



LGMSD 2022/23

Karenga District

(Vote Code: 634)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	62%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	52%
Educational Performance Measures	60%
Health Performance Measures	56%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	57%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	16%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>There was no DDEG projects planned and implemented in the Previous FY 2022/2023.</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 3 • 1 to 5% increase, score 2 • If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>From a copy of result assessment presented by Planner during the assessment indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 62% compared to the last year as per computation below;</p> <p>The average score for current year was 81%.</p> <p>The average score for previous financial year was 50%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>$= (0.81 - 0.5/0.25) * 100\% = 62\%$</p> <p>The LLG performance assessment for current year increased by 62% from previous year performance.</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>There was no DDEG projects implemented in the Previous FY.</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There were no DDEG projects implemented in the Previous FY.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There were no DDEG project implemented in the district in FY 2022/2023.	2
---	--	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	The information in the LG staff list tallied with the staff lists seen in the LLGS visited (Karenga Town Council, Kapedo Sub County and Kawalakol Sub county). For instance the following staff were found in Kawalakol Sub County as per the staff list;	2
---	--	--	---	---

1. Lokure John Bosco, Parish Chief
2. Odong Sam Bwangamoe, Senior Assistant Secretary
3. Piramoe John Bosco, Parish Chief
4. Lokwang Francis, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer
5. Kilama Lawrence, Assistant Agricultural Officer
6. Achero Paul Patrick, Parish Chief

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	There were no DDEG projects implemented in the Previous FY.	2
---	--	--	---	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise; If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs score 4 or else 0 NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.	The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was; DLG IVA Kapedo S/C 84 92 Karenga T/C 89 87 Karenga S/C 76 73 Kawakakol S/C 81 46 The performance of Kawakol S/C was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.	0
---	---	--	---	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	No evidence performance improvement plan was provided at the time of assessment.	0
---	---	--	--	---

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

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS on 29th September 2023 of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED under Ref: CR/D115/1	2
---	--	---	--	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The HR department did not provide any evidence during the assessment to show that the District had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):	0
---	--	--	---	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	Out of the 9 Heads of Department appraisals expected, only one was provided as below; 1. Abura Rebecca Onyango- DCDO was appraised on 31st July by Mulunda Hussein, Deputy CAO	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>There was evidence that the LG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. For instance, on 9th May 2023, the committee sat and rewarded Illukol Andrew- DHO, Auma Collin- Cold Chain Assistant and Oketch Michael- Health Information Assistant for outstanding performance. The officers received certificates of recognition for their contribution towards the fight against COVID 19,</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The 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>The LG recruited 184 staff the previous FY and only 14 accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. Some justifications were provided for those who had not accessed the payroll as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Arutlya Lux Idilla(Assistant Agricultural Officer) His issues was mainly wrong NIN number that was corrected and he already accessed the payroll last month 2. Ameo Jesca (Assistant Nursing Officer Midwifery) Her issue was wrong email address that was used for processing the TIN number that needed amendment but she already accessed the payroll last month and her salary arrears for this financial year is being processed 3.Amina Sarah (Health Information Assistant) Her issue was limited positional codes from the establishment hierarchy for accessing her to the payroll that need to be created from public service 4.Ekalam Johnathan (Health Assistant) His issue is limited positional codes in the establishment hierarchy that need to be created by public service 	0

9	Pension Payroll management	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:	There was only one LG staff that retired the previous FY. Lokong Peter Ben Omin retired on 22nd May 2023 and accessed the pension payroll on 30th June 2023.	1
	Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	Score 1.		

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in the previous FY as per the releases below;	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Kakwanga S/C received Ushs 2,432,678</p> <p>Kapedo S/C received Ushs 8,164,304</p> <p>Kapedo T/C received Ushs 963,238</p> <p>Karenga S/C received Ushs 6,544,497</p> <p>Karenga T/C received Ushs 10,637,499</p> <p>Kawalakol S/C received Ushs 23,739,376</p> <p>Kidepo T/C received Ushs 963,238</p> <p>Lobalangit S/C received Ushs 8,662,707</p> <p>Lokori S/C received Ushs 8,039,704</p> <p>Sangar S/C received Ushs 10,531,715</p> <p>The direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY were as follows:</p> <p>In quarter 1: Did not receive DDEG.</p> <p>In quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 3: The release was on 2nd January 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4: Did not receive DDEG.</p>	

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: LG Did not receive DDEG</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 9th November, 2022, warrant was made in more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd February, 2023 and warranted on 30th February, 2023 which More than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4: LG did not 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:	At the time of the assessment, release letters were not provided so it was hard to determine whether the LG communicated the funds within the stipulated time from the date of cash release.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
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:	The LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023. However, it was only done for quarters three and Four.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Q 1 -.No report was provided at the time of Assessment.</p> <p>Q 2 report was not provided at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Q 3 mentoring report was done on 20th March 2023.</p> <p>Q 4 mentoring report was done from 19th April 2023 to 20th April 2023.</p>	
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	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:	There was no 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,	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The DLG presented assets register which on review showed it was not Up to date. For instance, Land Register had no records for health facilities, schools, and District Headquarters.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Board of Survey report dated 23rd August 2022 recommended the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That action should be taken on the board of survey report for the previous FY 2. The LG should trace and return the missing motor cycle for Karanga HC IV 3. Departments should critically handle issues related to their assets register <p>No evidence of action taken on the above recommendations was availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref CR/651/1 dated 11st May 2023. However, the Minutes for the previous FY 2022/23 were not on file. It was also noted that the LG doesn't have a substantially appointed Physical Planner for the District.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't implement any development project funded by DDEG in the previous FY 2022/23.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects: e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't implement any development project funded by DDEG in the previous FY 2022/23.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>It was noted by the District Planner that TPC did not discuss the Project Profiles with costing for the current FY.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no investments in the current FY that had been approved and therefore no screening was required.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no project planned to be implemented using DDEG funding in the current FY, as was noted from approved procurement plan dated 11th July, 2023, submitted to PPDA on 14th July, 2023 and signed by the CAO, Uma Charles.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There were Contracts Committee minutes for the sitting on 6th October, 2023 where evaluation report was approved and contracts awarded. However, there was no project to be implemented using DDEG funds.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had established the Project implementation team (PIT) by the CAO, as specified in the sector guidelines that was seen during the time of assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There were no design drawings by the LG Engineer provided, since there was no project implemented in the year under review.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There were no supervision reports prepared since no project was implemented in the year under review	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	There was no record of verification of payments that was seen during the assessment exercise since no project was implemented in the year under review.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had no procurement file for review since no project was implemented in the year under review.	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District i) designated Mr. Lobolia John Mike the Labour Officer with an appointment letter issued on 20th November, 2020 to coordinate response to grievance/complaints and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) comprising of members from different departments as listed below,</p> <p>Nasur Charles from the works department, Logwee Francis Lokinga from Natural Resources, Dada Rose Romano from Education, Iluko Anderw Rews from Health, Ngole Moris from Commercial, Opul Alfred from Production, Abura Rebecca Onyang from Community Based Services, Engor Luke Ngoya from Finance, Mallo P. Lokiru from Planning Unit and Aballo Grace from Administration all appointed on 11th December, 2020.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had log book for recording, investigating and responding to grievances for example, a complaint recorded on 22nd May, 2023 by Napoyok Lucy for non-payment of UGX. 500,000 as 4 months arrears of labour work during the construction of Kawalakol classroom block. And a resolution was reached on 2nd June, 2023 for payment be to settled by 7th June, 2023</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The grievance redress mechanism was publicized by Lobolia John Mike on public displays at the entrance of the district headquarter administrative building although the date of publicization was not included on the post.</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the DDP III and AWP & budget showed that Climate change and environment are integrated in DDP III on page 82, AWP on page 14, and the approved budget on page 44 which included wetland management, tree planting, training farmers in smart agriculture etc. Community and mind set change, reducing negative cultural practices and attitude as an intervention on Social issues also found on page 75 and 76 of LG DDP III, AWP on page 16 and Approved Budget on page 45.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines. A meeting held on 22nd June 2023 in the Women's Club under MIN no 06/DTPC/JUN/2023:Dissemination of DDEG guidelines for FY 2022/23 to LLGs by the District Planner.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	There were no DDEG investments implemented in the respective financial years therefore, no costed ESMPs were prepared.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects that had been budgeted for in previous FY as an additional intervention to climate change.	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There were no DDEG investments that had been approved and or implemented for the respective financial years to ascertain whether they were located on land with proof of ownership.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports, for example; 1. Construction of a maternity ward, 4-stance latrine and a placenta pit at Kalimon HCII dated 28th June, 2023 and 30th May, 2023 2. Construction of a 2 classroom block with office and store at Kawalakol primary school dated 31st June, 2023 and 25th May, 2023 3. Report for the extension of pipe water system to Nakitoit parish, Karenga sub county dated 25th April, 2023 and 30th June, 2023	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environmental Officer and CDO did not complete and sign certification forms prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example; 1. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 6th September, 2023 for the construction of a block of 2 classrooms with an office at Kawalakol primary school was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO 2. Interim payment certificate No. 2 issued on 6th March, 2023 for the construction of a plant clinic at Kakanga sub county was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO 3. Interim payment certificate No. 2 issue on 3rd May, 2023 for the construction of a 2 stance latrine at Loyoro Napore primary school was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO.	0

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of Bank reconciliation reports were provided at the time of assessment. It was noted by the Assistant Accountant that they could not run an updated bank reconciliation report since the IFMIS was off due to poor network.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>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 20th November, 2022.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 30th January 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 25th April 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>There was no evidence provided by the Internal Auditor that the Internal Audit reports were provided to the council chairperson and LG PAC at the time of assessment.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was noted by the Internal Auditor that LG PAC didn't not discuss internal Audit reports for the Previous FY.</p>	0

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 15,690,421,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 35) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 541,711,282 which gave a variance of Ushs (15,148,709,718) this indicate that District local Government over collected local revenue which shows good performance.</p> $(15,148,709,718/15,690,421,000) \times 100\% = (97)\%$ <p>The LG corrected 3% of its planned revenue. This indicate that 97% of the planned revenue was not collected by the District in the Previous FY.</p>	2
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 35was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22 Total revenue = Ushs 136,507,744</p> <p>OSR 2022/23 Total revenue = Ushs 541,711,282</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> $\text{Ushs } 541,711,282 - \text{Ushs } 136,507,744 = \text{Ushs } 405,203,538$ $= (405,203,538/136,507,744) \times 100 = 297\%$ <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 increased by 297%.This indicate that the LG over collected own source revenue in the FY 2022/23 which was a positive result.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was noted from the Senior Accountant that there was no local revenue that was transferred to LLG in the previous FY.</p>	0

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder</p> <p>Procurement Reference: Kare854/WRKS/2022-2023/00003</p> <p>Subject Of Procurement: Partial Fencing OF Pire HC II Lobalangit Sub County</p> <p>Method of Procurement: Selective Domestic Bidding</p> <p>Best Evaluated bidder: Mogos Services</p> <p>Total Contract price: UGX 42,229,000/= V.A.T inclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 17th April, 2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 28th April, 2023</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had the performance assessment results and the implications for the FY 2021/22 publicized on the District notice board and endorsed by the CAO stamp. However, the results didn't have a date when they were publicized.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions e.g. municipal urban, forum, barazas , radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was seen on the notice board that LG made public available information on tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal.</p>	0

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

No IGG issue was reported in the previous FY.

