



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Kitgum Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 784)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	67%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	62%
Educational Performance Measures	79%
Health Performance Measures	67%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence provided indicated the following infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement of Furniture for the Municipal Office and 3 POS machines for the Divisions at Ushs 12,879,790 (ABPR page 106/107)</li> <li>• Completion of construction of selected roads of 4,842km at Ushs 7,017,966,900 (ABPR page 103)</li> <li>• Construction of office block at Central Division Council at Ushs 32,126.105 (ABPR page 107)</li> </ul> <p>The projects above were completed as per plan and functional and utilized for the purpose.</p>	<b>4</b>
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"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>• 1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>• If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment FY 2021/2022 average score was 72% FY2022/2023 average score was 85%</p> <p>Therefore, the average score increased by 13%</p>	<b>3</b>

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"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the USMID funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed. The MC had planned to implement 2 projects under Administration sector which were completed 100% as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY 2022/2023 as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement of Furniture for the Municipal Office and 3 POS machines for the Divisions at Ushs 12,879,790 (ABPR page 106 /107)</li> <li>• Completion of construction of selected roads of 4,842km at Ushs 15,217,966,900 (ABPR page 103)</li> <li>• Construction of office block at Central Division Council at Ushs 32,126.105 (ABPR page 107)</li> </ul> <p>The above planned projects were 100% completed by end of FY 2022/2023.</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC budgeted for Ushs 15,302,972,795 and spent Ushs 15,262,972,795 of the DDEG/USMID for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG/USMID grant, budget and implementation guideline as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement of Furniture for the Municipal Office and 3 POS machines for the Divisions at Ushs 12,879,790 (ABPR page 106 /107)</li> <li>• Completion of construction of selected roads of 4,842km at Ushs 15,217,966,900 (ABPR page 103)</li> <li>• Construction of office block at Central Division Council at Ushs 32,126.105 (ABPR page 107)</li> </ul> <p>The MC spend the entire budgeted DDEG/USMID grant of Ushs 15,262,972,795 on eligible projects.</p>	2

Investment Performance  
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

The contract price variation for all sampled DDEG/USMID projects in the approved consolidated annual report on procurement and disposal contracts (Amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, were within +/- 20% of the Engineer's estimates. For instance;

- For construction of office block at Central Division under DDEG on page 4 of the amended procurement plan at a contract price of UGX 93,828,687 against the engineer's estimate of UGX 98,001,954 giving the price variation of - 0.84%.
- For rehabilitation of Municipal Council Hall on page 4 of the amended procurement plan at a contract price of UGX 35,895,667 against the engineer's estimate of UGX 36,087,061 giving the price variation of +0.53.%.
- For designing of additional 2,211 Km of selected Urban Roads Infrastructure under USMID -AF Project on page 5 of the amended procurement plan at a contract price of UGX 197,950,000 against the engineers estimate of UGX 197,950,000 (as measured quantities) giving the price variation of 0.0%.

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information  
Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

According to the staff list obtained from the HRO, Divisions had positions filled but not to the minimum required standards of one SATown Clerk, one CDO and one Treasurer each. Below are the details;

At Pager Division

1. SAT - Irene Akumu
2. CDO- Barbra Alice Aciro
3. Treasurer - Irene Lamunu

At Padwong Division

1. CDO - Patricia Mary Amony
2. Treasurer - Jimmy Otto Odongkara

At Central Division

1. CDO - Andrew Dave Okot
2. Treasurer - Denish Okello Onencann

4 Accuracy of reported information  
Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:

- If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.

**Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0**

There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the USMID were in place as per reports produced by the MC. • Procurement of Furniture for the Municipal Office and 3 POS machines for the Divisions at Ushs 12,879,790 (ABPR page 106 /107) • Completion of construction of selected roads of 4,842km at Ushs 15,217,966,900 (ABPR page 103) • Construction of office block at Central Division Council at Ushs 32,126.105 (ABPR page 107) The above projects were 100% completed and in place as was reported the ABPR.

**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	
Central Div	84	43
Pandwong Div	88	34
Pager Div	82	45

The performance of the LLGs was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.

**0**

5 N23\_Reporting and Performance Improvement  
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence to show that the MC developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY.

**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	At the time of the Assessment the MC had not implemented the performance improvement plans and implementation records for the LLGs below 30 % in the assessment for FY2022/2023.	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 MLG consolidated and submitted staffing requirements for FY 2024/2025 to MoPS per letter stamp dated 29th September 2023.	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 Municipal conducted tracking of staff attendance but for only one month of June 2023 and therefore did not do an analysis for the period under assessment.	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	The LG had 6 HoDs excluding Administration. However, only one performance assessment was done by the Town Clerk as below  1. PCDO Michael Kilama was appraised on 30th June 2023	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>A meeting was held on 19th October 2022, where the case of Peter Obalim an Education Assistant II was discussed. He abandoned his duty since September 2022. All attempts to find him were futile, yet he also had multiple loans. A letter was written to him to come and defend himself to no avail.</p> <p>On 14th April 2023, a meeting was held to decide his fate. The recommendation was the Town Clerk to submit to DSC for termination of appointment on abandonment of duty.</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>There was no evidence that the MC had established a Consultative Committee at the time of assessment.</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>They were 56 staff recruited in the FY 2022/2023, effective 1st August 2022. Below are some of the sampled officers;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cinderella Achora the Assistant Town Clerk accessed payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>2. Jacob Oyet a Deputy Headteacher accessed payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>3. Benjamin Oyet an Education Assistant II accessed the payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>4. Jennifer Oyella an Education Assistant II accessed the payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>5. Brenda Sunday Lajara an Office Attendant accessed payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>6. Patrick Kilama a Deputy Headteacher accessed payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>7. John Baptist Acaye a Deputy Headteacher accessed payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>8. Micheal Olweny an Health Assistant accessed the payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>9. Walter Okema an Health Assistant accessed the payroll in September 2022.</li> <li>10. Ismail Oyoo an Askari accessed the payroll in September 2022.</li> </ol>	1

9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	According to the records provided by HRO, 4 staff retired in FY 2022/2023 and all of them appeared on the pension payroll within two months after retiring as sample shown below;  1. Hellen Apire Cook retired 27th January 2023 and accessed pension payroll in the month of March 2023.  2. Joyce Anekere a Senior Tutor retired on 27th January 2023 and accessed pension payroll in the month of March 2023  3. Florence Gladys Oyat a Headteacher retired on 5th September 2022 and accessed the pension payroll in the month of October 2022.  4. Joel Lacwec the Deputy Principal retired on 6th December 2022 and accessed the pension payroll in January 2023	<b>1</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

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

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;  Central Division received. Ushs 32,126,105  Pandwong Division received Ushs. 49,890,973  Pager Division received Ushs 43,014,250  The total transfers to all the LLGs in the MC added up to Ushs 125,031,329 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two instalments dated:  Quarter 2 - Ushs 41,677,110 was paid on 21st October 2022  Quarter 3 - Ushs 83,,354,219 was paid on 20th February 2023.	<b>2</b>
----	--	--	---	----------



10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as per copy of the warrant availed to the PAT;</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was done on 15th August 2022 while approval was on 11th August 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was done on 12th October 2022 while approval was on 12th October 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was done on 19th January 2023 while approval was on 19th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrant was done on 19th April 2023 while approval was on 5th April 2023, this was 7 days after the approval by MoFPED.</p> <p>The MC was not compliant with doing warrants in 5 working days after receipt of the cash limits from the MoFPED.</p>	0
10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was not done within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were uploaded on 14th October 2022 and the MC transferred to LLGs on 21st October 2022 which was 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were uploaded on 25th January 2023 and the MC transferred to LLGs on 20th February 2023 which was ore than 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED</p> <p>From the above observation the MC did not comply with the 5 days deadline as per the requirement.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence to prove that the MC supervised or mentored all the Divisions at least once per quarter consistent with the guidelines</p>	0

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p>	<p>Despite the fact the DTTPC held quarterly meetings as per the minutes provided by the Planner, there was no evidence from the minutes that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed to make recommendations for corrective actions.</p> <p>The MTTPC discussed Infrastructure/capital development monitoring reports in a meeting held on 5th January 2023 which were not support supervision reports as required.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		

### 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>There MC did not maintain an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual 2007, which clearly indicated the details of all assets for example;</p> <p>The assets acquired in FY 2022/2023 were not recorded in the Asset register.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
		<p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>		

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>There was no evidence that the MC used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY 2021/2022 and some of the recommendations in the report were rightly used it make Assets Management decisions concerning procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of asset.</p> <p>The MC took no initiative to implement the recommendations in the Board of Survey Report .</p>	0
		<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>		

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 MC had a Physical Planning Committee as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref KMC/227 dated 7th September 2022 signed by the Town Clerk. The committee was fully functional and held all the quarterly meetings in the FY 2022/23 as per the minutes of the meeting availed to the Assessment Team;</p> <p>Quarter 1 - meeting was held 14th July 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 - meeting was held 21st December 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 - meeting was held on 21st February 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 - meeting was held 30th June 2023.</p> <p>The minutes for the quarterly meetings were submitted to the MoLHUD on the 25th July 2023 by letter Ref. KMC/212/7 dated 19th July 2023 as per the guidelines.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that desk appraisals for all DDEG/USMID projects implemented during the previous FY were prepared.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that field appraisals for all DDEG/USMID projects implemented during the previous FY were prepared.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that the project profiles for all investments with costing in the current FY were developed and discussed by the MCTPC as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no USMID project planned for the current FY 2023/2024 therefore the MC did not screen for Environmental and social risks impact and put mitigation measures in place.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>In the approved updated consolidated procurement plan for Kitgum MLG for FY 2023/2024 by Alikuwan Ayub Kisubi dated 12th July 2023, there was no evidence of inclusion of DDEG/USMID funded projects. USMID funding was noted to be coming to a close at the time of assessment</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>In the approved updated consolidated procurement plan for Kitgum MLG for FY 2023/2024 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi dated 12th July 2023, there was no evidence of inclusion of DDEG/USMID funded projects. USMID funding was noted to be coming to a close at the time of assessment</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The following was presented as evidence for establishment of project implementation teams;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter by Alikwan Atub Kisubi the CAO dated 3rd April 2023 to Mr. Omona Charles the Municipal Engineer appointing him as the Contract Supervisor for Rehabilitation of Kitgum Municipal Council Hall.</li> <li>• A letter by Alikwan Atub Kisubi the CAO dated 3rd April 2023 to Abonga Alfred Alexis the Supretendant of Works/Civil Engineer appointing him as the Contract Supervisor for completion of one block of 4 class rooms at Kitgum Boys P/S</li> <li>• A letter by Alikwan Atub Kisubi the CAO dated 20th March 2023 to Abonga Alfred Alexis the Supretendant of Works/Civil Engineer appointing him as the contract supervisor for construction of Drug Store at Pandwong Health Centre III</li> </ul> <p>However, no appointment of the DCDO, Environment Officer , Labour Officer and Clerk of Works was presented as evidence</p>	0

