



LGMSD 2022/23

Kotido Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 797)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	62%
Education Minimum Conditions	30%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	75%
Educational Performance Measures	74%
Health Performance Measures	68%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The evidence provided indicated the Municipality implemented projects using DDEG funding and all were completed and fully utilised.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 at Ugx 40,000,000, page 8 Approved Budget and ABPR page 91. Construction of a Water bond toilet at Ushs 35,000,000.(Approved Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 39). 	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment decreased from 72% in the previous assessment to 55% in the current assessment.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 was all completed as per the quarter four Annual Budget Performance Report (ABPRS).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 at Ugx 40,000,000 ,page 8 Approved Budget and ABPR page 91 . Construction of a Water bond toilet at Ushs 35,000,000.(Approved Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 39) 	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence that the MC budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementation guideline. 1. Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 at Ugx 40,000,000 ,page 8 Approved Budget and ABPR page 91 . 2. Construction of a Water bond toilet at Ushs 35,000,000.(Approved Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 39).	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The project was within +2.52% and therefore complied. The project was construction of a water borne toilet at the Bus Park of Kotido Municipal council. Procurement Ref: KMU716/wrks/2022-2023/200004 ii Project: Estimated cost: Ugx 35,000,000/= Contract cost: Ugx 34,118,700/= Variation cost: Ugx 8881,300/= %age variation (881,300/35,000,000) x 100%= 2.52%	2
---	--	--	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	According to the staff list obtained from the HRO, and Divisions had positions filled as per the minimum required standards. At North Division 1. Assistant TC, Treasurer, Principal Town Agent, CDO and an Extension Worker. At Central Division 1. Assistant Town Clerk, CDO, Principal Town Agent, Treasure and Extension Worker. At West Division 1. SATC, Treasurer, CDO Information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate	2
---	--	--	--	---

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>A completion report dated 30th June 2023 indicated that all DDEG projects implemented in the previous FY were all completed and the report was acknowledged by the Senior Planner Lokwang Aaron.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 at Ugx 40,000,000. 2. Construction of a Water bond toilet at Ushs 35,000,000. 	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>	<p>The LLGs scores obtained from the internal Municipal internal assessment and from the LLG IVA was;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">DLG IVA</p> <p>Central Div 60 77</p> <p>Northern Div 48 72</p> <p>Southern Div 50 70</p> <p>Western Div 60 71</p> <p>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.</p>	0
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the MC had performance improvement plan for at least 30% of the lowest performing division. The activity was conducted on 31st September 2023 and all the Division which include Kotido North, South, Central and West divisions were involved. The report was acknowledged by the Town Clerk Mr Okaja Emmanuel and the team leader of the assessment (Senior Planner)</p>	2

5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Municipal implemented the PIP for all the divisions in the municipal council. Division which were mentored included Kotido North, South, Central and West divisions.</p> <p>Some of general challenges raised were insecurity, inadequate transport facilities in the district delayed work, poor documentation in some division.</p> <p>General recommendations were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to prioritize this activity and ensure adequate transport facilities are provided to the teams. - LLG lead persons (SAS/TCs) need to be prepared early to ease interface with the assessors. <p>The report was signed and acknowledged by the Town clerk.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS on September 29th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED dated 28th September 2023 and signed by Okaja Emmanuel, Town Clerk under ref CR/KTD/M/156/5.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the monthly attendance reports, there was evidence that the Municipality had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): The reports for October 2022, November 2022, March 2023, June, 2023 were sampled for analysis. For instance in the month of June 2023 the best performer was Okidi Gasper, Senior Engineer had 100% attendance while the worst performer was Lokawa Mauro Innocent the Physical planner who was present only four days in the month.</p>	2

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had conducted appraisals for HODs as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Auma Glori Achilla Ag. Principal Education Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 2. Lokwang Aaron, Planner was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 3. Okidi Gasper Ag. Municipal Engineer was appraised on 1st July 2023 by Okaja Emmanuel Town Clerk 4. Awuar Callisto Ag. Principal Health Inspector was appraised on 2nd July 2023 by Okaja Emmanuel Town Clerk 5. Lokawa Mauro Ag. Senior Environment Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 6. Akengo Florence- Principal Treasurer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 7. Kotol Emmanuel- Ag. Senior Veterinary Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 8. Lemukol Lilly- Principal CDO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher Deputy Town Clerk 	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: For instance on 16th November 2023 the committee sanctioned two Education Assistants at Mary Mother of God Primary School; Oronyo Patrick and Ochin Patrick Omara by issuing warning letters for abscondment and drinking.</p>	1

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional. For instance the committee sat on 15th June 2023 and handled grievances relating to underpayment and residual salary arrear claims from the following secondary school teachers; Sande William, Olupot Samuel, Olinga Rasma, and Oryonyo John Bosco. The Senior Human Resource Officer was tasked to guide the staff on the procedures to ensure speedy processing of the arrears.</p> <p>The committee was set up by the Town Clerk, Lokope Stephen on 30th June 2021 and comprised of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lotuk Christopher- Deputy Town Clerk, Chairperson 2. Okidi Gasper- Senior Engineer, Member 3. Auma Gloria Achilla- Environment Officer, Member 4. Lemukol Lily- Principal CDO, Member 5. Ngorok Emmanuel Noding- Senior HRO, Minute Secretary 	1
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The MC did not recruit any staff in the Previous FY.</p>	1
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>Two staff retired during the previous FY;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apule Margret Locheng- Nursing Officer- retired on 27th October 2022 and accessed the pension payroll in May 2023 2. Oryonyo John Bosco -retired on 22nd December 2022 and accessed the pension payroll in May 2023 	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed following the requirements of the budget in the previous FY as per the releases below;	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>1. North Division received Ushs 18,292,639.</p> <p>2. South Division received Ushs 26,256,207.</p> <p>3. Central Division received Ushs 18,130,089.</p> <p>4. West Division received Ushs 20,812,148.</p> <p>The transfer of funds were sent in two quarters as follows;</p> <p>In quarter 1: MC did not receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 3: Release was on 5th January 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4: MC did not receive DDEG</p>	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	<p>The evidence indicate that the MC did not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: MC did not receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2: Release was 3rd October 2022, warranted on 17th October 2022, warrant was 14 days.</p> <p>In quarter 3: Release was on 2nd January 2023, warranted on 13th January 2023 which was not within the time limit.</p> <p>In quarter 4: MC did not receive DDEG.</p>	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 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 provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done however it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 1 MC did not receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 31st October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>In quarter 4: Did not receive DDEG.</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>The MC provided evidence of quarterly reports for supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the Municipal FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Q 1 report was dated 30th June 2022 and some of the objectives were to ascertain conformity with performance management guidelines, to ascertain compliance with procurement guidelines. The team visited the division included the Town clerk, Deputy Clerk, Head of Finance, Senior Planner and others.</p> <p>Q 2 report dated on 5th January 2023 and the objectives of the monitoring report was to establish compliance reporting by LLGs, to ascertain conformity with project appraisals.</p> <p>Q 3 monitoring report dated 31st March 2023 was conducted and the main objective was to ascertain the level of project execution in divisions.</p> <p>Q 4 monitoring report was conducted on 20th June 2023 to ascertain the level of compliance of divisions on quarterly reporting and all the divisions were visited.</p>	2