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.	a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was = 586</p> <p>Total absentees were 13</p> <p>Total that sat were (586 - 13) =573</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 22 +297+137 = 456</p> <p>Pass rate = $456/573 \times 100 = 79.5\%$</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was = 713</p> <p>Total absentees were 12</p> <p>Total that sat were (713 - 12) =701</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 14 +293+180 = 487</p> <p>% pass rate= $(487/701) \times 100 = 69.47$</p> <p>% Decline = $69.47 -79.5 = -10.03\%$</p>	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 		

1

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

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered
was=127

Total absentees were =1

Total that sat were $(127 - 1) = 126$

Total Grades (1,2&3) = $4+27 +40 = 71$

% Pass rate = $71/126 \times 100 = 56.34\%$

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was
= 165

Total absentees were =2

Total that sat were $(165 - 2) = 163$

Total grades (1,2& 3)= $15 +44$
 $+54=113$

% pass rate= $113/163 \times 100$

= 69.32%

% improvement = $69.32 - 56.34$

=12.98%

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 LLG performance for FY 2022/2023
was 86%, while for FY 2023/2024 was
96%. The average score increased by
9%.

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>DLG did receive a Sector Development Grant of Ushs 1,022,046,000 for FY 2022/2023. was used towards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kawalokol Primary School at Ushs 76,000,000. 2. Construction of 2 stance pit latrines at Karenga Girls Primary School at Ushs 15,000,000 3. Construction of Kapedo Seed Secondary School at Ushs 850,095,000. 4. Construction of 2 stance pit latrine at Nalakas Primary School at Ushs 15,000,000. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The verified vouchers indicated the District Education Officer did not verify the work as per voucher item two, District Environment Officer, District community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on education projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Voucher no 6441093 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 12,330,822; Certificate No 1, dated 9th June 2023; Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00004, Project; Construction of a Two Stance drainable latrine at Karenga Girls Primary School was certified by District Engineer on 9th June 2023, District Education Officer on 29th May 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO did not verify the work. 2. - Voucher no 641685 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 71,440,000; Certificate No 1, dated 9th June 2023; Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00001, Project; Construction of a one block of two classroom with an office at Kawalokol Primary School was certified by District Engineer on 9th June 2023, District Education Officer did not certify the work, District Environment Officer and DCDO on 8th May 2023. 	0
			<p>As per Voucher item 2 District Education Officer did not certify the work. However, the payments were made.</p>	

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 were sampled only two were 2.83% within +/-20% the acceptable variation, while one -50.10% did not comply.

Project 1: Construction of One block of two classrooms with office at Kawalakol Primary School

Procurement ref: Kare854/wrks/2022-2023/00001

Project 2: Construction of 2-stance VIP latrine at Karenga girls Primary School

Procurement ref: Kare854/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Project 3: Construction of Kapedo Seed Secondary School

Procurement ref: MoES/UGFIT/2021-2022/0003 lot 23

Project 1:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 76,000,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 114,708,548/=

Variation: Ugx -38,078,548/=

%age $(-38,078,548/76,000,000) \times 100\% = -50.10\%$

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 15,000,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 14,575,440/=

Variation: Ugx 424,560/=

%age variation $(424,560/15,000,000) \times 100\% = 2.83\%$

Project 3:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 900,094,798/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 800,095,000/=

Variation: Cost: Ugx 99,999,798/=

%age variation $(99,999,798/900,094,798) \times 100\% = 11.11\%$

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There was evidence that education project Seed Secondary Schools was not completed as per the work plan in the previous FY. This was noted in the two reports dated 26th April, 2023 by the project implementation team where they put the percentage of work done at 10%, thus was signed by the DEO, DE, CDO, environment officer among the members of the team. Another was a report dated 29th June, 2023 by the assistant engineering officer-civil who was supervising the project who put the work progress at 16%.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	Karenga LG current primary Teacher's staff November, 2023 indicated a total 311 teachers posted in the 20 UPE schools which was 85.2% as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines in relation to the teachers ceiling of 365	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	311×100 365 $= 85.2$	
			This implied that the municipality was 14.8% 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 Karenga Consolidated Assets register for 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 20 registered UPE schools and 1 USE school was in place consisting of the following; 172 classrooms, 238 latrine stances, 2213 desks, 94 teachers houses and one laboratory at Jubilee SSS prepared by Gax Gabriel District inspector of schools and was approved by the district education officer Mr. Dada Ras Romano	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	This implied that 100% of the UPE schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format	
			21×100 21 $= 100\%$	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The DLG deployment list dated 11th November, 2023 consisted of 311 primary school teachers. The LG accurately reported on the teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving.

The LG teacher's deployment list from the DEO'S office dated 11th November, 2023 matched that found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:

At Kawalakol primary school taken as rural had 16 teachers listed and posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Nayet Jolly Josephine as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the DEO'S list..

Lokiel Primary School taken as semi-urban School had 15 teachers with Ajoko Peter Abednego as head teacher also matched well with the DEO's list at the DLG..

Karenga Girl's primary school taken as urban had 16 teachers the head teacher SR: Drabezuo Lois. The list also matched well with that of DEO at the DLG..

This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was = $16+15+16 = 47/47*100= 100\%$.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

Evidence indicated that the LG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 20 UPE schools as captured below;

Karenga Girl's primary school taken as urban had 12 classrooms, 150 desks, 11 stances of latrines though 4 were in bad shape and 12 teachers housing units .

Lokiel primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms 22 latrine stances though majority were full, 76 desks & 4 teacher's houses shared by 15 teachers.

Kawalakol primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 7 classrooms, 286 desks, 12 latrine stances & 8 teachers houses

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 evidence that Head teachers in the schools visited \ complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines;

Karenga Girl's primary school(urban)

Primary school had budgeted for the whole calendar year 2023 dated 25th January, 2023 with clear cash flow statements signed by the SMC chairperson Rev Fr; -Hillary Ikechukwu Ezekwueme and an asset register having 12 classrooms, 11 latrine stances, 150 desks and 12 teachers houses.

Lokiell primary school taken as semi urban primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC dated 18th January, 2023 clearly indicating the annual budget and cash flow .signed by the head teacher and SMC chairperson Mr. Lokapel Augustine and asset register attached of 7 classrooms, 76 desks, 22 latrine stances though only 12 were functional, 4 teachers houses shared by 15 teachers.

Kawalakol primary school equally had the necessary annual budget for of the 2023 calendar year which had been signed by the chairperson SMC Mr. Acherungimoc Phillips with minutes attached for the respective terms and an asset register consisting of 7 classrooms, 286 desks, 12 latrine stances and 8 houses for the 16 teachers submitted on 21st January, 2023.

$$3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$$

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence seen to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.</p> <p>.</p> <p>From the sampled and visited Schools;</p> <p>Lokiel primary school taken as semi urban;</p> <p>Had a 5 latrine stance newly constructed by UNICEF to improve the school's sanitation.</p> <p>-sensitizing parents in sangar sub county on the back to school campaigns and EMIS registration.</p> <p>- informing parents of the role of the SMC and PTA and how they can be utilised.</p> <p>Karenga girls primary school in a report dated 25thFebruary ,2023 had the following improvement done;</p> <p>- Construction of 2 stance latrine for teachers and another one for the boys.</p> <p>- Repainting of the administration block and 2 classrooms with support from the founding body.</p> <p>- Fixing of windows and doors of the classes that had been dilapidated.</p> <p>Kawalakol primary school had the improvement plan showing the following achievements as addressed by the school inspectors from the inspection feed back</p> <p>Sensitization of parent on back to school campaigns.</p> <p>- new office block and classrooms by the LG.</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"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The education office had submitted 25,790 learners for both primary and secondary as seen by 15th November,2023</p>	4

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>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 LG 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 2,164,704,000/=</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 311 teachers as per sector guidelines according to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was a teacher deployed at least per school as in the examples provided below;</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karenga girls Primary School taken as urban school had 16 teachers. Head teacher was sr. Drabezu Lois. 2. Lokiel primary school taken as semi urban had 15 teachers. head teacher as Ajoko Peter Abednego, and 3. Kawalakol Primary School taken as -rural had 16 teachers. Head teacher as Nayet Jolly Josephine 	
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>There was no evidence of dissemination of the teachers deployment at the LG notice board at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for primary school head teachers at the time of assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for secondary school headteachers at the time of assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for the LG Education staff at the time of assessment.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was no evidence of a training plan to address the capacity gaps seen at the time of assessment</p>	0
---	--	--	---	----------

