia, Kamion and Kaboong Town council	<b>1</b>
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	There was no signed contract with the farmer since these were demonstration site for learning purposes for the farmers.	<b>2</b>
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	There was no evidence that the MSI equipment installed were in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App). This was because the DLG is in its first year of implementation, and for UgIFT demonstrations, the DLG received approved designs from MAAIF that they customize to fit site conditions.	<b>0</b>

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	There was no evidence presented indicating that the Local Government (LG) conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects through relevant technical officers. The site books had no records of supervision visits.	<b>0</b>
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	There was no evidence that the LG oversaw the irrigation equipment testing for functionality. DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the co-funding stage.	<b>1</b>
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	DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of approved farmers under co-funding scheme.	<b>1</b>
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	The CFO noted that the LG was still in the first year of implementation of micro-scale irrigation, therefore no farmers had been selected and approved by the DTPC.	<b>2</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complete procurement file in place for the contract as per the PPDA law.</p> <p>The file reviewed was</p> <p>Project: Supply and installation of irrigation systems in selected demonstration sites</p> <p>Procurement ref: Kaab839/suppl/2022-2023/00007 had the following documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 29th May, 2023 with Ms. Fadaisy General supplies Limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 5th may, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 9th May, 2023</li> <li>• PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record, offer and acceptance letter among documents on file.</li> </ul>	2
----	---	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Local Government did not display details of the nature and avenues to address grievances prominently in multiple public areas arising from the micro-scale irrigation sector and there were no records of grievances.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation grievances were not recorded and neither investigated in line with LG grievance redress framework.</p>	0



14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation grievances were not recorded and thus there were no investigated grievances.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation grievances were not recorded</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation grievances were not recorded and neither investigated and therefore not reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated micro-scale irrigation program guidelines for farmers. For example; Micro-Scale Irrigation Program Improving Farmers' livelihood Technical Guidelines version 3, April 2023 was used. An Environmental, Social screening, and inspection report for small Micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites dated 30th June 2023 was also on file.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all micro-scale irrigation projects and prepared their respective ESMPs as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Micro scale irrigation at Kamion on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000</li> <li>2. Micro scale irrigation at Kakamar on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000</li> <li>3. Micro scale irrigation at Kaabong Town council on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,300,000</li> <li>4. Micro scale irrigation at Kaabong East on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 UGX 4,700,000</li> </ol> <p>The screening and ESMPs were conducted by the CDO and the Environment Officer.</p>	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality &amp; quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals &amp; management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Monitoring of irrigation impacts was done for all micro irrigation projects and costed ESMP prepared for the projects listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inspection report for the small micro scale irrigation at Losera village, Kamion sub county dated 30th June, 2023</li> <li>2. Inspection report for the small micro scale irrigation at Kaabong Town Council dated 30th June, 2023</li> <li>3. Inspection report for the small micro scale irrigation at Toroae village, Kaabong East sub county dated 30th June, 2023</li> </ol> <p>Below were the respective ESMPs that were prepared;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kakamar micro scale irrigation project prepared on 12 April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000</li> <li>2. Kaabong Town Council micro scale irrigation project prepared on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,300,000</li> <li>3. Kaabong East small scale irrigation project prepared on 12th April, 2023 UGX 4,700,000</li> <li>4. Kamion small scale irrigation project prepared on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000</li> </ol>	1

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Certification forms were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the Environment Officer signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	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	Certification forms were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the CDO signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	0

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Chief Finance Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Planner/Senior Planner nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Engineer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Eladu Fredrick as District Production Officer on 28th February 2008 under Minute no. 11/KGDSC/2008.	<b>3</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Ojok Jimmy Ayen as District Community Development Officer on 20th April 2020 under Minute no. 7/KBGDSC/2020.	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	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Procurement Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Onyango Gerald as Procurement Officer on 22nd June 2020 under Minute no. 19/KBGDSC/2020(2).	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	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Loibok Charity as Physical Planner on <u>20th April 2020 under Minute no. 7/KBGDSC/2020.</u>	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	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Akol Filister Comfort as Senior Accountant on 1st June 2016 under Minute no. 45/2016(ii)	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	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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).

The LG had substantively appointed 10 out of 19 Senior Assistant Secretaries For instance;

1. Achalei Kisito was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Loyoro Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute no. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(09)
2. Abura Catherine Lokiru was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Kalapata Sub County) on 22nd June 2022 under Minute no. 19/KBGDSC/2020(1.1)
3. Engor Damian was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Kakamar Sub County) on 16 April 2018 Minute no. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(11)
4. Akello Florence was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Lolelia Sub County) on 23 November 2021 under Minute no. 7/DSC/KTD//November2021(d)(2)(ii)
5. Arem Andrew was substantively appointed as Town Clerk (Kaabong Town Council) on 16th May 2021 under Minute no. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022
6. Nakwang Everline was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Kathile South Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute no. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(10)
7. Nachomin Nancy was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Lobongia Sub County) on 22nd June 2020 under Minute no. 19/KBG/DSC/2020(2)
8. Lemu Thomas was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Morungole Sub County) on 14th March 2003 under Ref CR/156/3 (No Minute)
9. Lolem Francis was substantively appointed as Town Clerk (Kalapata Town Council) on 28th February 2008 under Minute no. 8/KGDSC/2008
10. Koriang Esther was substantively appointed as Senior Assistant Secretary (Kaabong West Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute no. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(07)

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Kaabong LG had substantively appointed a Community Development Officer / Senior CDO for Town Councils and LLGs as below;

1. Kubal Mathew, CDO (Loyoro Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(35)
2. Lomer Daniel Longoli, CDO (Murungole Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute No.