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG/USMID followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer as presented below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of office block at Central Division under DDEG; the floor plan was 27.2mX12.92m overall dimensions. The Secretary's Office and Mayor's Office were 4.0mX4.0m and 4.0mX4.5m respectively. The super structure was constructed using block work as per specifications.</li> <li>• For rehabilitation of Municipal Council Hall under USMID, the works done included; casting of 3 columns of 230mX230m, installation of 2 casement windows of 1.5mX1.2m and fitting of window glass, partitioning of an office space of 2.3mX1.8m internal finished dimension in accordance to the specifications provided.</li> <li>• For designing of additional 2,211 Km of selected Urban Roads Infrastructure under USMID -AF Project, some of the project details included a 6m road width at a cross fall cumber of 0.5%.</li> </ul>
---	--	---

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

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

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

For instance;

- For construction of the class room block of four class rooms at Ojuma P/S, a request for payment by Lutojo Constructors & Designers Ltd for UGX 36,060,587 was dated 8th May 2023. The Municipal Engineer generated a certificate of payment and forwarded the requisition on 15th May 2023 after site measurement as per measurement sheet dated 15th May 2023. The Senior Community Development Officer, Environment Officer together with the Engineer all signed on the certificate of payment on 17th May 2023. . An environmental and Social Monitoring Report on the construction of class room block in Ojuma P/S by Okumu Eric Charles the CDO, Ayot Judith the Senior Environment Officer and Atim Harriet the Principal Education Officer dated 30th May 2023 was presented. Some of the community engagement observations mentioned were that the communities around the project area and parents of the school were informed about the project and were in support.
- For construction of Staff House at Pandwong Health Centre III, a request for payment of UGX 63,184,115 by Good Luck and Sons Multipurpose (U) Ltd was dated 12th April 2023. Certificate no. 2 was prepared and signed by the Principal Executive Engineer, Principal Health Inspector, Environment Officer and CDO on 12th April 2023. An environmental, social and Health Safeguards compliance monitoring report dated 30th May 2023 by Ayot Judith the Environment Officer, Okumu Eric Charles the CDO in which it was noted that the contractor had put in place measures to curb the spread of COVID-19 with 06 of the numbers being fully vaccinated was presented.
- For the completion of one block of four class room at Kitgum Boys P/S, a request for payment by Wan Aye Company Ltd was dated 12th May 2023. Measurement was done on 16th May 2023 as per attached measurement sheet. The certificate of payment no 01 was prepared and signed by all relevant officers on 16th May 2023. An environmental, social and Health Safeguards compliance monitoring report dated 30th May 2023 by Ayot Judith the Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the CDO in which it was noted that the noise generated were within the recommended standards was presented.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames as per contract. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of the class room block of four class room at Ojuma P/S, a request of payment by Lutojo Constructors&amp; Designers Ltd for UGX 36,060,587 was dated 8th May 2023. Municipal Engineer generated a certificate of payment and forwarded the requisition on 15th May 2023 after site measurement as per measurement sheet dated 15th May 2023. The Senior Community Development Officer, Environment Officer together with the Engineer all signed on the certificate of payment on 17th May 2023. Voucher no. 6420262 was effected on 28th June 2023 and acknowledged by Lutojo Constructors &amp; Designers Ltd on 29th June 2023.</li> <li>• For construction of staff house at Pandwong Health Centre III, a request for payment of UGX 63,184,115 by Good Luck and Sons Multipurpose (U) Ltd was dated 12th April 2023. Certificate no. 2 was prepared and signed by the Principal Executive Engineer, Principal Health Inspector, Environment Officer and CDO on 12th April 2023. Payment of voucher no. 5061891 was effected on 28th April 2023 and acknowledged by the Good Luck and Sons Multipurpose (U)Ltd on 29th April 2023.</li> <li>• For Completion of one block of four class room at Kitgum Boys P/S, a request for payment by Wan Aye Company Ltd was dated 12th May 2023. Measurement was done on 16th May 2023 as per attached measurement sheet. The certificate of payment no 01 was prepared and signed by all relevant officers on 16th May 2023. Payment voucher no. 5837468 was effected on 12th June 2023 and acknowledged by the contractor on 26th June 2023.</li> </ul>
---	---	--



13

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

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

Score 1 or else 0

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

- For construction of Staff House at Pandwong Health Centre III, procurement ref: KGMC714/WORKS/2022-23/00001, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 31st October 2022 recommending the ward to M/S Good Luck and Sons Multipurpose (U) Limited at a contract price of UGX 162,975,911. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation in a meeting held on 4th November 2022 under minute number KGMC/02/LGCC/01/22-23/26 and the contract between the parties was signed on 30th November 2022.

- For construction of one block of 4 class rooms at Ojuma P/S, procurement ref; KGMC714/WRKS/22-23/00003, the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 31st October 2022 recommending the award to Lujoto Constructors & Designers Ltd at a contract price of UGX 82,994,107 The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 4th November 2022 under minute number KGMC/02/LGCC/01/22-23/27 and the contract between the parties was signed on the 3rd January 2023.

- For Construction of Office Block at Central Division, procurement ref: KGMC714/WRKS/22-23/00004., the file had an evaluation report signed by the Evaluation Committee on 20th February 2023 recommending the award to DEGBODO Company Ltd at a bid price of UGX93,828,687. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report in a meeting held on 20th February 2023 under minute number KGMC/03/LGCC/03/22-23/05 and the contract between the parties was signed on the 20th March 2023

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	KMC/214/1, Renewal of Assignment as Focal person of Grievance/Complaints Committee for FY 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 to Mr. Oyoo Samuel – Records Assistant, dated 1st July 2021 Some of the roles included registering all queries and complaints lodged by both the staff and public, to sensitize staff on good client’s/customer management etc. this was signed by the Town Clerk – Ochan Patrick Ocitti.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	KMC/214/1, Assignment to the Grievance/complaints Committee for 2021-2023, dated 1st July 2021, to the following people:  Mr. Kilama Michael – PCDO (Chairperson)  Mr. Omona Charles – Municipal Engineer (Member)  Mrs. Achola Irene Origa – Senior Physical Planner (Member).  Mr. Aketo Cathereine – Human Resource Officer (Member).  Letter signed by the Town Clerk – Ochan Patrick Ocitti.	
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.	There was a book with MC Logo titled “Kitgum Municipal Council Complaints Register” inside it had page heading “Complaints and Grievances Log Book.” It included no. date, complainant details, detailed description of complaint, USMID/NON USMID, action taken, further action to be taken, resolved, referred for legal action and Remark/Comment. The log book had complaints registered from 2016 to date.  For instance, there was a complaint registered on 24th August 2022 by Aloyo Filder – East ward C. She reported Damage of vegetables plantation and she needed her vegetables compensated. There was an engagement meeting made with the affected person and she was compensated accordingly. (this was an informal meeting with the affected party, so minutes were not generated).  Another complaint was registered on 3rd September 2022 by Alice Labalprint Ayat 0782600836 Central cell. That water drainage is blocked and water drops from the roof, has no outlet and rather enters her building destroying her property. The case was resolved by the contractor and reworked on the drainage system. The focal point person called the road inspector and informed of the complaint and he tasked the contractor to resolve the issue immediately, which was done.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0	No minutes were seen for the year of assessment.	

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	There was a notice titled "Grievances Reporting Format - KMC" the drawing showed the reporting line. The complaints from the aggrieved/complainants are received from the Complaint desk (Focal person Grievance), then forward to the Town Clerk for sanctioning, It's then returned to the Committee and line department affected. Then in case the aggrieved party was not contented, he or she would go to the Legal proceedings.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the Annual Work Plan found correlating information that Environment, Social and Climate Change Interventions were well integrated. In the LGDP III, for example, the subject is articulated in p.38 - 42, where interventions such as environmental management, conservation of natural resources, climate change, and increased access to clean safe water, increasing forestry and wetland coverage are highlighted, including in the LG Approved Budget Estimates and in the LG Approved Work Plan for FY 2022/2023.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management	The evidence of the signed attendance list for the MTPC meeting held on 16th July 2022 and acknowledgement of receipt of the DDEG guideline by the DAS, CDO, Town Clerks and Parish Chiefs of the 3 Divisions, Division Heads of department proved that the DDEG guidelines were disseminated. The description and explanations for the use and allocation of grant were given.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	Contract/Reference no. Kgmc 714/Wrks/2022-2023/00004, Construction of an Office block for Central Division. The costed ESMP was incorporated in the BoQ element 3, Others and Environment and Social Safe Guards (HIV/AIDs sensitizations, monthly meetings etc. at UGX 5,220,000.  Contract/Reference no. Kgmc714/Wrks/2022-2023/0000-. Renovation of the Council Hall. The costed ESMP was incorporated in the BoQ , Safety, Health and Environment management with total cost of UGX 3,049,260.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects with additional costings on impact of climate change.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was proof of land ownership shared as evidence that projects are actually implemented on rightfully owned land.  Construction of office block at administration of central division Council is situated on Freehold Volume HQT1032 Folio 22. Block road Labongo road, plot 9, Langa Langa. Owner: Kitgum Town council; size 0.2530ha; Issued on 30th November 2016.  Renovation of municipal council hall at Kitgum municipality is situated on freehold Volume GUL71 Folio 11. Plot 36, Chua Road at HILL-TOP CELL. Owner: Kitgum Town council. Issued on 2nd June 2022; Size 1.1880ha.	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environmental and Social Monitoring Report dated 30th June 2023 for the construction of an office block for Central Division.</p> <p>Environmental and Social Monitoring Report dated 30th May 2023 for the construction of an office block for Central Division.</p> <p>Reports were signed by CDO and Senior Environment Officer. The main objective was to check progress implementation of Environmental, Social and Health issues.</p> <p>Environment, Social and Health Safeguards Compliance Monitoring Report for the rehabilitation of Council Hall dated 30th May 2023.</p> <p>Environment, Social and Health Safeguards Compliance Monitoring Report for the rehabilitation of Council Hall dated 2nd June 2023.</p> <p>Both reports were signed by CDO and the Environment Officer. The report covers progress implementation of Environmental, Social and Health issues at site.</p>	<b>1</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that E&amp;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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC had prepared E&amp;S compliance Certification forms and were shared as source of evidence before a contractor's payment is processed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of office block at administration of central division Council. E&amp;S compliance Certification form dated 31st May 2023 was seen on file.</li> <li>2. Completion of a drug store at Pandwong HCIII. E&amp;S compliance Certification form dated 6th June 2023 was seen on file.</li> <li>3. Construction of one block of four classrooms in Ojuma P/S. E&amp;S compliance Certification form dated 7th March 2023 was seen on file.</li> </ol> <p>The above 3 sampled projects had reports signed and stamped by both CDO and Senior EO.</p>	<b>1</b>