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>There was evidence of submission to PBS the list of schools, their enrolment and budget done on 25th January, 2023 by Dada Ross Romano. However, the letter was submitted beyond the stipulated deadline of December 15th.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The plan for inspection was seen, it was prepared as per sector guidelines for all terms. It was dated 24th July r 2023 with a budget attached of UGX; 10,102,000 for FY 2022/2023 and UGX: 18,520,000 for FY2023/2024.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July 2022 and warranted on 17th August 2022 after 30 days. 2. 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October 2022 and warranted on 9th November 2022 after 30 days. 3. 3rd Quarter was released on 2nd January 2023 and warranted on 2nd January 2023 which was within 5 days. 4. 4th Quarter was released on 11st April 2023 and warranted on 2nd May 2023 after 19 days. 	0
---	---	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>At the time of the assessment release letters were not provided so it was hard to determine whether the LG communicated the funds within stipulated time from the date of cash release.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DLG Education Department prepared an inspection plan for schools in the LG in a letter addressed to the CAO on 13th March 2023.</p> <p>Planning meeting had been held on 22nd February 2023 with the following action plans,</p> <p>The inspection for term 1 2023 was to take 5 days from 14th March 2023 to 20th March 2023 for UPE and the USE school.</p> <p>To assess the general conditions in the schools.</p> <p>To assess teacher presence and teaching processes. It was attended by 6 persons in charge of the inspectors.</p> <p>According to the minutes dated 11th July 2023.</p> <p>Inspection schedule for term 2 2023 was to be between 15th July 2023 to 17th July 2023. After which a field findings discussion of reports was to be done on 31st July 2023 as compiled by Lotuk Gax Gabriel, Ag District inspector of schools.</p> <p>However, the inspection schedule for Term 3 was not availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>Evidence indicated that 20 UPE schools had been inspected in a report dated 13th April,2023 for term 1 2023 which was done between 14th to 20th March,2023 as compiled by Lopeyok Hillary DIS at the time, term 2 report dated 15th August,2023 prepared by Ag District inspector of schools Gax Gabriel also indicated 20 schools covered for term 2 2023 and also for term 3 2022 in a report dated 5th November,2023 of inspections that were carried out between 14th October to 27th October,2022</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 only observed one inspection report for Term 2, dated 18th August 2023, out of the expected three reports. The other reports were not available during the assessment:</p> <p>Term one: No report was presented.</p> <p>Term three: No report was presented.</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>There was evidence of submission and acknowledgement by the Directorate of Education Standards or receiving the Inspection findings from Karenga DLG education department on 11th September,2023 by Lotuk Gax Gabriel and was received by Komugabe Edith</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education sat and discussed delivery issues in a meeting that was held on 22nd May 2023 at the Women’s Club where at least 5 members were present. Under Min no MIN 3/22/05/2023.some of key service delivery issues included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Athletics of the year were delayed and there was a need to budget something that would help our children. 2. Music dance and drama are always done in the second term. 3. DEO noted the budget for the Kid league has not been handled yet the kids were going for nationals. 4. Issues to do with the inspection of schools were discussed. 5. Issues of Karenga Girls Primary School which was collapsing and needed to be rectified. <p>The coding of schools in the region was also discussed.</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>There was evidence that the Karenga DLG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called “Go back to school” campaign</p> <p>Evidence of sensitization dissemination conducted were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 14th July ,2023 a report was made showing 48 members of the community together with the education department of the LG with aid from some NGOs like WFP,FIDA did a mobilization encouraging parents to take children to school at Napore primary school on the 20th June,2023 targeting the sub counties of Loyoro North, Loyoro South and Nakitoyiti. • On 12th October, 2022 the education department with aid from UNICEF reached out to t6he communities of Lobalangit, Kakwanga, Karenga, Kapedo Town council, kapedo were reached out via a public address system on back to school campaigns. Evidence shows that over 665 people were reached.
----	---	---	--

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>Evidence indicated that the LG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 20 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>172 classrooms, 238 latrine stances, 2213 desks, 94 teachers houses as prepared by Gax Gabriel District inspector of schools and was approved by the district education officer Mr. Dada Ras Romano .</p> <p>From the schools sampled the following assets were evidenced;</p> <p>Karenga Girl’s primary school taken as urban had 12 classrooms, 150 desks, 11 stances of latrines though 4 were in bad shape and 12 teachers housing units .</p> <p>Lokiell primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms 22 latrine stances though majority were full, 76 desks & 4 teacher’s houses shared by 15 teachers.</p> <p>Kawalakol primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 7 classrooms, 286 desks, 12 latrine stances & 8 teachers houses</p>
----	--	---	--

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals for education projects that were implemented in the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG conducted field appraisals for education projects that were implemented in the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. It was approved on 11th July, 2023 by the, CAO, Uma Charles. The education items were; Completion of Kapedo Seed Secondary School, Completion of construction of store and kitchen at Lomamok and Completion of a two-unit staff house at Kalimon primary school.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There were Contracts Committee that sat on 8th November, 2022, in which they approved the evaluation and award of contract minute Kare854/cc/2022-2023/4/2. The contracts approved were Kapedo Seed Secondary school.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>A letter written by the CAO dated 20th January, 2023 that established the project implementation team (PIT) for school infrastructure named;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lobolia John Mike- Labour officer 2. Iteo John Bosco- Environment officer 3. Nasur Charles- Ag. DE 4. Abura Rebecca- Ag. DCDO- <p>The letter did not spell out their roles on the</p>	0

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 MoES. A visit to Kapedo Seed Secondary school. This was observed from the plinth foundation for one block for two classrooms which was 1.5 m deep constructed out of solid concrete blocks of 200mm thick, with an intermediate ground beam and top beam, spaced at 600mm centre, with Y12 bars 4no, while the external size of the 2-classblock as 18.5 x 7.4m.	1
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 minutes dated 23rd February, 2023, 15th March, 2023, 24th May, 2023 and 29th June, 2023 signed by the assistant engineering officer-civil that indicated that there was supervision of the infrastructure projects in the previous FY.	1
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 were reports dated 24th February, 2023 30th March, 2023 and 27th June, 2023 signed by the inspection team comprised of the Environment officer, CDO, Labour officer and the District Engineer as an indicator that there was joint supervision of the projects in the previous FY.	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed. However, payments to contractors were not within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Voucher no 6421685 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 71,440,000; Certificate No 1, dated 9th June 2023; Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00001, Project; Construction of a two-classroom with an office at Kawalakol Primary School was certified by the District Engineer on 9th June 2023, payment was initiated on 5th May 2023, and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was not within the time flame. 2. - Voucher no 6441093 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 12,330,822; Certificate No 1, dated 9th June 2023; Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00004, Project; Construction of a two Stance drainable Latrine at Karenga Girls Primary School was certified by the District Engineer on 9th June 2023, The District Education officer on 8th June 2023 payment was initiated on 24th May 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was not within the time flame. 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The education procurement plan was not seen during assessment to determine the date when submission was done</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The files reviewed were;

Project: Construction of 1-block of 2 classrooms with office at Kawalakol primary school

Procurement ref: Kare854/wrks/2022-2023/00001; had these documents

- Signed works contract 10th November, 2022 with Ms. Kogate Technical services limited
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 8th November, 2022.
- Evaluation report dated 26th October, 2022
- PP1 form, call of bids, record of issue and receipt of bids, among other documents on file.

Project: Construction of Kapedo Seed Secondary school

Procurement ref: MoES/UGFIT/2021-2022/0003 lot 23; with these documents

- Signed works contract on 10th October, 2022 with Ms. Mangron Investment Limited
- Solicitor General letter dated 30th August, 2022 signed by Lubega Daniel Wembabazi clearing the contract for Kapedo Seed secondary School
- Evaluation report dated 4th February, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 25th February, 2022.

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The LG recorded 2 complaints on 22nd May, 2023 for non-payment for the casual labour provided by Lokiru Luka and Napoyok Lucy amounting to arrears of UGX. 75,000 and 500,000 respectively and the cases were handled and a resolution agreed on 2nd June, 2023 for settlement to be effected using payments from contractor retentions.

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>The LG did not disseminate the Education guidelines for environmental management to the respective school for example at Karenga Girl's primary school, Lokiel primary school and Kawalakol primary school.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Safeguard requirements within the Education sector were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents for example,</p> <p>1. The construction of a 2 stance latrine at Nalakas primary school in Kidepo Town Council with an ESMP prepared and costed on 24th October, 2022 at UGX. 750,000 integrated within the BoQ at a total cost of UGX. 14,569,885 whereas, environmental and social mitigation measures under summary of bill, element No. 7 allocated at a cost of UGX. 404,000</p> <p>2. The construction of a 2 classroom block at Kawalakol primary school on 25th July, 2022 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX. 2,959,060 integrated within the BoQs at a total cost of UGX. 114,083,640 whereas, environmental and social mitigation measures under summary of bill, element No. 12 allocated at a cost of UGX. 1,976,000</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no proof of land ownership for school construction projects availed at the time of assessment although, a report dated 29th June, 2023 was availed for the title processing for schools like Lokori seed secondary school, Kapedo seed secondary school and St. Andrew seed secondary school.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring with the technical team to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions and prepared monthly monitoring reports for the following projects below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of facilities for Kapedo seed secondary school at Kapedo town Council dated 27th June, 2023 and 10th July, 2023 respectively. 2. Construction of a 2 classroom block with office and store at Kawalakol primary school dated 5th June, 2023 and 25th May, 2023 respectively. 3. Construction of a 2 stance latrine at Nalakas primary school at Kidepo Town Council prepared on 30th May, 2023 and 30th April, 2023. 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO did not complete and sign all certificates prior to executing the project contractor payments at interim and final payments, for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interim payment certificate issued on 6th September, 2023 for the construction of a block of 2 classroom with an office at Kawalakol primary school 2. Interim payment certificate issued on 30th January, 2023 for the construction of Kapedo seed secondary school 3. Interim payment certification issued on 3rd May, 2023 for the construction of a 2 stance latrine at Loyoro Napore primary school. 	0