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC availed TPC minutes which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed by the TPC to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the chairperson Lotuk Christopher were as below;</p> <p>Q 1 report was discussed on 17th October 2023- Min 8/KMC/TPC/17/10/22/22-23: Discussion of second monitoring and supervision report.</p> <p>Q 2 report was discussed on 28th February 2022- Min 9/KMC/TPC/28/02/23/22-23: Discussion of first monitoring and supervision report.</p> <p>Q 3 report was discussed on 8th May 2023- Min 8/KMC/TPC/08/05/23/22-23: Discussion of three monitoring and supervision report.</p> <p>Q 4 report was discussed on 8th June 2023- Min 8/KMC/TPC/08/06/23/22-23: Discussion of four monitoring and supervision report.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal had an IFMIS based electronic assets register, formatted as required by the LG Accounting Manual. A printed copy was also availed for this assessment.</p> <p>A number of assets sampled during this assessment including land and buildings, computers, furniture and motor vehicles were found in the register.</p> <p>The Municipal had an asset register which is updated and its details and content satisfy this requirement. The items were categorized into Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment, Machinery, Buildings specialized, among others.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 in place a copy of which was submitted to the Accountant General on 23th, August, 2022 with reference CR/KTD/M/108/1. The report was acknowledged by the Accountant General on 31th August, 2022. The Board made several recommendations some of which were being acted on and others cleared at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Examples of recommendations raised by the Board included disposal of district old assets, engraving the district assets, disposal of old computers, key board printer, old furniture etc.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the physical planning committee was in place and submitted all quarterly minutes to the Ministry. This was evidence with the sampled appointment letter dated on 3rd January 2019 acknowledge by the Town Clerk Mr ukobi Seleverio Byarufu. Physical planning minutes were submitted to Ministry as per the dates below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter one minutes dated 18th August 2022 and were submitted to the Ministry on 30th August 2022. 2. Quarter two minutes dated 9th December 2022 and were submitted to the Ministry on 14th December 2022. 3. Quarter three minutes dated 16th February 2023 and were submitted to the Ministry on 28th February 2023. 4. Quarter four minutes dated 12th June 2023 and were submitted to the Ministry on 20th June 2023. 	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. For the DDEG/USMID project was desk appraised on 3rd February 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the MCDP page 146 , AWP and availability of funds in the Approved budget</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 at Ugx 40,000,000 and the projects was recommended for funding and implementation. 2. Construction of a Water bond toilet at Ushs 35,000,000 and the projects was recommended for funding and implementation. 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility,</p> <p>(ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects</p> <p>The project field appraisal was conducted on 3rd February 2022 for the DDEG/USMID projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of North Division Offices phase 2 2. Construction of a Water bond toilet at Bus Park <p>The project was appraised by the Senior Planner, PCDO, Environment officer, and other technical team. The project was recommended for funding to improve the service delivery at the district Headquarters.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>While project profiles to be implemented in the current FY were discussed by TPC in a meeting held on 18th November 2022 at the Municipal board room under MIN no 3 KMC/TPC/18/11/22/23, there were no DDEG projects discussed because there were none planned for FY 2023/2024.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Screening for environmental and social risks/impact was done however, monitoring using checklists was not carried out. Below were the projects that were screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a patients' kitchen at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 2. Construction of a Drugstore at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 3. Construction of a 2 stance latrine for OPD at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 	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>There was evidence to show that no planned infrastructure projects for the current FY, to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan that was signed on 8th September, 2023 by, TC, Okaja Emmanuel.</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>There were no projects to be implemented in the current FY, using DDEG that were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction since none had been planned for in approved procurement plan.</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>There was evidence that the LG did not properly established the Project Implementation team (PIT) as specified in the sector guidelines in a letter dated 18th May, 2023 signed by TC were the following persons were named on the PIT;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cwinyyai Felix as project supervisor • Awuar Callisto as Contract manager. <p>The letter left out the other PIT members such as the Clerk of works, Environment officer, CDO and the labour officer.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG, followed the standard technical design provided by the LG Engineer, as was established at the busk part water borne toilet at Kotido municipality, where the external dimension of the structure were 4.6 x 9.6 M, with G.28 iron sheets, on 100 x 50 mm purlins on 100 x 75 mm timber trusses on 100 x 75 mm wall plate anchored into the wall using hoop iron.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was a report dated 5th June, 2023 by the Senior assistant engineer to show that technical supervision had been provide by the relevant technical officers	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	The LG had verified works, certified and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract as was noted when, Ms. Oleez Mechanic Enterprise, the contractor raised a request for payment on 23rd May, 2023, then was certified on 14th June, 2023 by the ME, CDO, Environment officer and payment was done on 28th June, 2023.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law, the file reviewed it was for; Project: Construction of Water borne toilet at the Bus Park in Kotido Municipal. Procurement ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/20004 iii, it had these documents on file; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 9th May, 2023 with OLEEZ Mechanic Enterprise • Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023 • Contracts Committee minuted dated 24th April, 2023 • PP1 form, call for bids, records for issue and receipts, supervision reports, payment record among the documents on file. 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.	The Municipality i) designated Mr. Lotuk Christopher the Deputy Town Clerk with an appointment letter issued on 1st July, 2022 to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) comprising of Mr. Okidi Gasper the Senior Engineer; Mr. Lokawa Innocent Mauro the Physical Planner; Ms. Chilla Rose Lilly the Environment Officer; Ms. Lemukol Lily the Principal Community Development Officer.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
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.	The Municipality had a centralized complaints log for recording grievances and Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) that handles complaints as and when they are captured. For example, in the centralized complaints log a complaint recorded on 26th April, 2023 by Etuko Emmy Brain who was affected by the road construction project and the matter was handled by the GRC on 11 May, 2023 under Min. 4/5/2023/KMC GRC: Consideration of Grievances and Committee Recommendations in a meeting that was held at the Kotido Municipal Council Board Room on 8th May, 2023.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0		
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.	The Municipality publicized the grievance redress mechanisms on the notice boards so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress although the date of publicization was not displayed on the post.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MLG integrated environment, social & climate change interventions into the MDP III. Some of the interventions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Afforestation / tree growing on page 112 of the MDP III and budgeted at =UGX 1,000,000 on page 30 of the budget. - Waste management on page 147 of the MDP III and budgeted at =UGX 13,136,000 on page 24 of the budget. - Promotion of energy savings technologies <p>Social intervention on page 100 of DDP III, which included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Training special group leaders on their roles and responsibilities. The LG allocated UGX 4,000,000 to PWD and the elderly on page 32 of the budget. -Support to youth, elderly, women and Persons with disabilities which was allocated 33,500,000 on page 46 of the budget. - Strengthen families to reduce child deprivation, abuse and child labor. The LG allocated 3,000,000 to support children and youth services on page 46 of the budget. 	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Mc availed a training report dated 3rd November 2022 during which the LLG were trained on the DDEG guidelines and a printout of the distribution of the soft copies of the guidelines. The activity was done by the Senior Planner and endorsed the report with unit stamp.</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no other projects financed from DDEG that had been budgeted for and approved for the previous FY and therefore no costed ESMPs were prepared.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change that were budgeted for in the previous FY.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence available to ascertain proof of land ownership for the DDEG projects for the previous FY.</p>	0
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>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring report of the construction of an OPD in Panyaranga HCIII dated 19th April, 2023 2. Monitoring report for the construction of a VIP latrine for staff at Panyangara HCIII dated 19th April, 2023 3. Monitoring report for the construction of Construction of a water borne toilet at Kotido Central Bus park prepared on 19th April, 2023 	1