**Financial management**

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to-date at the time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to PAT as detailed below;</p> <p>Reconciliation Previous FY 2022/2023</p> <p>A/c name: KITGUM MC General Fund A/c</p> <p>A/c No:9030005811634</p> <p>Bank Name: STANBIC Bank – Kitgum Branch</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th June 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 4,511,367 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 7th July 2023</p> <p>Reconciliation Current FY 2023/2024</p> <p>A/c name: KITGUM MC General Fund A/c</p> <p>A/c No:9030005811634</p> <p>Bank Name: STANBIC Bank – Kitgum Branch</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th September 2023 with a closing Balance of Ushs 4,288,212 verified by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 7th 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>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 MC produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below.</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 27th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 31st January 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 30th April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 29th July 2023</p> <p>Form the observation the reports were timely produced to impact the improvement in financial management and reporting of the MG as per the report production dates stated above,</p>	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC provided information to the Town Clerk and MCPAC on the status of the implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY 2022/23 as per letter Ref KMC/252/01 dated 30th August 2023 signed by the Internal Auditor and received in the MC Registry and Secretary to PAC on 30th August 2023.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the stamped copies of the Internal Audit Reports, it was evident that the reports for the previous FY were submitted to MC Accounting Officer, MCPAC and that PAC has reviewed as follows;</p> <p>1st quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk on 27th October 2022 and MCPAC on 7th November 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk on 31st January 2023 and MCPAC on 10th February 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk on and MCPAC on 30th April 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was submitted to the Town Clerk and MCPAC on 29th Jul 2022</p> <p>The minutes for the LGPAC indicated that the quarterly reports were reviewed, and issues followed up e.g;</p> <p>Minutes for PAC meeting held on 10th March 2023 Min 07/10/03/2022/, Discussion of the Internal Audit report for quarter 1 and 2. PAC recommended the Town Clerk to enforce the implementation of the audit recommendations.</p>	1

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The MC planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 1,000,100,000 and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 667,516,152 which gave a variance of Ushs 332,583,848 (Final draft A/cs 2022/2023-page 33)</p> <p><math>(667,516,152 / 1,000,100,000) \times 100\% = 67\%</math></p> <p>The MC only managed to correct 67% of its planned revenue, leaving a balance of -33% not collected. The budget realization was above -10%.</p> <p>The failure to realize the planned revenue was because of; the Government ban on the sale of forest products like charcoal which was a major source of revenue for the MC hence the short fall.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The ratio of OSR for the MC the previous FY as compared to that the previous FY but one as per Final A/cs 2022/23 page 33 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/2022 Final Accounts FY2021/2022 page 33)</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 174,715,965</p> <p>OSR 2022/2023 Final Accounts FY2022/2023-page 33)</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 667,516,152</p> <p>Therefore, Revenue 2022/2023 less revenue 2021/2022</p> <p>Ushs 667,516,152- Ushs 174,715,965</p> <p>= Ushs 492,800,187</p> <p>= <math>492,800,187/174,715,965) \times 100 = 282\%</math></p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/2023 increased by 282%.</p> <p>The increase in the OSR for the FY 2022/2023 was due to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the introduction and close monitoring of the IRA system regulated the revenue collection gaps hence the increase.</li> </ul>	2



20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	At the time of the assessment the MC provided evidence to show that the local revenue collections for the FY 2022/2023 subjected to be shared with the LLGs was remitted to the Division at 50% as follows;  Central Division received - Ushs 12,152,350  Pandwong Division received - Ushs 19,592,450  Pager Division received - Ushs 12,425,925  The above transfers were remitted on;  24th February 2023 for Q 2 & Q3 collections.  28th June 2023 for Q4 collections.	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts for FY 2022/2023 were published.  For Example;  • For Construction of Staff House at Pandwong HC III, the best evaluated bidder notice was dated 4th November 2022 with best bidder as M/S Good Luck and Sons Multipurpose (U) Limited at a bid price of UGX 162,975,911  • For construction of one block of 4 class rooms at Ojuma P/S, the best evaluated bidder notice dated 4th November 2022 with best bidder as Lujoto Constructors and Designers Limited at a bid price of UGX 82,994,107  • For Construction of Office Block at Central Division, the best evaluated bidder notice dated 27th February 2023 with best bidder as DEG BODO Company Ltd at a bid price of UGX 93,828,687.	<b>2</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	The display of the LLG performance assessment results and implications for the FY 2021/2022 on the MC and Division notice boards on 25th August 2023 signed by the Town Clerk Ayub Kisubi.  The MC performance assessment results and implications for the FY 2021/22 were disseminated and presented by the Planner to the MTPC, Council Executive Committee, Municipal Development Forum, Division Town Clerks and Media Fraternity on 25th August 2023 at the District Council Hall as per the report Budget Conference.	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>During the previous FY 2022/2023, the MC conducted radio programs in various county community dialogues. radio stations to provide feed-back on the status of activity implementation to the public where different topics discussed included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation and sensitization of the community on the Parish Development Model (PDM)</li> <li>• Revenue collection/ Budget Performance report for 2022/23.</li> <li>• Garbage collection and disposal.</li> <li>• HIV prevention and prevalence in the community.</li> <li>• Polio campaigns and immunization programs.</li> </ul> <p>The above discussions were held on Temple FM, Radio Peace and Jambo FM located in Kitgum MC. The panelists included the Municipal Planner, MHI, MEO, MCDO and Mayor. The programmes were done every Wednesday from 9:00 Am - 10:00Am.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of the assessment the MC had no proof to show that the tax rates for the previous FY had been displayed on the notice board to show the collection procedures, and procedures for appeal with contacts of the focal person in case of appeal.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No alleged fraud and corruption case was raised by the IGG hence no report was prepared.</p>	1

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>For 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X were 1,178</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II &amp; III = 267+797+90= 1154</p> <p>Percentage was <math>1154/1178 \times 100 = 97.9\%</math></p> <p>For 2020, total number of candidates excluding Division X were 1,109</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II &amp; III = 259+725+70= 1,054</p> <p>Percentage pass was <math>1054/1109 \times 100 = 95.0\%</math></p> <p>Percentage change was <math>97.9\% - 95.0\% = 2.9\%</math></p> <p>Hence percentage increased by 2.9%</p>	2
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>For 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X were 1,325</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II &amp; III = 98+334+406= 838</p> <p>Percentage was <math>838/1325 \times 100 = 63.2\%</math></p> <p>For 2020, total number of candidates excluding Division X were 1,530</p> <p>Total passes in Div I, II &amp; III = 87+319+449= 855</p> <p>Percentage pass was <math>855/1530 \times 100 = 55.9\%</math></p> <p>Percentage change was <math>63.2\% - 55.9\% = 7.3\%</math></p> <p>Hence percentage increased by 7.3%</p>	3

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>The LLG performance results for FY 2021/2022 was 30% and for FY 2022/2023 was 77% hence an increase of 47%</p>	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>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion the construction of a 1 Block of 4 unit classrooms Kitgum Boys P/S at total cost of Ushs 40,000,000 (AWP page 62, Approved Budget page 25)</li> <li>• Construction of 1 block of a 4-classroom block at Ojuma P/s at a total cost of Ushs 92,624,000 (AWP page 62, Approved budget page 28).</li> </ul>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Certificate No. 2 issued on 15th May 2023 for Ushs 33,001,390; Contract No. KGMC784/WRKS/2021 -2022/00009; Project; Construction of I block of a 4-classroom block at Ojuma P/s by M/s Lutojo Construction & Designers Ltd was certified on 17th May 2023 by Environment Officer and CDO and DEO on 18th May 2023as per the guidelines; payment was done on 28th June 2023.

Certificate No. 1 issued on 16th May 2023 for Ushs 36,325,499; Contract No. KGMC784/WRKS/2022-2023/00005 Project; Construction of one block of 4 classrooms at Kitigum Boys P/s by M/s Wan Aye Co Ltd was certified by DEO on 18th May 2023; Environment Officer and CDO on 16th May 2023as per the guidelines; payment was done on 12th June 2023.

Certificate No. 1 issued on 9th March 2023 for Ushs 42,934,109; Contract No. KGMC784/WRKS/2021 -2022/00009; Project; Construction of I block of a 4-classroom block at Ojuma P/s by M/s Lutojo Construction & Designers Ltd was certified on 9th March 2023 by Environment Officer and CDO and DEO on 10th March 2023as per the guidelines; payment was done on 12th April 2023.

From the above sampled certificates, the LG was compliant with the guidelines.

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	The variation in the contract price for all sampled education projects for FY 2022/2023 was within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates as per evidence provided. For instance;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Construction of one block of 4 class rooms at Ojuma P/S at a contract price of UGX 82,994,107 against the engineers estimates of UGX 92,633,956 The contract price variation was determined to be +10.4%.</li> <li>• For completion of one block of 4 class rooms at Kitgum Boys P/S at a contract price of UGX 40,000,000 against the engineers estimates of UGX 40,000,000giving the contract variation of 0.0%.</li> </ul>	
			Only two infrastructure projects were planned for under Education department in Kitgum Municipal Local Government.	
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	In the approved quarterly report on procurement plans (amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Projects	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	Kitgum MLG had a staff ceiling of 165 primary school teachers and 162 positions were filled at the time of assessment.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	To calculated the percentage; $162/165 \times 100 = 98\%$	

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MC had 8 UPE schools, and one USE School. According to the consolidated assets register dated 10th June 2023, all the 9 schools met the basic standards</p> <p>To calibrate the LG compliance, <math>9/9 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed. The staff lists provided by the MEO were compared with the lists at the visited schools (Pandwong, Kitgum Girls and Kitgum). The two lists were similar as verified from the staff lists posted at the head teachers' notice boards . At Pandwong P/S, the list from MEO had 33 teachers and these were found to be deployed at the school. The list from the MEO for Kitgum Girls P/S had 14 teachers and these were the same teachers deployed at school. The same was with Kitgum P/S school which had 29 teachers.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG education department compiled an asset register that did not accurately report on infrastructure in all registered schools, dated 10th June 2023.</p> <p>For example, the consolidated asset register indicated that Pandwong had 35 classrooms, while a visit at the school revealed that the school has 21 classrooms. Another divergence was found at Kitgum Girls P/S where asset register at the MLG indicated that 15 classrooms and 22 latrine stances, and yet a visit at the school indicated 13 and 6 respectively.</p> <p>Hence the MLG had a school asset register with inconsistencies.</p>	0