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was evidence for increased utilization of Health Care Services in Karenga District.</p> <p>From the annual HMIS reports 107, the Annual deliveries of the 3 Health facilities were observed and the percentage increase for the three facilities was calculated, comparing the two financial years 2021/22 and 2022/23.</p> <p>The findings were shown below:</p> <p>The Annual deliveries for the 3 Health facilities Kapedo HC III, Karenga HCIV and Kocholo HC III for the FY 2021/22 were: 188, 461 and 218 respectively. The Total Deliveries for the three above mentioned Facilities for FY 2021/22 was 867.</p> <p>The Annual deliveries for the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 were: 275, 805 and 637 respectively. The Total Deliveries for the three above mentioned Facilities for FY2022/23 was 1717</p> <p>The Percentage increase in Deliveries for the 3 Facilities was 98 %</p> <p>This percentage increase was more than 20% meaning Karenga performed very well in as far Utilization of Health care services (focusing on Total deliveries was concerned)</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"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 100% as per the OPAMS.</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC as the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th Dec 2022.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 1,002,526,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a maternity ward in Kalimon HCIII at Ushs 750,000,000. 2. Construction of a staff house in Kocholo HCIII at Ushs 222, 526,000. 3. Partial fencing of Pire HCII at Ushs 30,000,000. 	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer and District Engineer only certified the work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Voucher no 6433574 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 28,200,000 Certificate No 1, Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00003, Project; Partial fencing of pire HC II was only certified by the District Engineer on 9th June 2023. 2. - Voucher no 6441093 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 41,830,443 Certificate No 1, Contract No. Kare634/Wrks/2021-22/00004, Project; Construction of a Four Unit Staff House at Kawalakol S/c was certified by the District Engineer on 13th December 2022, District Health Officer on 13th December 2022, DCDO and District Environment Officer didn't certify the work. <p>The District Community Development Officer and the District Environment Officer didn't certify the work for payments.</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	Two projects were implemented, and both were sampled, one was within +/- 0.69% of the +/-20% acceptable variation while the other was -22.27% outside the acceptable variation and therefore did not comply.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>The projects were;</p> <p>Project 1: Partial Construction of fence at Pire HCII</p> <p>Procurement ref: Kare854/wrks/20211-2023/00003</p> <p>Project 2: Upgrade of Kalimon HCII to HCIII</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoH-UGIFT/wrks/2022-2023/00001</p> <p>Project 1:</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 42,526,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx 42,229,000/=</p> <p>Variation: Ugx 297,000/=</p> <p>%age variation $(297,000/42,526,000) \times 100\% = 0.69\%$</p> <p>Project 2:</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 750,000,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx 917,079,435/=</p> <p>Variation: Ugx -167,079,435/=</p> <p>%age variation $(-167,079,435/750,000,000) \times 100\% = -22.27\%$</p>	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was no health facility upgrade done in the district in the year under review.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>From the approved structure and staff list, the LG had deployed 96 out of the approved 185 health worker positions. Hence the staffing level was at 52%.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the district in the year under review.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

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; Karenga HCIV, Kocholo HCIII and Kapedo HCIII was accurate as indicated below.</p> <p>Karenga HCIV had 45 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>Kocholo HCIII had 12 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the facility staff list at noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site.</p> <p>Kapedo HCIII had 17 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 evidence for upgrading of Health Facilities in the FY 2022/23</p> <p>2 Health Centres which were upgraded were:</p> <p>Kochola HCIII from HCII</p> <p>Lobalangit HC III from HCII.</p> <p>There was also a new Health Centre; Kidepo HCII which has been Established. It was formerly a community serving people in The Game Park, now it is serving General Public.</p> <p>The construction of Staff House at Kachola was completed.</p> <p>They were all functional.(Letter by CAO to NMS dated 8th June 2023 titled New facilities upgraded)</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that all the 3 sampled Health facilities : Kapedo HC III,Karenga HCV and Kocholo HC III prepared and submitted Annual Workplans and budgets to the DHO , as per the LG Planning Guidelines. Their submission dtes were as follow:</p> <p>Kapedo HC III submitted to the DHO on 30th ,March ,2022.</p> <p>Karenga HCIV submitted on 31st March,2022.</p> <p>Kocholo HC III submitted on 30 March 2022</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that None of sampled Health facilities: Kapedo HC III,Karenga HCIV and Kocholo HC III, submitted the Budget Performance report for 2022/23.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that none of the Sampled Health Facilities</p> <p>Kapedo HC III, Karenga HCV and Kocholo HC III developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans 2023/24.</p> <p>The facility improvement Plans were not available in DHO's Office.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was Evidence that all the sampled health facilities.</p> <p>Kapedo HC III, Karenga HCV and Kocholo HC III, submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter)</p> <p>Their submission dates were indicated below:</p> <p>HMIS 105</p> <p>July 2022</p> <p>Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 5th Aug,2022</p> <p>Karenga HCIV Submitted on 4th Aug,2022</p> <p>Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Aug 2022</p> <p>August 2022</p> <p>Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 4th Sept,2022</p> <p>Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th Sept 2022</p> <p>Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Sept 2022</p> <p>September 2022</p> <p>Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 5th Oct,2022</p> <p>Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th Oct,2022</p> <p>Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Oct 2022</p> <p>October 2022</p> <p>Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 4th Nov,2022</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th Nov,
2022

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th
Nov,2022

November 2022

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 6th Dec,2022

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 5th Dec
2022

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 4th Dec
2022

December 2022

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 4th Jan,2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 4th Jan,
2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6 th Jan
2023

January 2023

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 5th Feb,
2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 7th Feb
,2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Feb,
2023

March 2023

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 3th March
2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 7th March
2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 3 th March
2023

April 2023

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 5th April
2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th April
,2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th April
,2023

May 2023

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 6th
May,2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th
May,2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th May,
2023

June 2023

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 6th

June,2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 5th
June,2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 5th June,
2023

Quarterly 107 Reports

Quarter 1

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 4th Oct
,2022

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th
Oct,2022

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Oct
2022

Quarter 2

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 6th Jan, 2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 4th Jan,
2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 6th Jan,
2023

Quarter 3

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 5th April
,2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 7th April
2023

Kocholo HC III Submitted on 4th April
2023

Quarter 4

Kapedo HCIII Submitted on 6th July,
2023

Karenga HCIV Submitted on 6th July
,2023

Kocholo HC III Sub

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>	RBF was incorporated into PHC	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	RBF was incorporated into PHC as per the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	The Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. He noted the new system doesn't send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that Karenga District, health department developed Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities. There was no copy of Performance Improvement Plan seen in DHO's office during the assessment.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

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

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Karenga LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 2,454,706,000 (Approved budget estimates for Karenga LG 2023/24 page 21 of 56, vote 854). 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 2,454,705,633 as indicated on page 96 vote 854.</p> <p>Therefore, Karenga LG budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Karenga HCIV had 45 out of 48 required health workers for HCIV, giving over 93.8% of the required staffing norm for HCIV (Confirmed Staff list at Karenga HCIV noticeboard)

Kocholo HCIII had 12 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 63.2% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Kocholo HCIII noticeboard)

Kapedo HCIII had 17 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 89.5% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Kapedo HCIII noticeboard)

According to the findings above, Kocholo HCIII didn't have at least 75% of staff required therefore Karenga LG did not deployed health workers in all health facilities in accordance with the staffing norms.

0

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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).

Karenga HCIV: 29 out of 45 health workers deployed to Karenga HCIV 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. Dr Banya Nicholas; Medical Officer was present on duty on 20th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 23 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Longok Paulin ; Senior Nursing Officer was present on duty on 20th 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. Namoe Rose; Nursing Assistant was present on duty on 20th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 24 days in the month of October 2023.

(Karenga HCIV staff attendance book 20th November 2023 and Attendance

3

Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

Kocholo HCIII: 10 out of 12 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. Lemukol Benard Deo, Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 20th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for all the 4 days the facility was open in the month of October 2023. (Note the facility was closed in the early month of October due to insecurity issues caused by warriors in the community and was re-opened during the week of assessment)

2. Similary Lokii Simon Peter, Health Assistant was present on duty on 20th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for all the 4 days the facility was open in the month of October 2023.

3. Lokedi Anjello Microscopist was present on duty on 20th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for all the 4 days the facility was open in the month of October 2023.

(Kocholo HCIII staff attendance book 20th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

Kapedo HCIII: 8 out of 17 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. Achiro Christine Enrolled midwife was present on duty on 20th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 29 days in the month of October 2023

2. Lokiru Philips Iteo Assistant Nursing Officer was present on duty on 20th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 27 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Atamba Joshua Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 20th

November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 26 days in the month of October 2023

(Kapedo HCIII staff attendance book 20th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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 Karenga DLG publicized health worker deployment. Lists of health workers were found displayed on the noticeboards at the three sampled facilities visited.

The displayed list of staff at Karenga HCIV noticeboard had a total of 45 staff whereas for Kocholo HCIII and Kapedo HCIII had a total of 12 and 17 staff respectively. *(Karenga HCIV Kocholo HCIII and Kapedo HCIII noticeboards)*. These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 and were stamped.

2

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DHO had conducted annual performance appraisal of some Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY as below;

1. Akorio Abraham- In-charge Lobalangit HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Banya Nicholas, Medical Officer
2. Achen Rose Monica- In-charge Kocholo HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Banya Nicholas, Medical Officer
3. Lemukol Benard- In-charge Kocholo HC III was appraised on 25th June 2023 by Acheng Gloria
4. Banya Nicholas- In-charge Krenga HC IV was appraised on 24th August 2023 by Bahati Amon- DHO

Akongo Joyce- In-charge Pire HC II was not appraised

0

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The Health Facility In-charges had conducted performance appraisal of health workers as below;

Ilukol Paul Pax - Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 17th May 2023 by Akoro Abraham, In-charge

Lokiel Liberty Winnie, Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 25th June 2023 by Lemokol Bernard In-charge

Okidi Robert Ramson, Laboratory Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Banya Nicholas, In-charge

Akiror Eunice Annet, Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 25th June 2023 by Lemokol Bernard, In-charge

Edam Ceasor, Laboratory Assistant was appraised on 17th May 2023 by Akoro Abraham, In-charge

Lanyero Sharon Clare, Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 24th June 2023 by Odong John Bosco, Senior Nursing Officer

Ayere Caroline, Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 17th May 2023 by Akorio Abraham In-charge

Odong John Bosco, Senior Nursing Officer was appraised on 10th June 2023 by Banya Nicholas, In-charge

Omwony Paul Oryem, Health Assistant was appraised on 10th June 2023 by Nakwang Rose, In-charge

Lokwar Largolomoe, Laboratory Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Banya Nicholas, In-charge

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence provided to this effect at the time of assessment.