15

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:

Score 1 or else score 0

Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environment Officer and MCDO prior to payments of contractors 'invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;

1. Final payment certificate No.1 issued on 5th June, 2023 for the rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido Army school was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO

2. Final payment certificate No. 1 issued on 13th June, 2023 for the construction of a water borne toilet at the Bus Park was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO

3. Completion certificate No. 3 issued on 4th April, 2023 for the construction of OPD at Panyaranga HCIII was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO

Financial management

16

LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the MC made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to-date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to Assessment Team as detailed below;

A/c name: KOTIDO MUNICIPAL YOUTH RECO

A/c No: 3100047710

Bank Name: Centenary Bank

Reconciled up to 31st October 2023

Amount; Ugx 3,899,020

A/c name: KOTIDO MUNICIPAL UWEP RECOVERY

A/c No: 3100050802

Bank Name: Centenary Bank

Reconciled up to 31st October 2023

Amount; Ugx 2,016,537

A/c name: KOTIDO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL GF

A/c No: 6212300013

Bank Name: Centenary Bank

Reconciled up to 31st September 2023

Amount; Ugx 5,507,842

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 16th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 31st May 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 06th April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 21st July 2023</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the IA reports for the previous FY were submitted to Town clerk and LG PAC as per the acknowledgment of the reports by the secretaries on the stated date;</p> <p>1st quarter report was received on 27th February 2023.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was received on 28th July 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was received on 28th July 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was received on 03rd 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>The reports were submitted to LG PAC through the registry as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarter 1 on 30th October 2022 - Quarter 2 on 30th January 2023 - Quarter 3 on 30th June 2023 - Quarter 4 on 29th July 2023 <p>Quarter one, two and Quarter three reports were reviewed by PAC and were all reviewed in one meeting that was held on 9th March 2023 at the District Board room under minute no 04/DPAC/03/2023:Examination of Internal Audit Report for First to Third Quarter FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>For Quarter four report, it was noted by the internal Auditor is yet to be discussed by the LG PAC.</p>	0

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 289,360,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 40) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 205,179,501 which gave a variance of Ushs 84,180,499 this indicate that Municipal less collected local revenue which shows a poor performance.</p> <p>$(84,180,499) / 289,360,000) \times 100\% = (29\%)$</p> <p>The MC managed to correct 71% of its planned revenue.</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"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 40 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22 Total revenue = Ushs 186,649,823</p> <p>OSR 2022/23 Total revenue = Ushs 205,179,501</p> <p>Therefore Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22 Ushs 205,179,501- Ushs 186,649,823= Ushs 18,529,678 $= (18,529,678 / 186,649,823) \times 100 = 9\%$</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 increased by 9%.</p>	1
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenue. The shareable revenue of Ugx 205 million. Only Ugx 73,029,616 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Division received Ushs 1,000,000 2. North Division received Ushs 3,300,000 3. West Division received Ushs 35,611,602 4. Central Division received Ushs 19,486,000 	0

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder</p> <p>Procurement reference: KMC716/WRKS/2022-2023/200004 II</p> <p>Subject of procurement: Construction of a 4-stance VIP latrine for maternity at Panyangara HCIII</p> <p>Method of procurement: Selective bidding</p> <p>Best evaluated bidder: Elengu Enterprise Limited</p> <p>Price: Ugx 22,796,550/=</p> <p>Date of display: 25th April, 2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 9th May, 2023</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence provided that the municipal council had a copy of public announcement of performance results for the previous FY dated on 5th March 2023 and the scores were as follows,</p> <p>Cross cutting measures 51</p> <p>Education measures 57</p> <p>Health measures 55</p> <p>The overall ranked number was 56 and overall score 54%.</p> <p>The announcement report was signed by the Deputy Town clerk Lotuk Christopher.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence pf a report provided at the time of assessment dated 14th January 2023 at the Central Division Offices with the members of the Public on status of implementation of activities at Central Division.</p> <p>Some of cases issues that were discussed with the public were;</p> <p>Opening of roads in Kotido West Division.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of garbage in the divisions • Renovation of a two class room block at Kotido Army. <p>Renovation of a boys dormitory at Lomukura primary school.</p>	1

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal stamp dated on 14th July 2023 by the Town Clerk on the notice board.</p>	1
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>There was no IGG issues reported in the Previous FY 2022/23.</p>	1

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was 498</p> <p>Total absentees were 5</p> <p>Total that sat were $(498 - 5) = 493$</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = $77 + 307 + 65 = 449$</p> <p>Pass rate = $(449) \times 100 = 91.07\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">493</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 556</p> <p>Total absentees were =25</p> <p>Total that sat were $(556 - 25) = 531$</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= $82 + 323 + 62 = 467$</p> <p>% pass rate= $(467) \times 100 = 87.94\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">531</p> <p>% Change = $87.94 - 91.07 = - 3.13\%$</p>	0

1

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

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered was
= 330

Total absentees were =03

Total that sat were = 327

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 20 +90 +109
=219

Pass rate = $219 \times 100 = 66.97\%$

327

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was
= 315

Total absentees were =04

Total that sat were (315 - 04) =311

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 13+58 +84
=155

% pass rate= $155 \times 100 = 47.4\%$

327

% change = $47.4 - 66.97 = -19.57\%$

0

2

N23_Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

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

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

The average score of education LLG
performance decreased by 15%
compared to the last year as per the
computation below;

The average score for the current year
was 60%.

The average score for the previous
financial year was 75%.

LLG performance decreased by 15%

0

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

MC did receive SFC for FY Ugx
97,599,000 2022/2023. was used
towards;

1. - Renovation of Boys dormitory at
Lomukura primary school at Ushs
17,000,000.
2. - Renovation of a five class room
block at kotido Girls primary
school at Ushs 42,000,000.
3. - Renovation of a 2 class room
block at Kotido Army at Ushs
35,000,000.

The balance of Ushs 3,500,000 was
used on monitoring and supervision
function of the above projects as well
as bank charges

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence the MEO, Environment Officer, and CDO certified works for sampled Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the MC made payments to the contractors. For example;

1. Voucher no. 6420674 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of a classroom block in Kotido Girls Primary School at Ushs 32,395,000 by Orbit Rollers U Limited was certified by MEO on 8th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 5th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 12th June 2023 and PCDO on 5th June 2023, payments was initiated on 15th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
2. Voucher no. 6441638 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of a classroom block in Army Primary School at Ushs 29,718,586 by Bladina Memorial Enterprise was certified by MEO on 16th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 16th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 15th June 2023 and PCDO on 16th June 2023, payments was initiated on 5th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
3. Voucher no. 6420360 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of Boys dormitory in Lomukura Primary School at Ushs 13,306,734 by Iwon Pei General Hardware Limited was certified by MEO on 15th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 15th June 2023 and PCDO on 15th June 2023, payments was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0

Projects sampled were three and all were within +7.47% of +/-20% acceptable variation and complied.