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) highlights of school performance,</li> <li>ii) a reconciled cash flow statement,</li> <li>iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and</li> <li>iv) an asset register:</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence at the time of assessment that the Municipal Council complied with the annual budgeting and reporting guidelines as none of these reports were presented at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Hence percentage compliance was : <math>0/8 \times 100 = 0\%</math></p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that schools were supported to make SIPs.</p> <p>In a report by the MIS to the MEO, 8 government aided schools were supported to make SIPs.</p> <p>In the primary schools sampled and visited, that is Pandwong, Kitgum Girls and Kitgum primary schools, SIPs were found pasted on the walls in the head teachers' offices</p> <p>Hence percentage of compliance is = <math>8/8 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all registered schools from previous FY as follows;</p> <p>8 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 7,713 pupils , 1 USE school with a total enrolment of 1,671 and 2 tertiary institutions with a enrolment of 412.</p> <p>To calculate level of compliance; <math>11/11 \times 100 = 100</math></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 for the current FY year at UGX 1,312,771,000/-as reflected on page 32/53 of the approved budget estimates for FY 2023/2024.</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 LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY. According to staff lists of the three sampled primary schools, teachers were deployed as follows in the sampled schools;</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>1. Pandwong primary school had 32 teachers and a head teacher. Attendance register between 19th to 21st September 2023 confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p>	
			<p>2. Kitgum Girls primary school had 13 teachers and a head teacher deployed. Attendance register between 10th to 15th September, 2023 confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p>	
			<p>3. Kitgum primary school had 28 teachers and a head teacher deployed. Attendance register between 18th September and 22nd 2023, confirmed these teachers to be on the ground as deployed.</p>	
			<p>Hence deployment in the three sampled schools was also according to the guidelines since they were at least 7 in the P7 schools.</p>	
7	<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>Lists of deployment were displayed in head teachers' offices in the schools that were sampled and visited. At Pandwong primary school, the deployed list had 33 teachers. At Kitgum Girls and Kitgum primary schools, teacher deployment data were clearly displayed on the notice boards indicating 14 and 29 government teachers respectively. The details displayed included; name, qualifications, and title among others. At the district, the deployment list was displayed the notice board of the education department.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>		

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>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 MC had 8 primary school. However the headteachers of these primary schools had not been appraised by 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 MC had 1 secondary school. However, this one head teacher had not appraised by the D/CAO and no appraisal reports had been submitted to the HRM 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>All staff (MEO, School inspectors, education officers) in the Education Department had not been appraised against their performance plans for FY 2022/2023.</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>The LG education department prepared a training plan dated 12th October 2022. The training plan targeted the following: Two education officers were planned to go for master's degrees, two education assistants were to go for bachelor's degrees, and all head teachers were to be supported to develop SIPs.</p>	2
---	--	--	--	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget for the FY 2023/2024 in the letter written by the town clerk and dated 21st October 2022. This information corroborated well with the list schools from PBS and the OTIMs submitted on 21st October 2022 at 4:01 PM.</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>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 LG Education department spent UGX 1,282,667/- and UGX 933,333 on inspection and monitoring functions respectively as reflected in the quarter 4 report for FY 2022/2023.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

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 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters  
If 100% compliance, score: 2  
else score: 0

There was evidence that the LG made timely submission of warrants for school's capitation grants for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget the 3 quarters. as per the dates from the IFMS.

Quarter 1 warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 11th August 2022 which was the same MoFPED had approved.

Quarter 3 warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 23rd January 2023 which was 1 day after approval from MoFPED on 19th January 2023.

Quarter 4 warrants for school's capitation grants were submitted on 5th May 2023 the same day it was approved by MoFPED.

Therefore, the LG was compliant.

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 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.  
If 100% compliance, score: 2  
else, score: 0

There was no evidence that the MC invoiced and communicated all the quarterly school capitation Grant transfers for the previous FY to schools within 3 working days as per the verified transfer vouchers below;

Quarter 1 was invoiced on 22nd August 2022 which was 3 days after the release of funds from MoFPED on 17th August 2023.

Quarter 3 was invoiced on 20th February 2023 which was more than 3 days from the release of funds from MoFPED on 25th January 2023.

Quarter 4 was invoiced on 17th May 2023 which was which was 3 days from the release of funds from MoFPED on 12th May 2023.

The invoicing for quarter three was delayed hence not being compliant.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.

- If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0

There was evidence that the education department prepared an inspection plan for Quarter 1&2 FY 22/23 dated 10th August 2022 in which digital inspection, UNEB exams , monitoring BoT three were the main highlights.

.Quarter 4 inspection plan was dated 22nd May 2023 mainly focused on digital training and monitoring BoT two.

Quarter 3 inspection was made on 15th January 2023. This plan focused on EMIS registration, digital inspection and training & registration of PLE 2023.

There was a planning meeting held on 27th October 2022. In this meeting the inspectors were oriented on the tools, allocated the schools to inspect and the tools were distributed.

Another meeting was held on 17th March 2023. It was clarified that E- inspection was to be done in government aided schools while hard copies of the tools would be used in private schools. Inspectors and associate assessors were allocated schools to inspect.

Another planning meeting was held on 19th May 2023. Inspectors were allocated schools for inspection in term 3

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:

- If 100% score: 2
- Between 80 - 99% score 1
- Below 80%: score 0

UPE schools were inspected and monitored as follows;

In quarter 3(term one 2023) the report indicated that 28 primary schools (including all the 8 government aided schools), two vocational schools and one nursing school were inspected. This report was received by DES ON 27th April 2023.

In quarter 4(term two 2023) inspection was done between 3rd and 27th July 2023. In this period 45 primary schools (including all the 8 government aided) were inspected. The report was received by DES on 1st August 2023,

Quarter 1(term 3 2022) inspection was carried out between 27th October and 26th November 2022. A total of 41 primary schools (including all the 8 government aided) were inspected. The report was received by DES on 5th January 2023.

Average number of schools inspected =  $(8+8+8)/3 = 8$

Hence  $8/8 \times 100 = 100\%$

Therefore, inspection percentage based on the three terms seen averaged to 100 %

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>There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions. Meetings held after inspection included: A meeting held on 14th March 2023 reviewed term 1 , 2023 inspection under Min 5/3/2023 – Review of term one inspection. As a way forward, E-inspection was to start in term two.</p> <p>Another meeting held on 17th October, 2023 gave feedback to head teachers and their deputies about the inspection in term two 2023. The meeting was attended by 20 members.</p> <p>The visitors’ books at the sampled schools confirmed that inspection was done.</p> <p>For instance, at Pandwong P/S the visitor’s book revealed that the school was inspected on the following days; 29th June 2023, 7th March 2023 and and 18th July 2022.</p> <p>At Kitgum Girls P/S the visitor’s book revealed that the school was inspected on the following days: 7th July 2023, 30th March 2023 and 15th November 2022.</p> <p>At Kitgum P/S the visitor’s book revealed that the school was inspected on the following days: 27th March 2023, 7th July 2023 and 14th November 2022. A SMC meeting held on 29th September 2023 at this school, there was discussion of inspection reports in Min 5 – 1-2023 Presentation and approval of SIP for term three 2023</p>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC submitted inspection reports to DES as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 3 FY 2022/23 inspection: This report was received by DES on 27th April 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 FY 2022/23 inspection: The report was received by DES on 1st August 2023,</p> <p>Quarter 2 FY 2022/23 inspection: The report was received by DES on 5th January 2023.</p>

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>The minutes for the Council Committee responsible for education met and discussed delivery for the meeting held on 4th October 2022 under Min 3/04/10/2022/2023 the monitoring and inspection reports and deliberated upon by the committee.</p> <p>The following recommendations to the issues were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen the inspection of schools in the MC and ensure that teachers are at schools.</li> <li>- SMC and PTA should be oriented on their roles in the management of schools.</li> <li>- Immunization of children should be taken to pre-primary schools to attend to children in the immunolabel age bracket.</li> <li>- Best performing schools and pupils in PLE should be recognized and rewarded.</li> </ul>	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>The MC produced evidence that radio announcements to call on parents to send their children back to school were aired on two local FM radios in both English and Acholi languages. A receipt number 3255 for Mighty fire FM and receipt number 4240 for Tembo FM (U) Ltd, both dated 25th April 2023, were presented. The announcements were run for two days.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards,</p> <p><i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the MLG had an assets register setting out facilities and equipment in schools. However, the register's information was not in agreement with what the schools reported on the ground.</p> <p>For example, the assets register at the MLG indicated that Pandwong P/S had 427 desks, while a visit at the school revealed that they had 449 desks. At Kitgum Girls P/S the asset register indicated 78 desks while the MLG register indicated 216 desks. Hence the MLG assets register was not up to-date at the time of assessment.</p> <p>However, the asset registered was submitted to MoES on 10th June 2023.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The desk appraisal report dated 12th December 2022 indicated that the Education Development implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were appraised as per the details below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 1 block 4 classroom block in Ojuma P/s in Padwong Division at Ushs 92,624 with funding from SECTOR DEVELOPMENT GRANT (AWP page 6 and Approved budget 26)</li> </ul> <p>The report recommended for the field appraisal, social and environmental screening of the above project.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>The field appraisal report dated 12th December 2022 indicated that the Education Development implemented projects in the previous FY 2022/2023 were appraised i) technical feasibility; ii) environmental and social acceptability; and</p> <p>(iii) customized designs as per the details below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 1 block 4 classroom block in Ojuma P/s in Padwong Division with funding from SECTOR DEVELOPMENT GRANT (AWP page 6 and Approved budget 26)</li> </ul> <p>The report recommended for the implementation of the projects since the funding was available</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the approved updated consolidated procurement plan for Kitgum MLG for FY 2023/2024 by Alikuwan Ayub Kisubi signed on 12th July 2023, there was no evidence of inclusion of Seed Secondary School projects.</p>	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure in FY 2022/2023 was approved by the contracts committee. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of one block of 4 class room at Ojuma P/S was approved by the Contracts Committee on 4th November 2022 under minute number KTGCC/02/LGCC/01/22-23/27 and the contract awarded to Lujoto Constructors &amp; Designers Ltd at a contract price of UGX 82,944,107.</li> <li>• Completion of one block of 4 class rooms at Kitgum Boys P/S was approved by the Contracts Committee on 20th March 2023 under minute number KGMC/03/LGCC/03/22-23/05 and the contract awarded to Wan Aye Company Limited at a contract price of UGX 40,000,000.</li> </ul> <p>Only two education infrastructure projects had been included in the procurement plan for FY 2022/2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG established project implementation teams for school construction projects as presented below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter by Alikwan Atub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 3rd April 2023 to Abonga Alfred Alexis the Supretendant of Works/Civil Engineer appointing him as the contract supervisor for completion of one block of 4 class rooms at Kitgum P/S.</li> </ul> <p>There was no appointment of the Environment Officer, Labour Officer, Community Development Officer and Clerk of Works as members of the PIT that was presented.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the approved consolidated annual report for procurement &amp; disposal contracts (amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Projects.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the approved consolidated annual report for procurement &amp; disposal contracts (amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, there was no planned Seed Secondary School Projects</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of monthly joint technical supervision at critical stages of the planned sector infrastructure projects at by the relevant officers. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of the class room block of four class room at Ojuma P/S, an Environment and Social Monitoring Report on the construction of Class room block in Ojuma P/S dated 30th May 2023 by Okumu Eric Charles the CDO, Ayot Judith the Senior Environment Officer and Atim Harriet the Principal Education Officer was presented. Some of the community engagement observations mentioned were that the communities around the project area and parents of the school are informed about the project and are in support.</li> <li>• For Completion of one block of four class room at Kitgum Boys P/S, an Environmental and Social and Monitoring report dated 30th may 2023 by Ayot Judith the Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the CDO in which it was noted that the noise generated were within the recommended standards was presented.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