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 available to show that Karenga District conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance with the training plans at DLG.</p> <p>There was a Training Data base and plans for staff who were supposed to undergoing various trainings in the previous financial year 2022/23 and the schedule.</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 several training reports seen on trainings that were attended by Health Staff in the Financial year 202/23.</p> <p>These included:</p> <p>A training report on medical waste management dated 12th April, 2023 attended Health facility In charges.</p> <p>A Report on CME done on IMAM at Karenga HCIV on 25th Jan, 2023.</p> <p>A training for Karenga HCIV workers and HUMIC members on Health care waste management 24th April 2023.</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>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a letter from CAO to Permanent Secretary MOH dated 20 Aug 2023 Confirming the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) all the 10 Health facilities were supposed to receive the Funding</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 38 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 36,394,000 and on (page 36) ,PHC non - wage was allocated UGX 185,675,000.</p> <p>As per the computation $36,394,000/185,675,000 \times 100 = 19\%$</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>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 of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 17th August, 2022 after 30 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 9th November, 2022 after 30 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 2nd January, 2023 which was within 5 days. • 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 2nd May, 2023 after 19 days. 	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>At the time of the assessment release letters were not provided so it was hard to determine whether the LG communicated the funds within stipulated time from the date of cash release.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Karenga DHMT implemented the recommendations of the Performance Review meetings as indicated In the Follow up reports below:</p>	2
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			<p>A follow up report on Quarter 1 Performance Review meeting, dated 2nd Dec,2022 compiled by Auma Colline, indicated implementation of the recommended actions in the quarter 1 of FY 2022/23 Performance review meeting.</p>	
			<p>The implemented actions included:</p>	
			<p>Redistribution of the medicine from Karenga HCIV to Kidepo HII. This was action point recommended by the performance review meeting of the Quarter 1 of FY 2022/23 in response to reported stock out rate in Kidepo HCII.</p>	
			<p>The report also reported the Mentoring of VHTs which was done by Health staff. This was action point recommended in the quarter 1 Performance review meeting in response to the reported challenge of the Knowledge Gap among the VHTs in the test and treatment policy for Malaria.</p>	

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 that the quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments and implementing Partners.</p> <p>For example;</p> <p>In the quarter 2 Performance review meeting that tookplace on 13th Jan,2023 ,there was attendace of all</p> <p>The 10 Health facilities in charges for example</p> <p>Nakwang Rose I/C Lokoli HCIII,</p> <p>Loybok John I/C Kidepo HCII</p> <p>Ilokol James I/C Kalimon HCII.</p> <p>There were members from other departmental Heads for example:</p> <p>Dada Rose District Education Officer,</p> <p>Simon Peter Akello SAS representing CAO, among others.</p> <p>There were also members from Development partner</p> <p>For example Kodet Mary from CUAMM</p> <p>Avellon Morine from AFI</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>Karenga District had only one HCIV; Karenga HCIV.</p> <p>From the DHT support supervision reports, there was evidence that Karenga DHT carried out only 2 Support supervisions on Karenga HCIV in the FY year 2022/23.</p> <p>Only 2 Quartely Supervision reports were available in the DHO's Office</p> <p>The dates of support supervisions were indicated below:</p> <p>On 5th May 2023, there was DHT support supervision and Nutrition mentorship. On 28 March,2023 there was DHT support supervision on Karenga HCIV This report was submitted by Ngoya Lina PHI on 30 th March 2023</p>	1
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that HSD carry out Support supervision to lower HCs</p> <p>On 20-23rd June 2023 The SubDistrict carried out Support supervision to all the 10 Health Facilities in the District including the 3 sampled Health Centres namely:Kidepo HCII,Lokori HCII,Pire HC II</p> <p>In Kidepo HCII, the gaps of No staff House,Poor waste management among others were noted</p> <p>In LOKori HCII the gaps of No Poster for Available Services, and No TB screening at OPD were noted.</p> <p>On Pire HCII the gaps of No SOP for HIV and Malaria Testing were noted</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the recommendations of the Support supervision were implemented</p> <p>There was no copy of Feed Back Report nor Health facility activity reports of these sampled facilities, seen in the DHO's office.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was a Report on MMS submitted by Lobeerei James and received by DHO on 22 September 2022 reporting activities of MMS done 11th -14 July2022 and covered all the 10 Health facilities of the district.</p> <p>The report highlighted some gaps found in some Facilities which included not filling the Stock cards fully by some facilities. Some Facilities were not using the stock books as they had been mentored.</p>	1

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 36,394,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 11,866,000 was spent on Health promotion on page 37 of the approved budget.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		Expressed as a % = $\frac{11,866,000}{36,394,000} \times 100 = 32\%$.	
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	There was evidence that DHT led Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in FY 2022/23.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		The following activities were done: Community Sensitization on Hygiene and Sanitation done on 12th -14th June ,2022 and the Report was submitted to DHO on 14th June 2022 by Ngoya Liner Principal Health Inspector. 33 people participated in the exercise. A report by Gabriel Lokwal Health Inspector dated 6th June 2023 indicated Sanitation and Hygiene activities done a n the year 2022/23 in Kalenga Town council which included Solid waste Management, Home improvement campaigns and school health Inspection.	
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence to show that DHMT carried out a follow up on Health promotion ,Disease prevention and community mobilization. No follow up report could be traced in DHO's office.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was assets register dated June 2023, which included assets of DHO's office and 10 Health Facilities.</p> <p>There were vehicles for example: Toyota Hilux GUN 125R, Chassis Number AHTFB 8CD 103875685.</p> <p>Toyota Land Cruiser Numberless.</p> <p>Double cabin which was for Covid 19 Control UG 7043M.</p> <p>There were 10 motorcycles attached to DHO's Office, Some medical equipment attached to Health centre like weighing scale, Fridges etc.</p> <p>The register also included the physical infrastructure for the Health facilities for example the wards for each Health facility.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals for Health projects that were implemented in the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG conducted field appraisals for Health projects that were implemented in the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>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>Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction however, monitoring using the checklist was not carried out. Below were the projects in the health sector that were screened.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Pire HCII at Pire Central on 24th September, 2022 2. Construction of a maternity ward at Kalimon Headquarters on 25th September, 2022 <p>and their respective ESMPs were prepared as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Pire HCII at Labalangit sub county prepared on 25th September, 2023 at UGX. 1,810,000 2. Construction of maternity ward at Sangar sub county on 25th September, 2022 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department did timely submit by April, 30th for the current FY all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan. Their request was submitted on 13th April, 2023, the procurement plan was approved on 13th October, 2023 by the CAO, Uma Charles.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department submitted procurement request form PP1 to the PDU by 1st Quarter of current FY on 14th July, 2023. The request was for construction of maternity ward at Kalimon HCIII.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee minutes dated 17th April,2023, approved the award of the contracts minute Kare854/cc/22-23/4/3 for Partial fencing at Pire 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>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>A letter dated 20th January, 2023 signed by the CAO, Ekachelan Esau named</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nasur Charles -DWO-Project supervisor • Illukol Andrew Rews.Ag. DHO-Contract Manager • Lobilia John Mike- labour officer • Abura Rebecca Ag. DCDO • Iteo John Bosco- Environment officer and left out Clerk of works therefore PIT was not properly established as per guidelines. 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH this seen at Kamolin HCII upgrade the female ward had 5 x 7m, 3.4m, 1.9 x 2.3m, 1.8m as the internal dimension of the ward, height from floor to ceiling, entrance to the ward and width of the corridor respectively.</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 reports seen that were consolidated by the Clerk of works to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for the health facility.</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>The LG did not hold monthly site meetings by the project site committee: Chaired by the CAO and comprised of the SAS, the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility, the CDO and Environment officer as no minutes were seen to indicate that they had done so</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>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no report by the CDO, DE and DNRO to show that technical supervision of all health infrastructure had been done by the relevant officers</p>	0

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. However, payments were not within the specified timeframe. For example;

- Voucher no 6433574 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 28,200,000 Certificate No 1, Contract No.Kare/854/Wrks/2022-23/00003, Project; Partial fencing of pire HC II was only certified by District Engineer on 9th June 2023, payment was initiated on 6th June 2023 and payments were done on 28th June 2023 which was more than 10 working day.

- Voucher no 6441093 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 41,830,443 Certificate No 1, Contract No. Kare634/Wrks/2021-22/00004, Project; Construction of a Four Unit Staff House at Kawalakol S/c was certified by District Engineer on 13rd December 2022, District Health Officer on 13rd December 2022, payment was initiated 7th November 2022 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project 1. Partial Construction of chain link fence at Pire HCII</p> <p>Procurement ref: Kare854/wrks/22-23/00003, it had these documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 8th May, 2023 with Mogosi Services. • Evaluation report dated 30th March, 2023 • Contracts Committee minutes dated 17th April, 2023. • PP1 form, call for bids, record of bid issue and receipt, among record on file <p>Project: 2 Kalimoni HC II upgrade</p> <p>Procurement Ref: MoH-UGFIT/wrks/2022-2023/00001, with the following documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 10th January, 2023 with Mangron Investments • Solicitor General letter dated 14th December, 2022 • Evaluation report dated 27th September, 2022 • PP1 form, call for bid, record of issue and receipts, among the other records on the file.
----	--	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