The projects were;

Project 1: Renovation of Boys Dormitory at Lomukara Primary School

Procurement Ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/100003 i

Project 2: Renovation of a 2-classroom Block at Kotido Army Primary school

Procurement Ref: KMC761/wrks/2022-2023/100003 ii

Project 3: Renovation of 2-classroom Block at Kotido Girls Primary School

Procurement Ref: KMC761/wrks/2022-2023/100003 iii

Project 1

Estimated cost: Ugx 17,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 15,729,000/=

Variation cost: Ugx 1,271,000/=

%age variation

$(1,271,000/17,000,000) \times 100\% = 7.47\%$

Project 2

Estimated cost: Ugx 35,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 33,342,650/=

Variation cost: Ugx
 $1,657,350/35,000,000) \times 100\% = 4.73\%$

Project 3

Estimated cost: Ugx 35,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 34,100,000/=

Variation cost: Ugx 900,000/=

%age variation $(900,000/35,000,000) \times 100\% = 2.57\%$

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was no Seed secondary school project implemented in the Municipality in the year under review.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>From the customized structure there were 140 positions for primary school teachers and 131 were filled at the time of assessment putting the staffing level at 93%.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>The Kotido municipal council Consolidated Assets register for the FY 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 7 registered UPE primary schools and 2 USE schools was in place consisting of the following ; 133 classrooms, 175 latrine stances , 1501 desks, 94 teachers houses and 02 laboratories' prepared by the principal education officer.</p> <p>This implies that all schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format .</p> 9×100 9 $= 100\%$	3

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>The municipal council teacher's deployment list from the municipal education office dated 15th February , 2023 matched with that one found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:</p> <p>At Mary Mother of God primary school taken as rural the list had 22 teachers listed on the list posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Sr; Lettedawit Ghirmay Fadegae as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the municipal education office.</p> <p>Lomukura Primary School taken as semi urban School the list indicated 25 teachers with Odongo George as head teacher also matched well with the one at the municipality list..</p> <p>Kotido mixed primary school taken as urban the list had 26 teachers and the head teacher being Ms. Okello Suzan the list also matched well with that of the municipal offices.</p> <p>This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was at $73/73*100= 100\%$.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Evidence indicated that the municipal council had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 7 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>Kotido primary school taken as urban had 16 classrooms, 102 desks, 32 stances of latrines and 16 teacher's houses .</p> <p>Lomukura primary school taken as semi- urban had 17 classrooms, 37 latrine stances, 274 desks & 14 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Mary Mother OF God primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 16 classrooms, 120 desks, 24 latrine stances & 14 teachers houses.</p> <p>All the verified assets infrastructures and equipment were also indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

Kotido Mixed primary school(urban)

Primary school had budgeted for the whole calendar year 2023 on termly basis as was seen below;

Term 3 2022 dated 17th october, 2022, term 1 2023 dated 24th February,2023 and term 2 2023 dated 22nd June, 2023 with clear cash flow statements fully signed by the head teacher and the SMC chairperson Mr. Adal Felix Arnold, also attached was the asset register that had 16 classrooms, 102 desks, 32 stances of latrines and 16 teachers houses .

Lomukura primary school taken as semi urban primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC for the various terms such as;

Term 3 2022 dated 3rd November,2023 , term 1 2023 dated 31st March,2023, term 2 dated 17th June, 2023 clearly indicating the cash flow and had been signed by the head teacher and SMC chairperson Ms. Alupo Stella

Mary Mother of God primary school equally had the necessary annual budget for the previous FY clearly showing the budgeted figures for term III 2022 dated 11th October,2022, term I 2023 dated 31st March,2023, term II 2023 dated 27th June, 2023 all had been signed by the chairperson SMC Rev Fr: Gabriel Angella and by the head teacher representative

$3/3 \times 100 = 100$

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was some evidence seen in some schools visited to prove that the municipal council had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.

At schools visited, there were

School improvement plans on the walls and reports to ascertain the above subject as shown below;

Kotido mixed primary school

- Supervision of teachers by the head teacher to ensure effectiveness in the teaching.

- The municipal council was requested to recruit more teachers so as to complement those present due to the big population from 26 teachers to 46 teachers.

- They conducted go back to school campaigns so as to ensure more pupils enrolment.

Lomukura primary school there was no report to show that the municipal council education office had supported in the implementation of any school improvement plans.

Mary mother of God primary school SIPs in place involved the following:

Conducting back to school campaigns within the community .

- Support supervision to the teachers by the municipal inspector Mr. Okengo Dennis on 14th November, 2022.

- Repair of the primary six block and giving it a new face lift through repainting it during term one holiday of 2023.

This indicated: $2/3 \times 100 = 66.6$

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The municipal council had collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the 7 UPE and 2 USE registered schools from the previous FY. The %age of schools was;</p> 9×100 9 $= 100\%$ <p>11,470 learners had been registered by 15th June, 2023. Confirmed by the senior education officer.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The MC had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY at Ugx 1,076,000,000/=</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>The municipal council deployed 131 primary school teachers for the 7 UPE schools which aligns with the education sector guidelines.</p> <p>According to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment, for instance:</p> <p>Kotido Mixed Primary School taken as Urban had 26 teachers with enrolment of 2399 pupils</p> <p>Lomukura Primary School taken as semi urban had 25b teachers with enrolment of 1829 pupils.</p> <p>Mary Mother of God Primary School taken as rural had 22 teachers</p>	3
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The municipal council notice board did have displayed teacher's staff list as mandated.</p> <p>Head teachers at the visited schools had displayed their respective staff lists for the calendar year 2023 in their offices that matched that the list from the senior education officer for instance;</p> <p>Mary Mother of God primary school had list of 22 teachers displayed as of 6th February, 2023.</p> <p>Kotido mixed primary school had a list of 26 displayed as of 16th February, 2023.</p> <p>Lomukura primary school had a list of 25 displayed dated 17th February, 2023 that accurately matched that of the municipal council..</p>	1
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 Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Kotido MC appraised the following four out of seven primary School head teachers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Namit Leo Head Teacher- Kotido Army PS was appraised on 20th December 2022 by Lotuk Christopher, Deputy Town Clerk 2. Okello Suzan Head Teacher- Kotido Mixed PS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by Lotuk Christopher, Deputy Town Clerk 3. Logira Sam Head Teacher- Panyangara PS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by Lotuk Christopher, Deputy Town Clerk 4. Ochen Jimmy Mathew-Head Teacher Kotido Girls PS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by Lotuk Christopher, Deputy Town Clerk <p>Those not appraised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Onyango Powell Embony Head Teacher Kanawat Primary School 2. Ongwen Richard Head Teacher- Mary Mother of God PS 3. Odongo George Head Teacher Lomukura PS 	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There were two secondary schools however no appraisals were provided 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>1. Okengo Denis- Inspector of Schools was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Lotuk Denis Deputy Town Clerk</p> <p>The Education department had only two staff at the time of assessment, the MEO and the Inspector of Schools.</p>	2
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 MC had prepared a training plan dated 15th July 2023 for the Education department. The training plan was prepared by Auma Gloria Achilla the Education Officer, reviewed by Ngorok Emmanuel Noding the Senior Human Resource Officer and Approved by Lotuk Christopher the Deputy Town Clerk . The planned sessions for 2022/2023 included; Time management skills training for Headteachers, School Management for SMC members, and performance appraisal training for all teachers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategies to attract and retain children at school. - School governance. - Support supervision to teachers for teaching and learning. - Preparation and submission of EMIS returns. 	2

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p>	<p>The assessment team received evidence from the acting municipal education officer, that the municipality was compliant in confirming the learners enrolment and budget allocation for the education department as the Town Clerk wrote to the permanent secretary on 17th October, 2022 on the updated enrolment.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>		
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>Kotido municipal council made allocations of UGX 13,751,000 for FY 2022/2023 in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>		
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	<p>The Municipal did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 10th August, 2022 which was more than 5 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 15 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 13rd January, 2023 which was within 5 days. • 4th Quarter funds were released on 11st April 2023 and warranted on 28th April 2023 which was more than 5 working days. 	