- 64/DSC/KBG/2018(39)
3. Auma Grace, CDO (Kaabong East Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(43)
4. Lotyang Simon Peter , CDO (Timu Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(42)
5. Modo Emmanuel, CDO (Kathile Sub County) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.6)
6. Walamoe Walter, CDO (Kaabong West Sub County) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.1)
7. Ome Patricia, CDO (Kathile South Sub County) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.3)
8. Nakiru Winnie Eko, CDO (Kakamar South Sub County) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.4)
9. Nakwang Winnie Thelma, CDO (Kathile Town Council) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.2)
10. Mogo Rose Winny, CDO (Kalapata Town Council) on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(18.5)
11. Locokio Moses, CDO on 16th May 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(19)
12. Ateu Benjamin Ilukori, CDO (Kaabong Town Council) on 28th February 2008 under Minute no.8/KBGDSC/2008
13. Lokong John Bosco, CDO (Lodiko Sub county) on 14th September 2005 under Ref CR/156/3
14. Ayo Agnes Odwar, CDO (Lobong Sub County) on 16th April 2018 under Minute No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(41)
15. Dida Gabriel, CDO on 1st March 2022 under Minute No. 16/KBG/DSC/May/2022(18.7)
16. Adyaka Simon Achuka, CDO on 22 June 2020 under Minute no. 19/KBGDSC/2020 (3.1)

Some Sub counties did not have substantively appointed CDOs like Lolelia, Lotim, Kamion, Lobongia, and Kalapata Sub County

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Kaabong LG had substantively appointed a Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant for LLGs as below;

1. Lokuwan Ruth was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Kaabong West) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBG/DSC/May/2022(17.1)

0



2. Natyang Vanessa Doneta Achuka was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Lolelia) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBG/DSC/May/2022(17.3)
3. Akech Christine Okot was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Sidok) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBG/DSC/May/2022(20)
4. Opio Peter Emmanuel was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Kamion) on 16th April 2018 under Minute no. 64//DSC/KBG/2018(25)
5. Orebo Caesar Okuda was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Kathile) on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(8)
6. Adupa Joel was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Morungole) on 2nd May 2019 under Minute no. 42/KBGDSC/2019(3)
7. Okiror Daniel Kilfeldod was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Loyoro) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(17.5)
8. Munyes Veronica was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Kaabong Town Council) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(17.4)
9. Natyang Anna Grace was substantively appointed as Accounts Assistant (Timu) on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(17.2)
10. Adong Rebecca Nangiro was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kalapata Town Council) on 5th April 2019 under Minute no. 24/KBGDSC/2019 (A)(ii)(2)
11. Achuu Jacinta was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kathile South) on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(1)
12. Akudo Noah was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (KalapataSub County) on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(13)
13. Nakiru Sarah Stella was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kaabong East) on 5th April 2019 under Minute no. 32/KBGDSC/2019 (B)(iii)(1)
14. Apio Sarah Hope was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Ludiko) on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(3)
15. Lomonyang Simon Adingiri was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Lobongia) on 5th April 2019 under Minute no.

- 24/KBGDSC/2019(A)(ii)(5)
16. Komol Peter Kin was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kaabong LG) on 14th September 2005 under CR/156/3
  17. Ochan Dickson was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kaabong LG) on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(12)
  18. Kotol Wilfred was substantively appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant (Kaabong LG) on 5th April 2019 under Minute no. 24/KBGDSC/2019(A)(ii)(1)

The sub counties without substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants/an Accounts Assistants included Lotim, Kakamar, and Lolele South

### 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, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;</p> <p>Actual received from MoFPED by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 140,852,667 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14). Actual amount released by LG to department was UGX 140,852,667</p> <p><math>(UGX\ 140,852,667 / 140,852,667) * 100 = 100\%</math>.</p>	2
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. score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 76% for community based service as per the computation below;</p> <p>Amount received from MoFPED by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 754,446,404 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14). Amount released to department as of 30th June 2023 was UGX 754,446,404</p> <p><math>(UGX\ 754,446,404 / UGX\ 754,446,404) * 100 = 100\%</math></p>	2

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for the renovation of Sidok Administration block and the respective ESMP prepared on 9th August, 2022 at a cost of UGX 1,900,000.	4
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	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	The project that was implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage it required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.	4
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0	The LG had a costed ESMP for the renovation of Sidok Administration block a DDEG project which was also integrated into the BoQs at a total cost of UGX 39,260,000 with Bill No. 2 under Preliminaries, item 1 and Element 1 item A, B and D costed at UGX 2,000,000 as environmental and social safeguards.	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 audit opinion for Kaabong LG 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 internal Auditor claimed that as LG they provided information to the PS on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General Findings. However he was not in position to provide to the assessment team a copy of letter so it was hard to determine whether the LG submitted the report before the end 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 LG submitted an annual performance contract on 3rd July 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 16th August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

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

Maximum score is 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

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

Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 8th February 2023.

Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 20th March 2023.

Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 30th June 2023.

Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 16th August 2023.

From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has 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	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOES.	<b>0</b>
<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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kaabong LG had substantively appointed;</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sangar Santina as Senior Inspector of Schools on 1st June 2015 under Minute no. 73/05/DSC/2015(1)</li> <li>2. Cire Lestin as Inspector of Schools on 16th May 2022 under Minute no. 16/KBGDSC/May/2022(4)</li> </ol>	<b>40</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education projects for the previous FY were carried out and below is the list of projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a boys' dormitory at Kakamar primary school on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>2. Construction of a staff house at Lotetelit primary school on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>3. Construction of a staff house at Lokwakaramoe primary school on 29th March, 2023</li> <li>4. Construction of kitchen and store at Nachakunet primary school on 23rd August, 2022</li> <li>5. Completion of 8 staff house at Tari primary school on 23rd August, 2022</li> <li>6. Construction of a kitchen and store at Nariamaoi primary school on 8th August, 2022</li> </ol>	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

2

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

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

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

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Nalibe Sharif as District Health Officer on 20th April 2020 under Minute No. 7/KBGDSC/2020.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing nor was there a seconded staff.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health nor was there a seconded staff.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Kibwota Godfrey Achilla as Principal Health Inspector on 1st April 2017 under Minute No. 15/2017(d)	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Anyakun Sandro Lotyang as Senior Health Educator on 5th April 2019 under Minute No. 32/KBGDSC//2019(B)(ii)(1)	<b>10</b>



1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Ekwee Simon as Biostatistian on 1st November 2007 under Minute No. 10/2007.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a District Cold Chain Technician nor was there a seconded staff.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health sector projects for the current FY was not carried out despite the fact that the projects were approved as of the procurement report for the current FY 2023-24 and also in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were the projects in the health sector that should have been screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. District Health Office Maintenance, at Campswahili Ward at UGX. 15,999,000</li> <li>2. Completion of General Ward Phase Two at Kalapata Health Centre III Kalapata Town Council budgeted at UGX 120,000,000</li> </ol>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Since Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was not carried out, therefore ascertaining whether Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) was carried out would be necessary if the screening process had been completed.</p>	<b>15</b>

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------

**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>	Anuso Gorreti, Senior Agricultural Engineer was seconded by the Permanent Secretary Gen. David Kusasira-Kyomukama on 18th April 2023 ref; FAD F50/181/02.	<b>70</b>
---	--	--	---	-----------

**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.	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all micro-scale irrigation projects and prepared their respective ESMPs as listed below;  1. Micro scale irrigation at Kamion on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000  2. Micro scale irrigation at Kakamar on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,700,000  3. Micro scale irrigation at Kaabong Town council on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 at UGX 4,300,000  4. Micro scale irrigation at Kaabong East on 15th March, 2023 and prepared the ESMP on 12th April, 2023 UGX 4,700,000	<b>30</b>
---	--	---	--	-----------

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

**Water & Environment  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The appointment letter for the Civil Engineer (Water) was not availed at the time of assessment. However, there was sufficient evidence that Lokwang Albine was substantively appointed as he appeared in the PBS staff list for FY 2023/2024 per page 46 of the same document.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was not captured in the approved and customised staff structure of Kaabong LG. Likewise, there was no designated officer for this role at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Abel Hillary Komol as Borehole Maintenance Technician on 1st May 2011 under Minute no. 43/KBGDSC/2011.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had substantively appointed Lomongin Emmanuel as Environment Officer on 1st June 2015 under Minute no. 64/05/DSC/2015(1).	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kaabong LG had neither substantively appointed a Forestry Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	<b>0</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

If the LG:

a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY was carried out and costed ESMPs prepared for each borehole site on 11th January, 2023 at UGX 1,800,000 as listed below;

1. Borehole drilling at Natipem, Morungole on 30th August, 2022
2. Borehole drilling at Moruita on 30th August, 2022
3. Borehole drilling at Kidebore, Kakamar on 29th August, 2022
4. Borehole drilling at Sokodu, Kaabong East on 29th August, 2022
5. Borehole drilling at Longoromit, Lobongia on 29th August, 2022
6. Borehole drilling at Lopedo, Lodiko on 26th May, 2022
7. Borehole drilling at Nangoletaba, Lobongia on 26th August, 2023
8. Borehole at Narube, kathile on 26th August, 2022
9. Production well at Timu, on 6th August, 2022
10. Production well at Lochom on 5th August, 2022
11. Production well at Usake, Morungole on 5th August, 2022
12. Production well at Kotome, Lodiko on 5th August, 2022

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.

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

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

There was no abstraction permit presented for assessment. This is because the LG did not implement piped water system for the previous FY.