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>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</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 no was evidence availed at the time of assessment on recorded grievances and or handling in line with the grievances redress mechanism.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the National Guideline for WASH in Health Care Facilities, Uganda dated 2022 and National Policy on Injection Safety and Health Care Waste Management dated July, 2004</p> <p>A report on the how the dissemination was carried out dated 12th April, 2023 following an orientation workshop on guidelines of health care waste management to DHT, health facility in charges, environmental health staff and health unit management committee held at women’s club, in the Town council.</p> <p>And also a training for Karenga HCIV workers and HUMIC members on Health care waste management dated 24th April 2023.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a functional system for medical waste management such as an incinerator and placenta pits for Health centre IV, coded bins for waste segregation in all the health centres, burning pits for non-waste</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a report dated 12th April, 2023 on the dissemination and training that were carried out following an orientation workshop on guidelines of health care waste management to DHT, health facility in charges, environmental health staff and health unit management committee held at women’s club, in the Town council.</p> <p>And also a training for Karenga HCIV workers and HUMIC members on Health care waste management dated 24th April 2023.</p>	1

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	A costed ESMP for the fencing of Pire HCII at Labalangit sub county prepared on 25th September, 2023 at UGX. 1,810,000 was incorporated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY at a total Bill No. 1 cost of UGX. 38,390,000 and element No. 3 allocated for environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 2,540,000.	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	Land ownership for health sector investments had not been secured, although a report on the title processing for Kalimon health centre II was availed at the time of assessment.	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 for example, for the construction of a maternity ward, 4-stance latrine and a placenta pit at Kalimon HCII on 26th April, 2023, 30th May, 2023 and 28th June, 2023	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	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 complete and sign on the certification forms prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects for example, 1. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 30th January, 2023 for the upgrade of Kalimon HCII to HCIII 2. Interim payment certificate No. 1 issued on 6th September, 2023 for the fencing of Pire HCII.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Karenga DLG in the previous FY was 76%</p>	0
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Karenga DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 90%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current FY was 56% which was far much below 60%.</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 95% were:-</p> <p>Drilling of 1 production well and design of one piped water system in Lokori S/C with a safe water coverage of 94%, rehabilitation of 7 boreholes in Kawalakol S/C with a safe water coverage of 80% and rehabilitation of 3 boreholes in Sangar S/C and extension of piped water to Nakitoit North in and rehabilitation of 4 boreholes in Karenga S/C.</p> <p>The projects that were implemented during the year under review were:-</p> <p>Drilling of 1 production well, design of 1 piped water supply systems, rehabilitation of 20 boreholes in different LLGs.</p> <p>The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 19 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 23 in number.</p> <p>The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was $19/23 \times 100\% = 83\%$</p>	1
---	---	---	---	---

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>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:-</p> <p>1). Drilling one production well, feasibility studies detail design of Lokori piped water supply systems in Lokori sub-countie.</p> <p>Engineers estimate = UGX 145,610,000</p> <p>Contract price = UGX 142,308,000</p> <p>Variation = UGX 3,302,000</p> <p>Percentage variation = $3,302,000/145,610,000 \times 100\% = 2.3\%$</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY as captured on page 27 and 28 of the Annual progress report included the following:-</p> <p>Drilling of 1 production well and feasibility studies and detail design of Lokori piped water supply system in Lokori sub-county, rehabilitation of 20 boreholes in different LLGs, and extension of piped water from Nakitoit North cell in Karenga T/C to Kamukoi South village in Karenga sub-county. Basing on the sampled facilities all of them were completed and were functioning well implying that the percentage of projects completed as per the annual work plan was: $23/23 \times 100\% = 100\%$.</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>There was a decrease 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 86% and FY 2022/2023 was 76% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage decrease was $76\% - 86\% = -10\%$.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. 	<p>There was a decrease 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 96% and 90% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage decrease therefore was $90\% - 96\% = -6\%$.</p>	0

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 as captured in pages 27 and 28 of the budget performance report of the previous FY (2022/2023) where the following facilities below were sampled;

- 1). Drilling of 1 production well and feasibility and design of piped water supply system in Kacapangole center in Lokori sub-county, funded under UGIFT, and completed on 14th June, 2023.
- 2). Rehabilitation of one borehole in Nakapangitenga village in Kawalako sub-county, funded under DWSCG, and completed on 15th May, 2023.
- 3). Extension of piped water from Nakitoit North cell in Karenga T/C to Kamukoi South village in Karenga sub-county, completed on 20th June, 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.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was dated 20th October, 2022, in page 3&4, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Government.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was dated 18th January, 2023 on pages 3; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties in the District.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was dated 28th April, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on pages 2.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was dated 4th August, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 2.</p> <p>Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 5th September, 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
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 41%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p>	0

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO had budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician at Ugx 79,020,000/=.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer at Ugx 336,800,000/=</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide evidence to show that the DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide evidence to show that the DWO had 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.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO allocated over 70% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 95%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Lokori S/C with safe water coverage of 94% was allocated drilling of 1 boreholes, Kawalakol S/C with a safe water coverage of 80% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 3 boreholes, Karenga S/C with safe water coverage of 93% was allocated drilling of 1 boreholes, Sangar S/C with safe water coverage of 92% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and Kapedo S/C with a safe water coverage of 95% was allocated feasibility studies and design of a piped water system and drilling of 1 production well.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 202,402,058

The total annual development budget for Karenga DWO for the current FY was UGX 266,226,420

Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =
 $202,402,058/266,226,420*100\% = 76\%$

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 4th August, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Lokori, Kawalakol, Karenga, Sangar and Kapedo; 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.

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 20th October, 2022, it was noted that there was a summary table in the report which showed that 310 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 18th January, 2023, a total of 310 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 28th April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 310.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 16th August, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 314.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $310 + 310 + 310 + 314 = 1,244/4 = 311$.

Karenga DLG had a total of 386 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $311/386 * 100\% = 81\%$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

A meeting held on 22nd September, 2022 this was during the first quarter. The key issues discussed during this meeting were found in minute number Min.05/09/2022 where the DWO emphasised on the sanitation and hygiene approaches to be used during the first quarter in the sub-counties and parishes where the sanitation grant is being implemented in, after discussion they agreed to use CLTS and the sanitation ladder. These approaches were to be used in Kakwanga and Lobalangit sub-counties where the sanitation fund was implemented in.

During the second quarter the meeting was held on 15th December, 2022 and the key issues discussed during the meeting were found in minute Min.04/12/2022 among the key issues discussed was the functionality and sanitation status following the agreed actions during the previous quarter. The DWO presented the status as at the second quarter as follows; the functionality was at 86% as compared to 84 during the previous quarter and the sanitation coverage stood at 63% as compared to 57% during the previous quarter.

For the third quarter the meeting was held on 29th March, 2023 and the major issues of discussion were found in minute Min.05/03/2023. One of the main issue of discussion was the sanitation status of the District the DWO gave his presentation on the sanitation coverage of the two sub-counties (Kakwanga and Lobalangit) and it was noted that Lobalangit had declared 9 villages as "Open Defecation Free" (ODF).

Whereas in quarter 4 the meeting was held on 28th June, 2023, and key issues discussed under minute Min.05/06/2023. The specific issue discussed here was the issue of access and functionality and it was agreed that during the next years' plan more boreholes be drilled and more rehabilitations be done so as to improve access and functionality.

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 95% as per the letter dated 4th August, 2023 which was found in the correspondence file. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties Lokori, Kawalakol, Karenga, Sangar and Kapedo whose safe water coverage was 94%, 80%, 93%, 92%, 95% respectively.</p> <p>The letter detailed the projects allocated to these LLGs together with their budgeted amounts.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Karenga DLG water sector was UGX 54,193,777. The DWO allocated UGX 28,560,999 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $28,560,999/54,193,777 * 100\% = 53\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 7th April, 2023. The training period spanned from 5th to 6th April, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others.</p> <p>The trainers were Ms Akello Betty ADWO in charge mobilization and Lokwang Dominic the BMT.</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 5th September, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. There were a total of 30 new water sources captured in the Form1, all were done by the development partners.</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>There was no evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals for Water projects that are to be implemented in the current FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>1). Application from Katanya village in Kapedo S/C, the application was dated 21st October, 2022, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 19th September, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LC I Mr. Loyera Pasqual and the following community members: Lokii Paul, Ayoolo Grace, and Muge Paul.</p> <p>2). Application from Kokoro village in Kawalakol S/C, the application was dated 5th June, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI Akuro Phillips with the following community members Nangiro Lorot, Natuk Gremina and Nakong Regina. The application was cleared by the DWO for implementation in 2023/2024 financial year on 28th September, 2023.</p> <p>3) Application from Lokori Central village in Lokori S/C, this application was dated 29th November, 2022, it was endorsed by the LCI Lokorimoe Alfred with the following community members: Lodeng John, Aringo Paska, and Ikonga Loise. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 6th November, 2023 by the District Water Officer.</p>	2
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 no evidence that LG conducted field appraisals for Water projects that are to be implemented in the current FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of water infrastructure projects implemented for the current FY because they had not been approved and therefore, no screening was carried out.</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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan by the CAO, Uma Charles, signed on 13th October, 2023. The investments as indicated on page 4 in the plan were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drilling of production wells at Kapedo RGC at Ugx 33 M • Deep borehole drilling and installation of 4 boreholes at Iokori, Karenga, Kapedo and Kawalakol at Ugx 112 M 	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>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>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY, were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction this was done, in their sitting on 8th November ,2022 in minute Kare854/cc/22-23/4/2, were they approved the supply of pipes and plumbing materials for extension of water pipes to Nakitoit sub-county.</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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The District water Officer did not properly establish the project implementation team (PIT) as per letter dated 20th January, 2023 it named;</p> <p>1. Nasur Charles- DWO- Contract Manager</p> <p>Other team members such as the project supervisor, Labour officer, Environment officer and Clerk of works were left out as per guidelines.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 Nakapangitenga village of Kawalakol 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>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There were no reports for supervision of the project seen during assessment as an indication that monthly technical supervision was carried in the previous FY.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of payment vouchers for water projects were presented to assessment team.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no complete procurement filed presented to the Assessment team for verification.</p>	0