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Municipal did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 20th July 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 5th October 2022 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 5th May 2023.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>For the FY 2022/2023, the Education department prepared an inspection Plan dated 10th October, 2022 it was prepared by education department. and Was signed by the acting municipal education officer together with the MIS. The plan prioritized to inspect the Government Schools (7 Primary and 2 Secondary). Below were the dates on which the pre- inspection plans were carried out;</p> <p>Term III 2022 meeting was on 10th October,2022 planned to cover all the 9 schools between 17th October to 31st October2022 minute number Min. 2/10/22.</p> <p>Term I 2023 meeting was held on 31st January ,2023 planned to inspect 9 schools in attendance were 5 members of the inspectorate and was between 12th April, 2023 to 21st April ,2023 .</p> <p>Term II 2023 meeting was held on 7th July, 2023 planned to inspect 9 schools, in attendance were 5 members it was carried out between 10th July 2023 to 21st July, 2023 min no min 2/07/2023</p> <p>3/3 x 100 = 100% compliant</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the previous Financial Year revealed that 100% Government Schools were inspected for term II I 2022, term I ,II & III 2023 as was seen below;-</p> <p>Term 3 2022 report dated 1st November, 2023 indicated that 10 schools were inspected of which 7 were government and 3 private.</p> <p>Term 1 2023, report dated 25th April, 2023 indicated that 6 schools were inspected between 12th April, 2023 to 21st April, 2023.</p> <p>Term 2 report dated 24th July, 2023 indicated that 12 schools were inspected of which 9 were government schools from 10th July, 2023 to 21st July, 2023.</p> <p>$7/7 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Reports were discussed especially at the municipal level as indicated in a report dated 7th November, 2022 basically for term 3 of 2022 , minute number min 4/11/2022 and 20th April,2023 for term 1 2023 key issues discussed were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor time management by teaching staff. - Inadequate preparation by the teachers for lessons. - Abandoning of duty by some teachers. - Absenteeism of teachers. <p>Indiscipline of some teachers in Mary mother of God primary school, Panyangara primary school especially over drinking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low enrolment of learners in kanawat and kotido girl's primary school. - Non provision of support supervision of teachers by some head teachers <p>27th July, 2023 for term 2 findings.</p>	2

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 no evidence that the findings from inspection were discussed with the respective schools among them was Kotido mixed primary school, lomukura primary school and Mary Mother of God primary school</p> <p>Reports were, though, submitted to DES by the MIS as per below;</p> <p>Term one report dated 8th May, 2023 and was submitted to DES on 11th October,2023</p> <p>Term 2 report dated 24th July, 2023 was submitted to DES on 11th October 2023</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education sat and discussed delivery issues in a meeting that was held on 20th February 2023 at the Municipal Board Room where at least 8 members were present. Under Min no MIN 3/3/2023.Under Education, some key issues were discussed by the committee;</p> <p>- It was noted that schools like Kanawat and Kotido Girls Primary Schools had low enrolment. It was noted by the committee that the parties responsible should play their role of mobilizing children to go to school.</p> <p>- In Lomukura Primary School, the boys don't have bathing shelters and a request for the construction of Teachers staff houses in Panyangara SSS.</p> <p>All the issues were discussed and recommendations were in the same meeting. Minutes were signed by chairperson Hon. Napio Rose Mary.</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>2</p> <p>There was evidence that the municipal education department conducted activities aimed at mobilising, attracting and retaining children in school called "Go back to school" campaign through radio talk shows on Etoil A- Karamoja 92.7fm by the MIS and the senior education officer on 25th May,2023 in report dated 30th May, 2023.</p> <p>- Parents were encouraged to take pupils to school over 6years to school or face penalties for that matter in case of failure to comply.</p> <p>- They also sensitized parents on their responsibilities.</p>
----	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>2</p> <p>The Consolidated School Asset Register at the MEO's office revealed accurate reporting on the assets of 7 primary schools and the 2 USE schools.</p> <p>The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:</p> <p>Evidence indicated that the municipal council had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 7 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>Kotido primary school taken as urban had 16 classrooms, 102 desks, 32 stances of latrines and 16 teacher's houses .</p> <p>Lomukura primary school taken as semi- urban had 17 classrooms, 37 latrine stances, 274 desks & 14 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Mary Mother OF God primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 16 classrooms, 120 desks, 24 latrine stances & 14 teachers houses.</p> <p>All the verified assets infrastructures and equipments were also indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register</p>
----	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, score: 1 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the desk appraisals were conducted on 3rd February, 2022 for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs for eligible projects under education and all projects were derived from MCDP III page 283 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Renovation of Boys dormitory at Lomukura primary school at Ushs 17,000,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal 2. - Renovation of a two class room block at kotido Girls primary school at Ushs 35,000,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal. 3. - Renovation of a 2 class room block at Kotido Army at Ushs 35,000,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal. 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>Field appraisal Renovation of Boys dormitory at Lomukura primary school. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 3rd February 2022.</p> <p>Field appraisal Renovation of a two class room block at kotido Girls primary school. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 3rd February 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal Renovation of a 2 class room block at Kotido Army. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 2nd February 2022</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by Senior Planner, PCDO and Municipal Engineer.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no seed secondary school planned for in FY 2023/2024	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There were Contracts Committee minutes for the sitting of 24th April, 2023 that approved the evaluation report and contract award in minute 6/4/CC/2022-2023, the contracts were for Renovations of the Boys Dormitory at Lomukura, Classroom block at Kotido Army and Kotido Girls Primarys.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The letter dated 1st November 2022 signed by the TC, Okaja Emmanuel, named; 1. Principal Community development officer 2. Economic planner 3. Procurement officer 4. Environment officer The letter did not include the Clerk of works, or specific the roles and responsibilities of the members, as specified in the sector guidelines.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES, as was observed at Kotido girls primary school, where the roofing was of pre-painted iron sheets G.28, on timber purlins of size 100 x 50mm, on timber trusses of 150 x 75mm tie beams with 100 x 50mm struts, all on 100 x 75mm timber wall plate as specified in the drawings.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence to show that monthly site meetings had been held for all sector infrastructure project planned in the previous FY	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show 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., had been conducted, this was in a report dated 10th May, 2023 which was signed by the joint technical supervision team as mentioned above.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Voucher no. 6420674 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of a class room block in Kotido Girls Primary School at Ushs 32,395,000 by Orbit Rollers U limited was certified by MEO on 8th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 5th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 12th June 2023 and PCDO on 5th June 2023, payments was initiated on 15th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline. 2. - Voucher no. 6441638 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of a class room block in Army Primary School at Ushs 29,718,586 by Bladina Memorial Enterprise was certified by MEO on 16th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 16th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 15th June 2023 and PCDO on 16th June 2023, payments was initiated on 5th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline. 3. - Voucher no. 6420360 dated 28th June 2023 for the Renovation of Boys dormitory in Lomukura Primary School at Ushs 13,306,734 by Iwon Pei General Hardware Limited was certified by MEO on 15th June 2023, Municipal Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, Senior Engineer on 15th June 2023 and PCDO on 15th June 2023, payments was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline. 	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30. This was done 22nd April, 2023. The request included; rehabilitation of 2-classroom blocks at Kotido Army, Kotido and Girls primary schools.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

Project: Renovation of Boys Dormitory at Lomukuru Primary school

Procurement ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/100003 i, had the following documents on file

- Signed works contract dated 9th May, 2023 with IWONPEI General Hardware Limited
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th April, 2023
- Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, acceptance and offer letters

• Project: Renovation of classroom Block at Kotido Army Primary school

Procurement ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/100003 ii, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 9th May, 2023 with Ms. Bladina Memorial Enterprise
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th April, 2023
- Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and completion reports.