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>The sector infrastructure projects were properly executed, however payments to contractors were not made within the specified timeframes and contract terms.</p> <p>For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voucher no. 5837468 dated 12th June 2023 for Completion of a 1 classroom block at Kitgum Boys P/s at Ushs 34,145,969 by M/s Wan Aye Ltd Invoice was raised on 12th May 2023 and payment process was initiated on 16h May 2023 and paid on 12th June 2023 which was within 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms.</li> <li>• Voucher no. 5751993 dated 12th April 2023 for Construction a block of 4 classrooms at OjumaP/S at Ushs 40,358,062 by M/s Lutojo Construction and Designers; Invoice was raised on 3rd March 2023 and payment process was initiated on 10th March 2023 and paid on 12th April 2023 which was above the recommended 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms.</li> <li>• Voucher no. 6420262 dated 28th June 2023 for Construction a block of 4 classrooms at OjumaP/S at Ushs 31,021,307 by M/s Lutojo Construction and Designers. The invoice was raised on 8th May 2023 and payment process was initiated on 18th May 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days of processing the payment as per the contract terms.</li> </ul> <p>From the sampled payment vouchers the MC did not comply with the guideline of paying contractors within 10 working days or 30 days as per the contract terms.</p>	<b>0</b>
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 Local Government Education department submitted its procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 to PDU on the 28th April 2022. This was within the timelines as per the guidelines.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary school implemented in the previous FY (2022/2023).</p>	<b>1</b>

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no grievance raised/reported under Education sector. The Log book did not have any complaints under Education.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence presented that The Municipal Environment Officer prepared and disseminated the said guidelines. In all the schools visited (Pandwong, Kitgum Girls and Kitgum Primary Schools) these guidelines were not found there.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>1. Contract/Reference no. Kgmc 784/Works/22-23/00005, Completion of one block of four classrooms at Kitgum Boys primary school, had costed ESMP included in the document. For instance, element 6-provision of Personal protective gear, 7-tree planting, 8-revegetation of the area, 9-water for works, 10-sensitization on HIV/AIDs, 11-provision of site security and N-sign boards. The total cost was UGX 340,000.</p> <p>2. Contract/Reference no. Kgmc 784/Works/21-22/00005, Completion of one block of four classrooms at Ojuma primary school, had costed ESMP included in the document. For instance, Safety, Health and Environmental Management (provision of COVID 19 safety awareness, provision of Personal protective gear, tree planting, revegetation of the area, water for works, sensitization on HIV/AIDs, provision of site security and sign boards). The total cost was UGX 4,000,000.</p>	2

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0	Two documents showing land ownership were shared as evidence namely;  1. For the completion of one block of four classrooms a Kitgum Boy's P/S, a catholic founded institution, presented a consent letter dated 10th February 2023 stamped and signed by the catholic church-Mary Immaculate (Father Paul Okot). However, the letter does not clearly indicate that it has accepted LG/ Government to invest in the school enterprise. It only affirms that the school is situated on church land.  2. For the construction of one block of four classrooms in Ojuma P/S, a land sales agreement was provided dated 21st April 2021 between Bongomin John Apete and Pandwong Division. Area is 196 by 45 meters signed by the vendor and Senior Assistant TC on behalf of purchaser.	1
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score:0	Environment and Social Monitoring Report on Completion of one block of four classrooms at Kitgum Boys Primary school, dated 30th May 2023.  Another Environment and Social Monitoring report for the same project above was dated 28th April 2023. Both monitoring reports had the monitoring team of CDO and Senior Environment Officer and signed by the same Officers.  Environment and Social Monitoring Report dated 30th May 2023 for the Construction of classroom block in Ojuma primary school.  Environment and Social Monitoring report dated 28th February 2023 for the Construction of classroom block in Ojuma Primary school.  Another report dated 31st January 2023 for the construction of classroom block in Ojuma Primary school/  All the three reports were signed by the CDO and Senior Environment Officer. A team of 3 people conducted the monitoring which included the Principal Education Officer, Environment Officer and the CDO. The activity was conducted to ascertain the compliance on the mitigation measures put in place.	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

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

1. Certificate no.1 dated 16th May 2023 for the Completion of one block of four classrooms of Kitgum Boys primary school worth UGX 33,634,721. Certificate was signed by the Municipal Engineer, Education Officer, Senior Community Development Officer, Environment Officer and verified by Internal Audit.

Payment made on 12th June 2023, PV no. 5837468. Therefore, works was certified before payment.

2. Certificate no.2 dated 15th May 2023 for the Construction of one block of four classrooms at Ojuma primary school worth UGX 30,556,843. Certificate was signed by the Municipal Engineer, Principal Education Officer, Senior Community Development Officer, Environment Officer and Head of Internal Audit on different dates.

Payment made on 28th June 2023, PV no. 6420262. Therefore, works was certified before payment.

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The HMIS 107 reports for Pandwong HC III were not available at the time of assessment.</p> <p>However, the Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 (prepared by the in-charge Winnie Acan – Senior Clinical Officer – on 15th July 2023, and approved by Principal Health Inspector) was reviewed.</p> <p>The report showed that there were <b>67 deliveries</b> in 2021/2022 FY.</p> <p>For FY 2022/2023, report indicated <b>166 deliveries</b>.</p> <p>The percentage in the utilisation of health care services was:</p> $\frac{\text{Current deliveries} - \text{Previous deliveries}}{100}$ <p>Previous deliveries</p> $\frac{166 - 67}{67} \times 100 = 147.7 \%$ <p>Therefore, the LG registered an increase in the utilisation of health care services.</p> <p>Note: The increased number of deliveries was because of upgrade of the facility and subsequent recruitment of more staff and resultant improvement in 24-hour coverage.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for Year 2022 was 100% and year 2023 was 90%; therefore, the average score for the health sector in the LLGs was 95%.</p>	2



2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p>	<p>There was a letter from the Ministry of Health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p>	
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>From the provided evident the MC budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines e.g;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rehabilitation of Mid-wife block, toilet and water system at Padwong HCIII at Ushs 34,224,000 (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Construction of 1 block of 2 units staff house at at Padwong HCIII at Ushs 170,000,000 (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Construction of a drug store at Padwong HCIII at Ushs 60,000,000 (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> </ul>	
			<p>However, the construction of the Mid-wife block, toilet and water system at Padwong HCIII was not done due delayed procurement procedures and funds were not utilized.</p>	

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The verified certificates indicated that the MHOH, MC Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified the works on health projects before the MC made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Certificate no 2; dated 6th June 2023 for Ushs 45,010,857: Contract no. KGMC714/22-23/00002 Project; Construction of a drug store at Padwong HCIII by M/s Zeta Engineering Services Ltd was certified by MMOH, MC Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO on 6th June 2023 and payment effected on 28th June 2023.	
			Certificate no 1; dated 31st January 2023 for Ushs 23,249,500: Contract no. KGMC714/22-23/00001 Project; Construction of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Padwong HCIII Ltd by M/s Good Luck & Sons Multipurpose (U) was certified by MMOH, MC Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO on 31st January 2023 and payment effected on 21st February 2023.	
			Certificate no 2; dated 24th April 2023 for Ushs 11,882,836: Contract no. KGMC714/22-23/00002 Project; Construction of a drug store at Padwong HCIII by M/s Zeta Engineering Services Ltd was certified by MMOH, MC Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO 24th April 2023 and payment effected on 17th May 2023.	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The planned infrastructure projects under health in FY 2022/2023 and the variation in the contract price for these health infrastructure investments were not all within +/-20%. For example	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Construction of staff house at Pandwong HC III. The estimated cost = 170,000,000/- and actual cost = 162,975,911/-. Variation = -4.13%	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Drug store at Pandwong HC III. The estimated cost = 60,000,000/- and actual cost = 59,414,180/-. Variation = -0.98%</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rehabilitation of Midwife block at Pandwong HC III. The estimated cost = 29,000,000/- and actual cost = 14,999,759/-. Variation = -48.28%</li> </ul>	
			Rehabilitation of Midwife block at Pandwong HC III had a variation of -48.28% that was not within the +/-20% range as required.	

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	In the consolidated annual report on procurement & disposal contracts (amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	Pandwong HC III (the only health centre in the MC) had total of 16 health workers out of 100 approved positions in the approved staff structure (Ref. ARC 135/306/01), dated 16th July 2017 and signed by Mrs Catherine Bitarakwate, the PS Ministry of Public Service.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	Hence, $16 \times 100 = 84\%$ 19	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	In the consolidated annual report on procurement & disposal contracts (amended procurement plan) for FY 2022/2023 by Alikwan Ayub Kisubi the Town Clerk dated 12th July 2023, there was no planned HC II being upgraded to HC III.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that information on positions of health workers filled was accurate.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		The Assessor reviewed the staff list from the MMOH's office (dated 03rd July 2023) and checked the staff list and duty roster at the health facility (Pandwong HC III) dated 03rd June 2023, signed by the in-charge Winnie Acan (Senior Clinical Officer).	
			It was established that the staff list from the MMOH's office was consistent with records of staff at Padwong HC III. The HC had 16 health workers.	
			Note: The MC has only one Government health facility i.e Pandwong HC III.	