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee handled water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework, for example, a complaint register was availed with recorded complaints on 5th December, 2022 on malfunctioned boreholes at the following villages of Napeibur, Komeem, Kachomin, Katanya and Komolcher primary school where the respective communities demanded rehabilitation/repairs and a technical team from the water department went and assessed the malfunctioned boreholes and repairs made on 15th December, 2022.</p>	3
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p>	<p>The DWO and the Environment Officer did not disseminate guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs although copies of the guidelines were available for example, Catchment Management Guidelines 2019, Framework for Water Source Protection FINAL_Vol. 1, Guidelines for Protecting Piped Water Sources - FINAL_Vol. 2, and Guidelines for Point Water Sources- FINAL_Vol. 3 dated May, 2013</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY that were prepared and implemented for example, screening as well as an ESMP prepared at UGX. 1,500,000 for the extension of pipe water system to Nakitoit parish, Karenga sub county on 25th October, 2022</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the water supply projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent; the DWO did not present any land consent forms at the time of the assessment</p>	0
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	No evidence of E & S certificates forms for water projects were presented to assessment team.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	The CDO and Environment Officer carried out monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the water sector projects for example, reports for the extension of pipe water system to Nakitoit parish, Karenga sub county dated 25th April, 2023, 27th June, 2023 and 30th June, 2023	2

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries - score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG kept up-to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>There was no data/evidence available and percentage acreage could not be computed easily.</p>	0
2	<p>N23 Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG approved staff structure provided for 35 extension worker positions and 15 were filled at the time of assessment = 42%.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to prove that the micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities.</p> <p>The LG did not prepared a budget performance report.</p>	0

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	DLG did not provide any evidence, and there were no available payment vouchers for all the MSI equipment supplied.	0
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	At the time of assessment, no evidence was provided, the Agriculture Engineer's estimates were unavailable, and no farm visit reports were presented. However, a supplier quote (BOQ) amounting to Ugx:41,507,798 was obtained, and a supplier contract with a procurement reference number KARE854/SUPLS/2022-2023/0002 between Karenga DLG and Amlo Holdings Ltd was entered on 8th May 2023. Therefore contract variation orders could not be calculated.	0
Maximum score 6				
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 • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	On the 8th May 2023, a supplier contract with the procurement reference number KARE854/SUPLS/2022-2023/0002 was established between Karenga DLG and Amlo Holdings Ltd. However, the budget performance report was not accessible, and as of the conclusion of the FY 2022/23, the commencement of installation of the microscale irrigation demonstrations had not been initiated.	0
Maximum score 6				
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 • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	The LG had deployed 15/35 extension workers as per the approved staff structure = 42%.	0
Maximum score 6				

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	During the assessment, no evidence was presented to verify that the micro-scale irrigation equipment met the standards set by MAAIF. This lack of evidence can be attributed to the fact that MSI installations had only commenced in the current financial year, and as a result, no sampling could be conducted during the assessment.	0
---	---	--	--	----------

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	During the assessment, there was no record of the procured micro-scale irrigation equipment, and the installation of MSI projects, which was scheduled for the past financial year 2022/23, had not been completed and was still ongoing.	0
---	---	---	---	----------

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was proof that the accuracy of information regarding the placement of extension workers was verified. Three LLGs were randomly selected and confirmed the placements of the following: Narot Regina Faith, serving as Assistant Agricultural Officer in Karenga Town Council. Ngole Simon Longaren, holding the position of assistant Agricultural Officer in Lobalangit Sub-county. Lomong Philip, functioning as a Veterinary Officer in Kakona Sub-county. Nkoyoyo Vicent who is serving as the Animal Husbandry Officer in Karenga Town Council.	2
---	---	---	--	----------

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	No inventory was kept for the procured micro-scale irrigation equipment, and the installation of MSI projects, originally planned for the past financial year, had not been completed and was still ongoing. Therefore, no project/site sampling was conducted.	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>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>Quarterly supervision and monitoring reports were not prepared. The production office lacked reporting templates and therefore, no data were captured on the irrigation equipment, complementary services, and farmer expressions of interest.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No MIS reports were presented.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</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>No Quarterly reports were prepared or presented.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no approved PIP. Karenga is a phase II district and this indicator does not apply.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Karenga is a phase II DLG under the Ugift grant and therefore, this indicator does not apply.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms at Ugx 847,324,000/=.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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

Maximum score 6

ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0

The LG had deployed the following extension workers as per guidelines;

1. Ngole Simon Longaren, Assistant Agric-officer Kakwanga/Lobalangit S/C
2. Lopeyo Simon Nading, Assistant Agric-officer Sangar Sub County
3. Ilukol Henry, Assistant Agricultural officer Karenga Town Council
4. Oryem Johnathan Lotyang, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer Kapedo/Kawalakol
5. Okello Francis Kacisi, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer Lokori Sub county
6. Lokwang Francis, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer Kawalakol Sub County
7. Nkoyoyo Vicent, Animal Husbandry Officer District H/Q/Karenga S/C
8. Chiyo Emmanuel Boniface, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kapedo Sub County
9. Narot Regina Faith, Assistant Agricultural Officer Karenga Town Council
10. Lomong Phillip, Veterinary officer Lobalangit Sub County
11. Kilama Lawrence, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kawalakol Sub County
12. Angom Agnes Adong, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kakwanga Sub County
13. Arutulyia Lux Idilla, Assistant Agricultural Officer Sangar Sub County
14. Auma Gwendolyn Loyer, Assistant Agricultural Officer Lokori Sub county
15. Lochan Fredrick Idilla, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kapedo Town Council

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The extension workers were deployed in the three LLGs samples as below;</p> <p>Ilukol Henry, Assistant Agricultural officer Karenga Town Council</p> <p>Oryem Johnathan Lotyang, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer Kapedo</p> <p>Lokwang Francis, Assistant Animal Husbandry officer Kawalakol Sub County</p> <p>Chiyo Emmanuel Boniface, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kapedo Sub County</p> <p>Narot Regina Faith, Assistant Agricultural Officer Karenga Town Council</p> <p>Kilama Lawrence, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kawalakol Sub County</p> <p>Lochan Fredrick Idilla, Assistant Agricultural Officer Kapedo Town Council</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>In the LLGs visited Karenga Town Council, Kapedo Sub County, Kawalakol Sub county, the extension workers were displayed on the LLG noticeboards as part of the LLG staff list.</p>	2

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

Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:

i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0

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

1. Ngole Simon Longaren - Assistant Agricultural Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotyang Benson, SAS Lobalagit TC
2. Oryem Johnathan Lotyang- Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 14th June 2023 by Aballo Grace, SAS Kapedo Sub County
3. Lokwang Francis- Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 17th June 2023 by Odong Sam, SAS Kawalakol Sub County
4. Phillip Lomong- Veterinary Officer at Kapedo Town Council was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotyang Benson, Town Clerk
5. Lochan Fedrick Idilla- Assistant Agriculture Officer at Kapedo Town Council was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Olanya Francis, Town Clerk
6. Chiyo Emmanuel Boniface- Assistant Agricultural Officer at Kapedo Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Aballo Grace
7. Narot Regina Faith- Assistant Agricultural Engineer at Karenga Town Council was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Atim Hellen, Town Clerk
8. Arutulya Lux Idilla-Assistant Agricultural Officer at Sangar Sub County was appraised on 5th June 2023 by Akumu Sabby Benna,SAS
9. Agona Agnes Adong- Assistant Agricultural Officer at Kakwaga Sub County was appraised on 27th June 2023 by Lotyang Fedelis Nakoma, SAS
10. Kilama Lawrence- Assistant Agricultural Officer at Kawalakol Sub county was appraised on 17th June 2023 by Odongo Sam, SAS

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to show that the District Production Coordinator had taken any corrective actions.	0
	Maximum score 4			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The HR team / District production Office did not provide any evidence of a training plan for extension workers. Furthermore, there was no evidence to substantiate that extension workers had fulfilled the mandatory requirement of completing the six modules of the MSI program.	0
	Maximum score 4			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence that training activities were documented, and there was no evidence of training activities being uploaded to the training database.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	No evidence was provided indicating that the LG did appropriately allocate the micro-scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro-scale irrigation equipment): and(ii) complementary services (in FY 2022/23 100 complementary services; starting from FY2022/23— 75%capitaldevelopment: and25%complementaryservice	0
	Maximum score 10			

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>No evidence was provided by the LG that the budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines at the time of assessment.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of cofunding planned as per the current budget.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable since the LG was still in the implementation stage.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence indicating that the LG had shared information regarding the utilization of farmer co-funding. The only available document was a report dated February 20, 2023, which specifically focused on sensitizing district stakeholders about Ugift Micro-Scale irrigation. All other crucial documents were missing; there was no awareness report (farmer EOI) for Lower Local Council leaders, sub-counties, town councils, and parishes in the records. Additionally, a monitoring and technical backstopping report was not supplied.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>Karenga DLG is in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of farmer field schools.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Karenga DLG is in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The indicator was not applicable since the LG was still in its first year of implementation</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Karenga DLG is in her first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers in accordance with the guidelines, and there were no records indicating that farmers were mobilized by gender in relation to the irrigation activities.	0
	Maximum score 4			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the district had trained staff and political leaders at the district and LLG levels. The report by DPMO Alfred Opol, dated 20th February 2023, specifically addressed the sensitization of district stakeholders on Ugift Micro-Scale irrigation.	2
	Maximum score 4			

Investment Management

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

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence that the LG had maintained an up-to-date database of applications, lacked hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms, and the MSI focal person demonstrated low competence in using the Irri Track application and MIS database.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented that the district conducted farm visits to farmers who submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI), and there were no documented farm visit reports or signed agreement to proceed forms between farmers and the LG.	0
	Maximum score 8			

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:</p> <p>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 evidence that the District Agricultural Engineer (SAE)/Secretariat publicized the approved eligible farmers, as evidenced by the lack of information about eligible farmers on the notice boards in the sampled sub-counties of Kapedo, Karenga, Kawalakol, and Lobalangit.</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>The micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan dated 13th October, 2023 signed by the CAO, Uma Charles. The item was for Supply and Installation of MIS Irrigation Systems.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG concluded selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee in their sitting of 17th April, 2023. Where they approved the evaluation report and contact award for the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation scheme at Kapedo Seed Secondary School and Karenga boys primary school in minute Kare854/cc/2013-2022/2023/4.</p>	1