Project: Renovation of 2-classroom Block at Kotido Girls Primary School

Procurement ref: KMC761/wrks/2022-2023/100003 iii; the file had these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 9th May, 2023 with ORBIT Rollers (U) limited
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th April, 2023
- Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports and completion reports

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 were no recorded grievances in the Education sector since none were observed throughout the project implementation in the previous FY.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of the education guidelines to the respective schools below; Mary Mother of God primary school, Kotido mixed primary school and Lomukura primary school.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido Army primary school was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents at a total cost of UGX. 33,343,200 and Bill 1: Preliminaries for environmental and social mitigation costed at UGX. 1,300,000</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>There was no proof of land ownership for school construction projects availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score:0</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow-up on recommended corrective actions and prepared monthly monitoring reports as below for the following projects on 15th May, 2023;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido Army primary school 2. Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido girls primary school 3. Renovation of the boys' dormitory at Lomukura primary school 	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

The Environment Officer and CDO approved and signed the certification forms prior to executing the project contractor payments for example;

1. Final payment certificate No. 1 issued on 5th June, 2023 for the rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido Army primary school

2. Final payment certificate No. 1 issued on 5th June, 2023 for the renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido girls primary school

3. Final payment certificate No. 1 issued on 13th June, 2023 for the renovation of a dormitory at Lomukoro primary school.

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>From the annual HMIS reports 107,the annual deliveries for the 3 Health facilities: Kanawat HC III Panyangara HCIII and KDDOHCIII respectively for FY 2021/22 were: 437,466 and 259.The total deliveries of the same Health facilities for the FY 2021/22 was 1162.</p> <p>The annual deliveries of the same Health Facilities respectively for the FY 2022/23 were 445,385 and 293 and the total deliveries of the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 was 1123</p> <p>From calculations ,this shows a Percentage decline in deliveries of 3.3% when you compare the deliveries of FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 15% as per the OPAMS.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF program was incorporated in PHC as per the letter from MOH to CAOS dated 7th December 2022</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

The Municipal budgeted for health development projects for Ushs 229,548,000 was all spent on the following projects namely;

1. Construction of An OPD Block At Panyangara Hc III at ushs 180,000,000.
2. Construction of a VIP Four Stance Latrine For Staff At Panyanagara Hc III at Ushs 22,000,000.
3. Construction of a Four Stance Vip Latrine To Operationalize The Planned Opd At Panyangara Hc III at Ushs 22,000,000.

The rest of the funds (5,548,000), per the guidelines went to monitoring and supervision of the abve investment projects.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence the MHO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works for sampled health construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the MC made payments to the contractors. For example;

1. Voucher no. 6419829 dated 28th June 2023 for the construction of a 4 Stance Pit Latrine at Panyangara HC III at Ushs 12,955,134 by Elegu Enterprises Limited was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 15th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
2. Voucher no. 6435983 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of a Water Borne Toilet at Bus Park Kotido Municipal Council at Ushs 20,947,314 by Oleez Mechanic Enterprise was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
3. Voucher no. 6441638 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of \$ Stance Pit Latrine in Panyangara HC III at Ushs 14,944,151 by Bladina Memorial Enterprise was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three projects sampled were +5.01% all within +/- 20% of the acceptable variation therefore complied.

The projects were,

Project 1: Construction of OPD ward at Panyangera Hill

Procurement Ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/100001

Project 2: Construction of a 4-stance latrine for staff at Panganyera HCIII

Procurement ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/20004i

Project 3: Construction of 4-stance latrine for maternity ward at Panganyera HCIII

Procurement ref: KMC716/wrks/2022-2023/200004 ii

Project 1:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 166,150,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 164,700,712/=

Variation Cost: Ugx 1,449,288/=

%age variation (1,449,288/166,150,000) x 100%= 0.87%

Project 2:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 24,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 23,828,175/=

Variation cost: Ugx 171,825/=

%age variation (171,825/24,000,000 x 100%= 0.71%

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 24,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 22,796,550/=

Variation Cost: Ugx 1,203,450/=

%age variation (1,203,450/24,000,000) x 100% = 5.01%

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the Municipality in the year under review.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		
4	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	The LG had no HCIV under its jurisdiction. There were 3 HCIII with an approved staff structure of 57 health workers. Per the staffing norms, two HCIIIs had a maximum number of approved health workers, while one HCIII had 11.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	To calculate, $19+19+11=49/57 \times 100=86\%$	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MOH, as was observed at Panyangira HCIII where there was construction of OPD. It was noted that the external dimensions of the ward were 8.2 x 16.6 m with the steel casement windows of 1.5 x 1.2 m. the waiting area 11.5 x 4.2M.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for the 3 existing health facilities; Panyangara HCIII, Kanawat HCIII (PNFP) and KDDO HCIII (PNFP) was accurate as indicated below.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>Panyangara HCIII had 11 staff (MMOH facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p>Kanawat HCIII had 31 staff (MMOH facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the facility noticeboard. Notably Kanawat HCIII is PNFP facility and is managed by Catholic Church. Kotido Municipal Council didn't deploy any staff to this health facility. All the staff working at this health facility were recruited by the Church.</p> <p>KDDO HCIII had 24 staff (MMOH facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard. KDDO HCIII is PNFP and the Muniapal did not deploy any staff to this health facility. All the staff working at the health facility were recruited by the health facility management.</p>	
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	<p>There was no Upgrade of any Health entre in Kotido Municipality in 2022/23.</p> <p>However there was a completed Construction of OPD, Of Pangerea HC III. There was a construction of 4 Pit latrine and staff houses at Panyangara HCIII.</p> <p>There as construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Pangara HC III.</p> <p>They were all functional.</p>	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Of the three Sampled Health centres: Kanawat HC III- PNFP, Panyangara HCIII and KDDO HCIII- PNFP, only one Health centre prepared and submitted annual work plan and budget for FY 2022/23</p> <p>This was Panyangara HCIII which submitted its annual work plan and budget on 22 March 2022</p> <p>Annual Budget and reports for other 2 PNFP health facilities were not available in the MMOH's office at the time of assessment.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence to show that the three sampled Healthfacilities :</p> <p>Kanawat HC III Panyangara HCIII and KDDOHCIII prepared and submitted their Annual Budget performance reports.</p> <p>The was no any Annual Budget performance report for the sampled Health health facilities seen in the DHO's at the time of assessment.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

The three sampled healthfacilities prepared and submitted Facility improvement Plans.