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From MMOH's office, it was noted that there was no health facility constructed or upgraded in the last FY 2022/2023. This information was collaborated with the Annual PBS report for FY 2022/2023 signed on 28 July 2023 by the Town Clark (Mr Alikwan Ayub Kisubi), and the information was confirmed as correct and accurate.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility (i.e Pandwong HC III) prepared and submitted Annual Work plan and Budget to the MMOH by 31st March 2023.</p> <p>The document was prepared by the in-charge (Acan Winne) on 28th March 2023, verified by the Chairperson HUMC (Olwoch Kulis Dickens) on 28th March 2023 and received on 29th March 2023 by the Principal Health Inspector.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Pandwong HC III prepared and submitted to the MMOH Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY.</p> <p>The report was prepared by the in-charge (Winnie Acan) on 15th July 2023, endorsed by the HUMC Chairperson on 15th July 2023 and received by the Principal Health Inspector (Rhina Kareo) on 15th July 2023. The report highlighted health facility's performance, reconciled cash flow statement, annual expenditure and budget report and an asset register.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

From the review of the performance improvement plan for FY 2023/2024 for Pandwong HC III (signed by the in-charge on 17th July 2023), it was established that the plan incorporated performance issues.

Some of the issues identified include ANC (4th Visit), PNC and new TB diagnosis. The plan highlighted the anticipated challenges, planned strategies and activities to mitigate the challenges.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was no 100% timely submission of up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports by Pandwong HC III In-Charge.

The Assessor reviewed all the monthly and quarterly HMIS reports (HMIS 105 and HMIS 106a respectively) for the FY 2022/2023 submitted by the in-charge (Winnie Acan, Senior Clinical Officer).

The submissions were as follows:

**HMIS 105:**

- July 2022: 05/08/2022
- August 2022: 06/09/2022
- September 2022: Not available
- October 2022: Not available
- November 2022: Not available
- December 2022: Not available
- January 2023: Not available
- February 2023: 06/03/2023
- March 2023: 11/04/2023
- April 2023: 05/05/2023
- May 2023: 07/06/2023
- June 2023: 05/07/2023

**HMIS 106a:**

- Quarter 1: report prepared on 12/10/2022 (no date of receipt)
- Quarter 2: report prepared on 09/01/2023 (no date of receipt)
- Quarter 3: report prepared on 14/04/2023 (no date of receipt)
- Quarter 4: report prepared on 08/07/2023 (no date of receipt)

**All the quarterly reports were prepared late.**

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

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was a letter from the Ministry of Health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 6e) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a letter from the Ministry of Health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all CAOs highlighting the termination of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.1.1, 6f) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable. To score 0 for all LGs. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC did not provide documentary evidence to show that they timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports to the Planner as required.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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 that the MC developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the lowest performing health facilities.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the MC implemented the Performance Improvement Plan for Pandwong HC III.</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>The MHO budgeted for health workers for the Pandwong HCIII and Municipal health workers wage of at Ugx 4,891,920 on page 30 of 44.</p> <p>This information was got from the annual comprehensive work plan for the FY 2022/2023 that was signed on the 28/ March/2023 by the office of commissioner planning and Town Clerk on the 27/March /2023.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---



7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The MHO presented a staff list which was prepared by the Principal Health Inspector on the 3/July /2023, showing that the MC has 20 health workers in total, two working at the Municipal officer (MO) and other 2 at the Municipal Division.</p> <p>Pandwong HCIII had 16 HWs out of the 19 required standards.</p> $= (16/19) \times 100$ $= 84.21\%$ <p>Pandwong HCIII had 84.21% staff required.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed.</p> <p>The Assessor reviewed the health workers' deployment list from the MMOH's office (3rd July 2023) and checked the duty roster, work attendance register and the staff list (dated 30th June 2023) at Pandwong HC III. There were 16 health workers deployed and working at the health facility.</p> <p>It was established that the health workers' deployment list was consistent with records of staff working at the health facility.</p>	3
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>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Assessor reviewed the health workers' deployment list from the MMOH's office (3rd July 2023) and checked the duty roster, work attendance register and the staff list (dated 30th June 2023) at Pandwong HC III. There were 16 health workers deployed and working at the health facility.</p> <p>It was established that the health workers' deployment list was consistent with records of staff working at the health facility.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had one Health facility Pandwong III with the in-charge Winnie Acan the Senior Clinical Officer who was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the DTC.</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. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC ensured that the Health facility in charge conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dorine Adong, the Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023.</li> <li>2. Christine Labahti the Nursing Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023</li> <li>3. Juliet Joyce Achola, the Health Information Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023</li> <li>4. Margaret Adong the Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 30th June 2023</li> <li>5. Josephine Acirocan the Nursing Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023.</li> </ol>	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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the corrective action they should have taken after the appraisals was taken</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the MC conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the MC documented training activities in a training/CPD database.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Whereas there was no cover letter to MOH, a list that included two health facilities (i.e Pandwong HC III and Diocese of Kitgum HC II (PNFP)), signed by the Principal Health Inspector and Town Clerk on 29th August 2023, was available. The list was received at the Registry, MOH on 13th September 2023. The remarks on the list showed that "the names of the health facilities were correct as indicated".</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The documentary evidence indicated that the MC allocated 15% towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services which was in line with the health sector grant as per the guidelines as per the computations below;</p> <p>The MMOH budget as per the Approved budget page 24 was Ushs 12,077,000 and the allocation was Ushs 1,867,500 which was 15%.</p> $1,867,500/12,077,000 \times 100 = 15\%$ <p>Hence being compliant.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made timely submission of warrants to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget the 4 quarters. as per the dates from the IFMS;</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrants direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 11th August 2022 the same day MoFPED approved the warrants.</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 31st October 2022 after 10 working days MoFPED approved the warrants on 14th October 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 23rd January 2023 after 2 working days MoFPED approved the warrants on 19th January 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities were submitted on 4th May 2023 the same day MoFPED approved the warrants.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC did not invoice and communicate all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to schools as per the verified transfer vouchers below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 was invoiced and communicated on 9th September 2022 which was 13 working days after the release of funds from MoFPED on 22nd August 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 was invoiced and communicated on 21st October 2022 which was 4 days after the release of funds from MoFPED on 17th October 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 was invoiced and communicated on 20th February 2023 which was 20 days after release of funds from MoFPED on 25th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 was invoiced and communicated on 17th May 2023 which was 10 days after release of funds from MoFPED on 28th April 2023.</p> <p>The invoicing and communication for quarter 1, 3 and 4 were delayed hence not being compliant.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was Evidence that the MC publicized on the notice boards all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED as below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 was publicized on 23rd August 2022 which was 22 days after the release of expenditure limits from MoFPED on 23rd September 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 was displayed on 17th October 2022 the same day the expenditure limits from MoFPED.</p> <p>From the above quarter 1 was publicized late hence not being compliant.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the MC health department implemented action (s) recommended by the MHT Quarterly performance review meeting(s).</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>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Review of the quarterly performance review meeting attendance lists indicated that in charges of Pandwong HC III and Kitgum Diocese HC II and other key stakeholders like Mayor, Senior Planner, PCDO, Hon. Counsellors implementing Partners e.g Bright Lite, Gud Kuo Community Based Organisation, NUYEN, CEHURD among others.</p> <p>The meetings were held as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting: held on 20th October 2022 (minutes approved by Principal Health Inspector).</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting: held on 30th January 2023 (minutes approved by Principal Health Inspector).</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting: held on 3rd May 2023 (minutes approved by Principal Health Inspector).</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting: held on 25th July 2023 (minutes approved by Principal Health Inspector).</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 PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable. The MC had no HC IV.</p> <p>However, the MC had Pandwong HC III, which was supervised 100% in the previous FY as follows.</p> <p>Quarter 1: supervision conducted on 09th September 2022. Report dated 14th September 2022 was compiled by Kareo Rhina (Principal District Health Inspector)</p> <p>Quarter 2: supervision conducted on 16th December 2022. Report dated 19th December 2022 was compiled by Kareo Rhina (Principal District Health Inspector)</p> <p>Quarter 3: supervision conducted on 07th March 2023. Report dated 10th March 2023 was compiled by Kareo Rhina (Principal District Health Inspector)</p> <p>Quarter 4: supervision conducted on 20th June 2023. Report dated 22nd June 2023 was compiled by Kareo Rhina (Principal District Health Inspector)</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>This indicator is not applicable. The MC had no HSD. The MC had only one health facility (Pandwong HC III) under its jurisdiction.</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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the MC used results/ reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the MC provided support to Pandwong HC III and Kitgum Diocese HC II (PNFP) in the management of medicines and health supplies during the previous FY.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The documentary evidence indicated that the MC allocated 30% towards promotion and prevention activities which was in line with the health sector grant as per the guidelines as per the computations below;</p> <p>The MMOH's budget as per the Approved budget page 22 was Ushs 12,077,000 and the allocation was Ushs 3,600,000 which was 30%.</p> $3,600,000/12,077,000 \times 100 = 30\%$	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.</p> <p>The evidence was established in the activity report, dated 25th September 2022 by the Principal Health Inspector (Rhina Kareo).</p> <p>The report was on health education awareness for teachers on Mass Drug Administration and School Sanitation. The awareness meeting was conducted at Pager Division headquarters and was attended by 46 teachers and 04 Village Health Team (VHT) parish supervisors.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of follow up actions taken by the MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an asset register for Pandwong HC III (the only health facility in the MC) for FY 2022/2023, prepared by the in-charge (Acan Winnie) and received by the Principal Health Inspector on 15th July 2023. The register indicated the equipment quantity available, condition and remarks</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 evidence that the Health Investments projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 were prioritized and derived from the Local Government Development Plan III as per the details below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 1 block of 2 units of staff houses at Pandwong HCIII at Ushs 170,000,000 with funding from SECTOR DEVELOPMENT GRANT was from the DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Construction of a drug store at Pandwong Health Center III at Ushs 60,000,000 with funding from SECTOR DEVELOPMENT GRANT was from the DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of Midwife block with toilet and water system at Pandwong HCIII at Ushs 34,224,000 with funding from SECTOR DEVELOPMENT GRANT was from the DDPIII page 117)</li> </ul>	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>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC conducted field appraisals for the projects implemented in the FY 2022/2023 for environmental and social acceptability by the hosting communities and mitigation measures put in place. The appraised projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 1 block of 2 units of staff houses at Pandwong HCIII (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Construction of a drug store at Pandwong Health Center III (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of Midwife block with toilet and water system at Pandwong HCIII (Approved budget page 24; AWP page 4; DDPIII page 117)</li> </ul> <p>The report recommended for the implementation of the projects since the funding was available</p>	<b>1</b>
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility investments were screened for the current FY 2023/2024. There was only one project planned for.</p> <p>Environment, Social and Climate Screening Form for the Completion of a store at Pandwong Health Center III, signed on by the Senior Environment Officer and the Municipal CDO.</p> <p>Report on Environmental, Social and Health Safeguard Screening conducted in Pandwong HC III for the Construction of the store, dated 8th August 2023. The report had a screening team of 3 members; Principal Health Inspector - Karco Rina, Senior Environment Officer - Judith Ayot and CDO - Okumu Eric Charles.</p> <p>The costed ESMP was attached with a total cost of UGX 400,000 for monitoring, planting grass, hoarding site, sensitization on HIV/AIDs etc.</p>	<b>1</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	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	For FY 2023/2024, the health department submitted its procurement plans to PDU on the 28th April 2023.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	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	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the Municipal Health Department submitted the procurement request forms for FY 2023/2024 citing that the user head of department had not yet submitted the procurement request forms to PDU.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	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	There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for FY 2022/2023 were approved by the contracts committee. For example; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of Staff House at Padwong HC III, the Contracts Committee approval meeting was on 4th November 2022 under minute no. KGMC/02/LGCC/01/22-23/26and the contract was signed with M/S GoodLuck &amp; Sons (U) Ltd at a contract price of UGX 162,975,911.</li> <li>• For Construction of drug stores at Padwong HC III the Contract Committee approval meeting was on 20th February 2023 under minute KGMC/03/LGCC/03/22-23/04 and the contract was signed with M/S Zeta Engineering Services Ltd at a contract price of UGX 68,838,132.</li> </ul>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0  If there is no project, provide the score	The following was presented as evidence for establishment of project implementation teams; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter by Alikwan Atub Kisubi dated 20th March 2023 to Abonga Alfred Alexis the Supretendant of Works/Civil Engineer appointing him as the contract supervisor for construction of Drug Store at Pandwong Health Centre III</li> </ul> <p>However, there was no appointment for other members of the project implementation teams.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	There were no planned Health facility upgrades in the PDP for FY 2022/2023	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment to show that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that were weekly consolidated to the Municipal Engineer in copy to the MHO	<b>0</b>
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0	There were no planned Health facility upgrades in the PDP for FY 2022/2023.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