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 evidence seen to show 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 as this was ax demonstration stage fore the project.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed was in line with the design output sheet. Since DLG is in the first year of implementation, for Ugift demonstrations, they received approved designs from MAAIF, which are then customized to suit site conditions.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented to confirm that the LG conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers. At the time of the assessment, the LG was just beginning the equipment installation for the demonstrations.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	At the time of assessment, the installation was starting. i.e. digging the trencehes.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	At the time of assessment, the installation was starting and there fore no handover.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	No evidence was provided since the LG was still in stage one of implementation.	0
----	--	---	---	----------

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There were no files accessed during assessment to determine their completeness.	0
----	--	--	---	----------

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	The Local Government did not display details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas and neither were any records on grievances from micro scale irrigation projects availed.	0
----	--	--	---	----------

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Local Government did not have any records on grievances from micro scale irrigation projects availed.	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>The Local Government did not have any records on grievances from micro scale irrigation projects availed.</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>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>The Local Government did not have any records on grievances from micro scale irrigation projects availed.</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>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Local Government did not have any records on grievances from micro scale irrigation projects availed.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	----------

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 no evidence that the LG disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals, and safe disposal of chemical waste containers.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening were carried out and ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment for example; 1. Screening of the micro-scale irrigation at Lobelle village was done on 4th August, 2022 2. Screening of the micro scale irrigation at Pire central village was done on 2nd August, 2022 and an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX. 2,075,389 on 3rd August, 2022	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	The CDO and Environment Officer carried out monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the water sector projects for example, reports for the extension of pipe water system to Nakitoit parish, Karenga sub county dated 25th April, 2023, 27th June, 2023 and 30th June, 2023.	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	E&S certification forms were not availed because no payments were made for micro scale irrigation projects.	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	E&S certification forms were not availed because no payments were made for micro scale irrigation projects	1

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a Chief Finance Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Planner/Senior Planner nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Engineer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Production Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Abura Rebecca Anyango as District Community Development Officer on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023.	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Okello John Bosco as District Commercial Officer on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Okumu Moses as Senior Procurement Officer on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 06/DSC/KTD/03/2022(71).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Longiro David as Procurement Officer on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 52/KAR/DSC/2020(01).	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	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Opiro Diken Thomas as Principal Human Resource Officer on 31st March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023(06).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Ngole Dennis Ross as Senior Environment Officer on 9th March 2022 under Minute no. 06/DSC/KTD/03/2022(69).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Francis Lokinga as Senior Land Management Officer on 9th March 2022 under Minute no. 06/DSC/KTD/03/2022(70).	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	Karenga LG had substantively appointed Loguiee Ambrose as Senior Accountant on 9th March 2022 under Minute no. 05/DSC/KAR/2022/1(a).	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	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).

Karenga LG had 10 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries as follows;

1. Lotyang Fidelis Nakoma-Kakwanga Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
2. Aballo Grace- Kapedo Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023(16)
3. Oketch Simon Peter- Karenga Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
4. Odongo Sam Bwangamoe - Kawalakol Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
5. Locha John - Lobulangit Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023 (04)
6. Loduk John Timothy - Lokuri Sub county was appointed on 1st April 2019 under Minute no. 24/KBGDSC/2019(c) (1)
7. Akumu Sabby Benna-Sangar Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023

Kapedo TC, Karenga TC, Kidepo TC did not have substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries nor were there seconded staff.

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.

Karenga LG had 10 LLGs and had substantively appointed Community Development Officer / Senior CDOs as follows;

1. Nachilla Jacqueline- Kakwanga Sub county was appointed on 3rd March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023(14)
2. Auma Lilly Rose- Kapedo Sub County was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
3. Akello Betty- Kapedo Town Council was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
4. Nakong Florence Napeyok- Karenga Sub county was appointed on 3rd March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023(14)
5. Adong Christine- Karenga Town Council was appointed on 3rd March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023
6. Aballo Rose Lochilla- Lobulangit Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023
7. Lomanat Andrew- Lokuri Sub county was appointed on 3rd March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023(16)
8. Longole Michael- Baari Sub county was appointed on 6th February 2023 under Minute no. 03/KAR/DSC/2023

Kawalakol Sub County and Kidepo Town Council did not have substantively appointed Community Development Officer / Senior CDOs nor were there substantively appointed staff.

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.

Karenga LG had 10 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants/Accounts Assistants as follows;

1. Idilla Pius Fredrick- Lokori Sub County was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-09/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
2. Lemukol Paul Oryangmoe- KarengaTown Council was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-49/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
3. Gloria Natyang Aryono- KarengaTown Council was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-49/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
4. Abong Esther Aruk- Karenga Sub county was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-09/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
5. Lokure Alex- Kawalakol Sub county was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-09/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
6. Lomuria Emmanuel- Lobalangit Sub county was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-09/KAR/DSC/2020(01)
7. Lokii Joseph Kabila- Sagar Sub county was appointed on 7th February 2020 under Minute no. 05(a)-09/KAR/DSC/2020(01)

Kidepo Town Council, Kapedo Sub County, and Kawanga Sub County had no substantively appointed Senior Accountants Assistants/Accounts Assistants.

Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	Actual received by the LG as of 30th June 2023 was UGX 665,026,081 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14). Amount transferred by the LG to the department was UGX 665,026,081 (UGX 665,026,081 /1665,026,081)*100=100%.	
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for community-based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	Amount received by the LG as of 30th June 2023 was UGX 2,516,000 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14). Amount transferred to the department by the LG was UGX 2,516,000 (UGX 2,516,000/UGX 2,516,000)*100=100%	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening because there were no projects in the previous FY that were approved under the DDEG funding.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Since no projects had been approved for the previous FY and or implemented, then Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) were not necessary.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have any approved DDEG projects for the previous FY and therefore no screening and neither preparation of ESMPs were carried out.</p>	4

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LGs' audit opinion for FY 2022/23 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>LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 04th November 2022. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	10

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG submitted APC for the FY 2023/2024.</p>	0
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 24th July 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 6th January 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 23rd March 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 28th April 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 24th July 2023.</p> <p>From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31st of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Karenga LG has substantively appointed all District Inspector of Schools as below; 1. Lotuk Gax Gabriel was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 3rd March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/MARCH/2023(75) 2. Ochen Paul Pax was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools on 31st March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/MARCH/2023(76)	40

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

The Environment Officer and the CDO carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education projects for the previous FY as listed below;

1. Construction of a block of 2 stances pit latrine at Karenga girls primary school on 24th August, 2022
2. Construction of a 2 classroom block with office and store at Kawalakol primary school on 25th July, 2022
3. Construction of Kapedo seed secondary school on 24th June, 2022
4. Construction of a block of 2 stances latrine at Nalakas primary school on 24th October, 2022

Below are the respective ESMPs;

1. Construction of a block of 2 stances pit latrine at Karenga girls primary school prepared on 24th September, 2022 at UGX. 750,000
2. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kawalakol primary school on 25th July, 2022 at UGX. 2,959,060
3. Construction of a 2 stance latrine at Nalakas primary school at Kidepo Town Council prepared on 24th October, 2022 at UGX. 750,000
4. Construction of Kapedo seed secondary school on 30th June, 2022 at UGX. 1, 825,000

The Maximum score is 30

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 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

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Bahati Amon was substantively appointed as District Health Officer on 31st March 2023 under minute no. 03/DSC/March/2023(29)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Ajok Doreen Jane was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing on 9th March 2022 under minute no. 06/DSC/KTD/03/22(52)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Ilukol Andrew was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health on 2nd May 2019 under Minute no. 35/KBGDSC/2019(B) (01)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nooya Lina was substantively appointed as Principal Health Inspector on 31st March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/MARCH?2023(33).</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Ocheng Dennis Raphael was substantively appointed as Senior Health Educator on 19th November 2019 under Minute no. 05[B(ii)}/KAR/DSC/2019(10)</p>	10

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Mallo Paul Lokiru was substantively appointed as Biostatistician on 7th February 2020 under Minute no.46/KAR/DSC/2022(01)	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed a District Cold Chain Technician nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	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) <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There were no projects for current FY in the health sector that were screened because the LG did not budget and neither were they approved by the time of assessment.	15
---	---	--	---	-----------

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

Maximum score is 30

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

Since no projects in the current FY had been approved, therefore no requirement for ESIAs was necessary.

**Micro-scale
Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------

Human Resource Management and Development

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Lakaye Gabriel Akope was substantively appointed as Senior Agricultural Engineer on 31st March 2023 under Minute no. 03/DSC/MARCH/2023(18).	70
---	--	--	---	-----------

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.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out by the Environment Officer and the CDO for the respective micro scale irrigation projects below; 1. Micro-scale irrigation at Lobelle village on 2nd August, 2022 2. Micro scale irrigation at Pire central village on 2nd August, 2022 Below was the prepared ESMP for the establishment of micro scale demonstration scheme at Kawalakol and Lobalangit sub counties prepared at UGX. 2,075,389 on 3rd August, 2022 However, the projects that were implemented in the micro-scale irrigation sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) 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.	30
---	--	---	---	-----------

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Nasur Charles was substantively appointed as Civil Engineer (Water) on 1st March 2008 under Minute No. 22/KGDSC/2008.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant Water Officer for mobilization nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Lokwang Dominic was substantively appointed as Borehole Maintenance Technician on 7th February 2020 under Minute No. 05(a)-22/KAR/DSC/2020(01).	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Karenga LG had neither substantively appointed an Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Iteo John Bosco was substantively appointed as Environment Officer on 7th February 2020 under Minute No. 05 (a)- 25/KAR/DSC/2020(01).	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Lokweny Emmanuel was substantively appointed as Forestry Officer on 7th February 2020 under Minute No. 05 (a)-26/KAR/DSC/2020(01).	10
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 as well as preparation of a costed ESMP were carried out at UGX. 1,500,000 for the extension of a pipe water system to Nakitoit parish, Karenga sub county were carried out On 25th October, 2022.	10

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	The projects that were implemented in the water sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) 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	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The DWO presented a copy of an abstraction permit which was not clear and one could not distinguish the details, however, it was issued to the Umbrella organization not to the LG	0