KDDO HCIII submitted its plan on 8th August,2023.

Panyangara HCIII submitted its improvement plan on 3rd August 2023

Kanawat HC III submitted on 1st July,2023

The facilities improvement plans incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and support supervision and were implemented.

For example, Panyangara improvement plan included conducting integrated outreaches. This was identified and recommended in the quarterly performance review of quarter that took place on 7th -9th December 2022.

Panyangara HCIII plan also included improving Lighting in Maternity ward. This was a recommendation of the quarter 2 Support supervision of the Facility by DHMT.

Progress report of Panyangara HCIII dated 29 Dec 2022 reported implementation of the above-mentioned issues in Panyangara HC III.

Solar system was installed at Marternity Ward, and integrated outreaches conducted in the catchments of the health facility..

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence to show that the sampled Health facilities submitted their HMIS reports 105 and 106 a timely

HMIS 105 Reports

July 2022

Kanawat HC III 5th Aug 2022

Panyangara HCIII 5th Aug 2023

KDDO HCIII -5th Aug,2022

August 2022

Kanawat HC III 2nd Sept 2022

Panyangara HCIII 6th Sep 2022

KDDO HCIII 6th Sep,2022

September 2022

Kanawat HC III 4th Oct,2022

Panyangara HCIII 4th Oct 2022

KDDO HCIII 4th Oct,2022

October 2022

Kanawat HC III 7th Nov 2022

Panyangara HCIII 6th November 2022

KDDO HCIII 3rd November,2022

November 2022

Kanawat HC III 5th December 2022

Panyangara HCIII 6th Dec 2022

KDDO HCIII 5th December 2022

December 2022

Kanawat HC III 4th January 2023

Panyangara HCIII 6th January 2023

KDDO HCIII 6th January 2023

January 2023

Kanawat HC III 4th Feb ,2023

Panyangara HCIII 5h feb 2023

KDDO HCIII 5th Feb 2023

February 2023

Kanawat HC III 4th March 2023

Panyangara HCIII 5th March 2023

KDDO HCIII 5th March 2023

March 2023

Kanawat HC III 6th April 2023

Panyangara HCIII 5th April 2023

KDDO HCIII 5th April 2023

April 2023

Kanawat HC III 3rd May 2023

Panyangara HCIII 6th May 2023

KDDO HCIII 5th May 2023

May 2023

Kanawat HC III 6th June 2023

Panyangara HCIII 4th June 2023

KDDO HCIII 5th June 2023

June 2023

Kanawat HC III 4th July 2023

Panyangara HCIII 4th July 2023

KDDO HCIII 4th July 2023

Quarterly Report 106 a

Quarter 1

Kanawat HC III 5th Oct 2022

Panyangara HCIII 6th Oct 2022

KDDO HCIII 7Oct 2022

Quarter 2

Kanawat HC III 5th Jan 2023

Panyangara HCIII 4th Jan 2023

KDDO HCIII 6th Jan 2023

Quarter 3

Kanawat HC III 6th April 2023

Panyangara HCIII 5th April 2023

KDDO HCIII 6th April 2023

Quarter 4

Kanawat HC III 4th July 2023

Panyangara HCIII 7th July,2023

KDDO HCIII 8th July, 2023

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

RBF was incorporated into PHC as per the letter from MOH o CAOs dated 7th December 2022

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>RBF was incorporated into PHC as per the letter from MOH o CAOs dated 7th December 2022</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>There was evidence provided that MC timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Quarter one reports were submitted on 5th September 2022. 2. - Quarter two reports were submitted on 19th December 2023. 3. - Quarter three reports were submitted on 30th March 2023. 4. - Quarter four reports were submitted on 3th July 2023. 	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Kotido developed a performance approved plan for the weakest Health facilities this plan was dated 17th January 2023</p> <p>The weak performing Health facility was Locilang HCIII</p> <p>There was low ANC4 attendance.</p> <p>The performance plan included Community dialogues about utilization of ANC services.</p> <p>VHT to map the pregnant women and follow the up for services</p>	1

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of implementation of a performance improvement plan, by the following activities:</p> <p>Three (3) community dialogue meetings were organized in the wards logwangita, Mirisae and lochoto wards.</p> <p>Pregnant women were mapped up and a program started where VHTs to accompany pregnant mothers for ANC 4 and delivery. (Progress report 27 July 2023)</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kotido Municipal Council budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx. 1,376,965,000 (Approved budget estimates for Kotido Municipal Council 2023/24 page 9 of 17, vote 871). This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 where the provided wage rate was Ugx. 1,376,965,420 as indicated on page 92 vote 716</p> <p>Therefore, Kotido Municipal Council budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Panyangara HCIII had 11 out of 19 required health workers for HCIII, giving over 57.9% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed Staff list at Panyangara HCIII noticeboard).</p> <p>Kanawat HCIII (PNFP) had 31 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 163.2% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Kanawat HCIII noticeboard), giving 100% staffing</p> <p>KDDO HCIII (PNFP) had 24 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 126.3% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at KDDO HCIII noticeboard), giving 100% staffing</p> <p>Therefore, $57.9\% + 100\% + 100\% = 257.9/3 = 85.97\%$</p>	2

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

Panyangara HCIII: 6 out of 11 health workers deployed to panyangara HCIII were present on duty on the day of assessment. 2 staff (Ondoma Emmanuel; Health Assistant and Ajengo Robert; Clinical Officer) were away for the training, 1 staff (Loyopo Simon Peter; Nursing Assistant) was for sick leave, another staff Anena Suzan; Enrolled midwife was for study leave and the rest of the staff were off duty on the day of assessment.

Examples of health workers found working at Panyagara health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Ongom Alex; Senior Clinical Officer was present on duty on 30th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 25 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Munyos Joseph Biolas; Laboratory Technicians was present on duty on 30th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 20 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Akongo Betty Dorothy; Enrolled midwife was present on duty on 30th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 11 days in the month of October 2023.

(Panyangara HCIII staff attendance book 30th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

Kanawat HCIII (PNFP): 16 out of 31 staff recruited at the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment.

Examples of health workers found working at Kanawat health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Muwanguzi Andrew; Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 30th November 2023.

2. Lojip Daniel; Laboratory Assistant was present on duty on 30th November 2023.

3. Epou Thomas; Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 30th November

202.

(Kanawat HCIII staff attendance book 30th November 2023).

Notably the practice of documenting monthly attendance analysis for health personnel was not initiated at the PNF facility.

KDDO HCIII: 10 out of 24 staff recruited at the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Some staff were for night duty while others were off duty. It's important to note that KDDO HCIII is PNF health facility and all the staff were recruited and paid by the health facility management.

Examples of health workers found working at KDDO health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Owilli Thomas Omagal; Medical Clinical Officer was present on duty on 30th November 2023.

2. Oywek Samson Okello; Data Officer was present on duty on 30th November 2023.

3. Ongom Steven Gerrard; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 30th November 2023.

(KDDO HCIII staff attendance book 30th November 2023).

Notably the practice of documenting monthly attendance analysis for health personnel was not initiated at the PNF facility.