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

For instance;

- Minutes for site hand over for the Construction of staff house at Pandwong HC III and Construction of drug Stores at Pandwong Health Centre III, for FY 2022/2023 dated 14th December 2022 were presented.

The in charge in his communication was happy to receive the development and reported that they staff level had gone to 84%. The chairperson HUMC Pandwong HC III also informed members that they were happy to receive the development. Members present in the meeting based on the attendance list provided included; Olwoch Dicken (Chairperson of HUMC), Acan Winnie (in charge), Ayot Judith (Senior Environment Officer), Omona Charles (Municipal Engineer), Okumu Eric Charles (CDO), Kareo rhina (the project manager and representative of the town Clerk).

- Also minutes of site meeting dated 25th January 2023 where the TC, in-charge, CDO, Environment Officer, Municipal Engineer (Omona Charles), were presented. Minute 03/01/01/2022/2023 was about site inspection but it was mentioned that there was not so much to inspect because works were still on floor level.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The sampled payment vouchers indicated that the MMOH did not verify and initiate payments for contractors within the specified time frame (within 2 weeks or 10 working days after receiving payment requests) as indicated below;

Voucher Payment Vouchers 6441464 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 40,667,220:

Contract no.

KGMC714/WRKS/2022/2023/00002; Project; Construction of a Drug store at Pandwong HCIII by M/s Zeta Engineering Services Ltd. Invoice was raised on 18th April 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by MMOH on 24th April 2023 6 days after of receipt of payment request and payment done on 28th June 2023.

Voucher 3801401 dated 17th May 2023 for Ushs 21,854,530: Contract no.

KGMC714/WRKS/2022/2023/00001; Project; Construction of a 1 block staff house at Pandwong HCIII by M/s Good Luck & Sons Multipurpose (U) Ltd. Invoice was raised on 16th January 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by MMOH on 31st January 2023 which was more than 10 days after receipt of payment request and payment done on 21st February 2023.

Voucher 5061891 dated 28th April 2023 for Ushs 59,393,068: Contract No.

KGMC714/WRKS/2022/2023/00001; Project; Construction of a 1 block staff house at Pandwong HCIII by M/s Good Luck & Sons Multipurpose (U) Ltd. Invoice was raised on 12th April 2023 and payment process was verified and initiated by MMOH on 19th April 2023 which was more than 7 days after receipt of payment request and payment done on 28th April 2023.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement file for each health infrastructure contract was complete with all records required by the PPDA. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For construction of Staff House at Pandwong Health Centre III, procurement reference number: KGMC714/WRKS/22-23/00001, the file had an evaluation report dated 31st October 2022 recommending award to Good Luck &amp; Sons Multipurpose (U) Ltd. The Contracts Committee approved the Evaluation Report on 4th November 2022 under minute KGMC/02/LGCC/01/22-23/26. The contract between the parties at a contract price of UGX 162,975,911 was signed on 30th November 2022.</li> <li>• For construction of drug Stores at Pandwong Health Centre III, procurement reference number: KGMC714/WRKS/22-23/00002, the file had an Evaluation Report dated 17th February 2023 recommending award to Zeta Engineering Services Ltd. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report on 20th February 2023 under minute KGMC/03/LGCC/03/22-23/04. The contract between the parties was signed on 20th March 2023 at a contract price of UGX 68,838,132.</li> </ul>	1
----	--	---	---	---

**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 was no grievance raised/reported, investigated and responded to, therefore no recording of grievance under the health sector was done in the Log book.</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>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 that the guideline on waste management was disseminated.</p> <p>There was a Distribution list for health guidelines and commodities dated 26th August 2022. The In-Charge Pandwong HC III and Diocese of Kitgum HC II received the copies of the guidelines including attending the training held on 21st February 2023.</p>	2

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	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>There was evidence that Kitgum MC had in place a functional system for Medical waste management.</p> <p>Pandwong Health Centre III had Placenta pit, Incinerator which was functional. The ash removed from the incinerator was dumped into another pit called ash pit. There were bins for rubbish including rubbish pits normally used for burning rubbish.</p> <p>Pandwong had an Annual Comprehensive Work plan FY 2023/2024 prepared by the In-charge Health Facility - Acan Winnie and signed by the Chairperson HUMC, received by MHO. It had budgeted for water and mowing of the facility at UGX 800,000, Digging round the fence UGX 600,000. And also under IPC for waste management like fuel for burning medical waste.</p> <p>There was no service provider put in place for waste management for the MC but the service provider at the district level managed their waste "Green Label" the medical waste (expired drugs and rusted instruments mainly) at the health centre III was transported to the main hospital for management.</p>	<b>2</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	Training of Facility Staff on Health Care Waste Management dated 21st February 2023. The training objective was to create awareness among the facility staff on health care waste management in order to reduce infections. This was attended by 6 health workers. The report was prepared and signed by Principal Health Inspector.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 5 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	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	Contract/Reference no. Kgmc 714/Wrks/22-23/00001, Construction of one block of staff house in Pandwong HC III, had ESMP costs included in the document. For instance, element H-provision of Personal protective gear, I-tree planting, J-revegetation of the area, K-water for works, L-sensitization on HIV/AIDs, M-provision of site security and N-sign boards. The total cost was UGX 1,510,000.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Contract/Reference no. Kgmc 714/Wrks/22-23/00002, Construction of a Drug store at Pandwong HC III, had ESMP costs included in the Engineer's costing. For instance, safety, Health and welfare of workers, water for works, sign boards. The total cost was UGX 5,850,000.	
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	Certificate of title, Freehold Register, Volume GUL34 Folio 12. Plot 7, Phillipa Lane at Pandwang. Kitgum Municipal Council of P.O Box 139, Kitgum, dated 4th September 2020. Instrument no. Gul-00001984. Signed by Registrar of titles. (Title for Pandwong Health Centre III).  The Land title covered two projects implemented in Pandwong Health Centre III (construction of a store and staff house).	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	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.	Environment, Social and Health Safeguards Compliance Monitoring Report dated 26th May 2023 for the Construction of staff house at Pandwong Health Centre III.  Environment, Social and Health Safeguards Compliance Monitoring Report dated 28th March 2023 for the Construction of staff house at Pandwong Health Centre III.  The activity was conducted by the CDO and the Environment Officer. The report was signed by both the CDO and the Environment Officer. The monitoring was conducted to ascertain the compliance with the mitigation measures.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			



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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Certificate of works no.2 dated 6th June 2023 for the Construction of one block of staff house in Padwong HCIII, worth UGX 58,084,053. Certificate was signed by the Principal Executive Engineer, Principal Health Inspector, Senior Community Development Officer and Environment officer.

Payment was made on 28th June 2023, PV no. 6438757. Certificate was issued before payment.

Certificate of works no.2 dated 6th June 2023 for the Construction of Drug store at Padwong HCIII, worth UGX 40,278,200. Certificate was signed by the Municipal Engineer, Principal Health Inspector, Internal Audit, Senior Community Development Officer and Environment officer.

Payment was made on 28th June 2023, PV no. 6441464. Certificate was issued before payment.

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	<b>0</b>

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"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</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 &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Kitgum Water sector was being managed by the National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore not eligible for the LGPA</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0

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



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.</p>	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts  o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 2, If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:  Score 3, If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0
----	--	---	---	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	This is not applicable as water in Kitgum municipality is managed by national water. Therefore, they do not receive the grant.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	0

15

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

Kitgum  
Municipal  
Council Water  
Sector was  
being  
managed by  
National  
Water &  
Sewerage  
Corporation  
and therefore  
ineligible for  
LGPA.

**0**

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.</p>	0

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

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

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

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

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
---	--	--	--	---

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

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0



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

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	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	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0

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

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0

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

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

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

### **Environment and Social Safeguards**

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

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

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for MSI projects implementation.	0
----	--	--	--	---



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

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Charles Darwin Opoka as the Principal Treasurer vide letter dated 17th August 2016 under DSC minute No: 4/2/2016 Ref. KMC/152/2	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Dennis Lokoya as the Senior Planner vide letter dated 9th April 2019 under DSC minute No: 1/2019(19) Ref. KMC/156/4	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Charles Omona as the Municipal Engineer vide letter dated 18th February 2021 under DSC minute: No. 4/2021(iv) Ref. KMC/156/1	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Judith Ayot as the Senior Environment Officer vide letter dated 9th April 2019 under DSC minute: No. 1/2019 (21) . Ref. KTC/156/4	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Senior Veterinary Officer was neither substantively filled nor was a staff secondment from MoPS at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Michael Kilama as the Principal CDO vide letter dated 9th April 2019 under DSC minute No: 1/2019(15) Ref. KMC/156/4	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Principal Commercial Officer was neither substantively filled nor was a staff secondment from MoPS at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The MC substantively appointed Denis Patrick Pacoto as the Senior Procurement Officer vide letter dated 1st August 2022 under DSC minute: 4/2022(ii)(a)(3) Ref. KMC/152/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Benson Ocan as the Procurement Officer vide letter dated 28th May 2018 under DSC minute No: 2/2018(3) Ref. KMC/152/2	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The MC substantively appointed Patrick Ocitti Ochan as the Principal Human Resources Officer vide letter dated 9th April 2019 under DSCminute No: 1/2019(13). Ref. KMC/156/4	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Environment Officer was neither substantively filled nor was a staff secondment from MoPS at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Physical Planner was neither substantively filled nor was a staff secondment from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Accountant was neither substantively filled nor was a staff secondment from MoFPED at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC substantively appointed Daniel Onek as the Senior Internal Auditor vide letter dated 18th August 2011 under DSC minute No: DSC/KTG/3/6/2011(a) (xi)Ref. KTC/156/2.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not on structure as they use the same as the district</p>	0

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The MC had three Divisions (LLGs) with Senior Assistant Town Clerks substantively appointed as below;</p> <p>1. Irene Akumu was substantively appointed vide letter dated 28th May, 2018 under DSC Minute No. 2/2018(2). He was deployed to Pager Division. Ref. KMC/152/2</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC had three Divisions (LLGs) and all had substantively appointed CDOs as follows:</p> <p>1. Barbra Alice Aciro was substantively appointed vide letter dated 1st August 2022 signed by the Town Clerk under DSC Minute No. 05/DSC/KTD/086/2020. She was deployed to Pager Division. Ref. KMC/152/1</p> <p>2. Patricia Mary Amony was substantively appointed vide letter dated 1st August 2022 under DSC Minute No. 4//2022(ii)(a)(13). She was deployed to Pandwong Division. Ref. KMC/152/1</p> <p>3. Andrew Dave Okot was substantively appointed vide letter dated 9th April 2019 DSC Minute No. 01/2019/(14). He was deployed to Central Division. Ref. CR/KTD/M/159/1</p>	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC had three divisions (LLGs) but had appointed Treasurers substantively as indicated below;</p> <p>1. Denish Okello Onencann was substantively appointed vide letter dated 5th August 2019 under DSC Minute No. 2/2019(12)(2). He was deployed to Central Division. Ref. KMC/156/4</p> <p>2. Jimmy Otto Odongkara was substantively appointed vide letter dated 6th February 2019 under DSC Minute No. 5/23/12/2016(B)(a). He was deployed to Pandwong Division. Ref. KMC/160/2</p> <p>3. Irene Lamunu was substantively appointed vide letter dated 5th August 2019 under DSC Minute No. 2/2019(12) (1). She was deployed to Pager Division. Ref. KMC/156/4.</p>	5

**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 MC released 50% for Natural Resources as per the computation below; The budgeted amount was Ushs 250,142,949 amount released was Ushs 124,781,873 (Final A/cs FY 2022/23-page 14), thus leaving a balance of the planned amount of Ushs 125,361,076. Therefore, the % released was; $(124,781,873 / 250,142,949) \times 100 = 50\%$ The MC did not release all the funds as planned hence being compliant.	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0		
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 MC released 47% for Community Based Services as per the computation below;	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.	The budgeted amount was Ushs 99,511,420 amount released was Ushs 52,288,556 (Final A/cs FY 2022/23-page 14) leaving a balance of Ushs 47,222,864. Therefore, the % released was;  $(52,288,556 / 99,511,420) \times 100 = 47\%$	

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,

score 4 or else 0

There was evidence that Kitgum MC had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for the projects under USMID/DDEG.

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Screening Form for the construction of Office block at Administration of Central Division. The form was signed on 8th September 2022 by Judith Ayot the Municipal Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the Municipal CDO.

Report on Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening conducted at Central Division Administration on 8th September 2022. The screening team included the Senior Environment Officer and CDO, all the Officers signed on the report.

Project commenced on 23rd April 2023.

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Screening Form for the Renovation of Municipal Council Hall. The form was signed on 8th September 2022 by Judith Ayot the Municipal Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the Municipal CDO.

Report on Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening conducted at Municipal Council Hall on 30th September 2022. The screening team included the Senior Environment Officer and CDO, all the Officers signed on the report.

.Project commenced on 14th April 2023.

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

Final Environment and Social Impact Assessment Report for 12No. Kitgum Roads (2.78km). Consultancy services for engineering designs, preparation of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Plans, Resettlement Action Plans and Tender Assistance for Urban Infrastructure Investments in Program Municipalities. Cluster 1: Kitgum. This was received by Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development on 18th December 2020.

The implementation started in 2023 with the designing of the road works. Volume 1: Detailed Engineering Design Report, March 2023. This was signed by the Consultants. This still the first phase of the project.

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

score 4 or 0

There was evidence that Kitgum MC had a costed ESMP for all projects implemented using the USMID/DDEG grant.

1. The Environment and Social Management Plan for the Construction of Office Block at Central Division and signed on 19th September 2022. The ESMP had a total cost of UGX 1,800,000 for the provision of the hand washing facilities, clear all debris etc. (DDEG Project)

2. The Environment and Social Management Plan for the Renovation of Municipal Council Hall and signed on 8th September 2022. The ESMP had a total cost of UGX 1,000,000 for the sensitization of the stakeholders, clear site off construction waste etc. (USMID Project).

## Financial management and reporting

5

Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

The MLG obtained Unqualified audit opinion on its works for the FY 2022/2023.

10

6

Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).

maximum score is 10

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),

score 10 or else 0.

The evidence provided indicated that the MC provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY as the submission letter Ref KMC/202/1 dated 15h June 2023 was received by MoFPED on 7th July 2023.

The submission date was far beyond the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).

0



7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC submitted the annual performance contract on 7th July 2023 which was before August 31st of the current FY. Hence being compliant.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on 20th July 2023, which was before the mandatory time frame 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 MC submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below.</p> <p>Quarter 1: the QBPR was submitted on 19th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2: the QBPR was submitted on 2nd March 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3: the QBPR was submitted on 16th May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4; the QBPR was submitted on 20th July 2023</p> <p>From the above submission dates the MC submitted the 4th QBPR before the mandatory date of August 31 of the current Financial Year. Hence being compliant.</p>	4

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Harriet Atim as the PEO vide letter dated 6th February 2017 under DSC minute No: 5/21/10/2016/B/a KMC/160/2	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Mary Susan Lalweny as the Senior Inspector of Schools vide letter dated 25th February 2022 under DSC minute No: 3/2/2022(ii)(3)(d) KMC/160/1	40
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			The LG substantively appointed Isaac Ocan as the Inspector of Schools vide letter dated 15th February 2023 under DSC minute No: 3/2/DSC/2023(1)(a) KMC/152/1	
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	<p data-bbox="914 1176 1398 1355">There was evidence that the MC carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for Education Projects. There were two projects implemented under Education:</p> <p data-bbox="914 1384 1414 1653">1. Environmental, Social and Climate Screening Form for the Completion of one block of four classrooms at Kitgum Boys primary school in Kitgum Municipality. The form was signed on 8th September 2022 by Judith Ayot the Municipal Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the Municipal CDO.</p> <p data-bbox="914 1682 1414 1921">Report on Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening conducted at Kitgum Boys primary school on 8th September 2022. The screening team included the Senior Environment Officer, CDO and Principle Education Officer, all the Officers signed on the report.</p> <p data-bbox="914 1951 1414 2159">The Environment and Social Management Plan for the Construction of one block of four classrooms at Kitgum Boys primary school signed on 12th September 2022. The ESMP had a total cost of UGX 1,000,000 for removing the debris after</p>	15
The Maximum score is 30				

construction and re-planting grass etc.

.Project commenced on 10th April 2023.

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Screening Form for the Construction of one block of four classrooms in Ojuma primary school in Pandwong Division. The form was signed on 8th September 2022 by Judith Ayot the Municipal Environment Officer and Okumu Eric Charles the Municipal CDO.

Report on Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening conducted at Ojuma primary school in Pandwong Division on 8th September 2022. The screening team included the Senior Environment Officer, CDO and Principle Education Officer, all signed on the report

The Environment and Social Management Plan for the Construction of one block of four Classrooms in Ojuma primary school signed on 12th September 2022. The ESMP had a total cost of UGX 1,650,000 for removing the debris after construction and re-planting grass etc.

.Project commenced on 10th January 2023.

2

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

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

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

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

The Maximum score is 30

15

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.		

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The MC had neither substantively recruited nor was there a seconded Medical Officer of Health Services at the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The MC substantively appointed Rhina Kareo as the Principal Health Inspector vide letter dated 25th February 2022 under DSC minute No: 3/2/2022(ii)(3)(a) Ref. KMC/160/1	<b>20</b>
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	The MC had nether substantively recruited nor was there a seconded Health Educator at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that the MC carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for all the Health sector projects. Only two projects were implemented as indicated below:

1. Environment, Social and Climate Screening Form dated 7th September 2022 for the construction of staff house at Pandwong Health Center III, signed by the Senior Environment Officer and the Municipal CDO.

Report on Environmental, Social and Health Safeguard Screening conducted in Pandwong HC III for the construction of the staff house, dated 7th September 2022. The report had a screening team of 3 members; Principal Health Inspector – Karco Rina, Senior Environment Officer – Judith Ayot and CDO – Okumu Eric Charles.

The costed ESMP was attached with a total cost of UGX 1,800,000 for re-planting grass, sensitization on HIV/AIDs etc.

Project commenced on 1st December 2022.

2. Environment, Social and Climate Screening Form for the Completion of a store at Pandwong Health Center III, signed by the Senior Environment Officer and the Municipal CDO.

Report on Environmental, Social and Health Safeguard Screening conducted in Pandwong HC III for the construction of the store, dated 8th August 2022. The report had a screening team of 3 members; Principal Health Inspector – Karco Rina, Senior Environment Officer – Judith Ayot and CDO – Okumu Eric Charles.

The costed ESMP was attached with a total cost of UGX 400,000 for monitoring, hoarding site, sensitization on HIV/AIDs etc.

Project commenced on 22nd March 2023.

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

Maximum score is 30

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

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

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions**

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



**Water & Environment Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has 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.	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.	<b>0</b>

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

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

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.

Kitgum Municipal Council Water Sector was being managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and therefore ineligible for LGPA.