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

The displayed lists of staff at Panyangara HCIII, Kanawat HCIII and KDDO HCIII Noticeboards had a total of 11, 31 and 24 staff respectively. (Panyangara HCIII Kanawat HCIII and KDDO HCIII Noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24.

2

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	<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>	Kotido Municipal Council had only one government Health Center; Panyangara HC III. Ongom Alex- the In-charge was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Christopher the Deputy Town Clerk.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	<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 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 as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aumo Proscovia Juliet - Health Information assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 2. Anena Suzan Scovia - Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 3. Olanya Eugene - Health Inspector was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 4. Munyos Joseph Biolas - Laboratory Technician was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 5. Ondoma Emmanuel - Health Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 6. Lokut Paul - Health Assistant was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 7. Ongodia Gilbert - Health Inspector was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 8. Akello Gorrety - Porter was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 9. Akongo Betty Dorothy was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ogom Alex the In-charge 	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>The MC had taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports and these included; reprimand letters for absence without official leave, among others</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were various training reports which included: Simple one step stool testing for T.B for Karamoja Region. This training took place on 3rd-8th September 2023 in Moroto ,3Staff attended. There was a training of Staff and HUMC. It took place on 21st-22nd Aug 2022, 10 staff attended.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was training database and training plan . The training plan included both short - and long-term training and the schedule for these trainings</p>	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23 Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a letter dated 2nd August 2023 from Town Clerk to MOH Confirmed the list of Health facilities receiving PHC NWR grants). They were four(4) Health facilities. The letter was also indicating a revision of some health centres For example KDDO HCIII had been captured as HC II</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the Approved Budget that on page 21 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 19,000,000 and on (page 19) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 132,009,000.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>As per the computation $19,000,000/132,009,000 \times 100 = 14\%$</p>	
			<p>The MC allocated 14% to supervision & monitoring which was less than 15 % of the PHC non-wage.</p>	
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 10th August, 2022 which was more than 5 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 15 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 13rd January, 2023 which was within 5 days. • 4th Quarter funds were released on 11st April 2023 and warranted on 28th April 2023 which was more than 5 working days. 	

9

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.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter;

Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 20th July 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 5th October 2022 which was within 5 days.

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

Quarter 4 funds were released on 11 April 2023 and the communication was made on 5th May 2023.

0

9

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.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the Municipal had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.

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>Kotido Municipality MMHT conducted quarterly Performance review meetings on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 Performance review meeting took place on 9th September, 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 Performance review meeting took place on 13th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 Performance review meeting took place on 15th March, 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 Performance review meeting took place on 30th June 2023</p> <p>The Municipality implemented actions recommended in the Performance review meetings examples of implementation are given below :</p> <p>Quarter 1 2022/23 recommended construction of OPD at panyangara to reduce on Congestion. This was implemented. An OPD ward was constructed and completed . Quarter 3 Meeting recommended construction of an incinerator. This was also implemented. An incenerator was constructed panyangara HCIII. This was reported on 30th June 2023.</p> <p>There were 3 Community Dialogue meetings in villages of Logwangita, Mirisai and Lochoto wards. This took place on 12th-15 June 2023. This was an implementation of the Recommendations of the quarter 3 performance review in response to poor performance of Locilang HC III in ANC. A total of 90 participants were involved. (Progress report dated 28th June 2023).</p>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that ,quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners, MHMTs, key LG departments</p> <p>The attendance lists were not available at the Time of assessmet.</p>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Kotido Municipality did not have a HCIV but There is a general Hospital Kotido Hospital supervised by the supervision of the District</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>Kotido Municipality did not have a Sub-district, but it conducted quarterly integrated support supervision to all health facilities (MMHT Quarterly integrated support supervision reports dated 12th September 2022, 6th December 2022, 17th March 2023.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kotido Municipality used results / reports of its support supervision on Health facilities to make recommendations and there were implementations on these recommendations.</p> <p>Example the quarter 2 support supervision on Losilang HCII identified a gap of loss to follow up of TB clients and recommended Contact tracing for TB and community Dialogue</p> <p>A quarter 3 DHT progress report dated 15th June 2023 reported implementation of the above action points ; dialogue meeting took place in Municipality on TB on 3rd-7th Feb 2023</p> <p>The Quarter 2 support supervision identified</p> <p>Lack of running water in Panyangara HCIII.this was rectified by reconnecting the water the facility.</p> <p>Health facility activity report dated 12 th January 2023</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kotido Municipality provided Support supervision on Medicine and Health supplies management.</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>A review of the performance report showed that MHO received UGX 19,000,000. A review of the approved Budget report shows that Ugx 5,700,000 was spent on Health promotion page 21 of approved budget.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = $5,700,000 / 19,000,000 \times 100 = 30\%$</p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kotido MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities . Examples of the activities conducted are indicated below:</p> <p>The MHT conducted a Radio talk show on Radio Karamoja, on Malaria Prevention, on 8th -9th May 2023.</p> <p>There were interated outreaches on 15th -16th September 2022, which included activities like Testing and treatment of illinesses, Nutrition promotion, Health education among others.</p> <p>There was a community dialogue meeting on ANC 11th - 19th November 2022 in Balomulope and Jimose viilages .</p> <p>The was a community leaders' sensitization</p> <p>Meeting intended to make all Community leader s LC leaders have Latrines. This took place on 20th March 2023 .it was attended by 36 leaders from the Minicipality.</p>	1

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was no evidence to show that Kotido MHT did a follow up on Health promotion and disease prevention .</p> <p>There was no Report on Health promotion follow up seen in MHO's office at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	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>Kotido Municipality had an updated assets register for July 2023.</p> <p>There were assets for different Health facilities including medical equipment, Diagnostic Equipements, Nursing and midwifery equipment, weighing scales, Fridges, sterilization equipment like Autoclaves, oxygen cylinders etc.</p> <p>It also had Vehicles for example UG 7068M Given for Covid Control still in a good state, there is Vehicle UG 1089R ; In poor mechanical condition .</p> <p>There are 3 motorcycles 2 of which attached to Panyangara HC III 1 is used by TB focal person.</p>	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);

(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and

(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));

score 1 or else score 0

The MC presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived MDP II page 143 and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.

- Construction of An OPD Block At Panyangara Hc III at ushs 180,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Construction of a VIP Four Stance Latrine for Staff at Panyangara HC III at Ushs 22,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Construction of a Four Stance VIP Latrine to Operationalize the Planned OPD at Panyangara HC III at Ushs 22,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

All the projects were appraised on 3rd February 2022 by the Senior Planner, Environment Officer, PCDO, and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0

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

- Field appraisal for Construction of An OPD Block at Panyangara Hc III. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 3rd February 2022 signed by Senior Planner, PCDO and Environment Officer.

- Field appraisal for Construction of a VIP Four Stance Latrine for Staff at Panyanagara Hc III. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 3rd February 2022 signed by Senior Planner, PCDO and Environment Officer.

- Field appraisal for Construction of a Four Stance VIP Latrine to Operationalize the Planned OPD at Panyangara Hc III. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 3rd February 2022 signed by Senior Planner, PCDO and Environment Officer.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction however, monitoring using the checklist was not adhered to.

1. Construction of an Out Patient Department in Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th November, 2022
2. Construction of a VIP latrine for staff at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th November, 2022
3. Construction of a latrine for patients at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th November, 2022
4. Construction of a patients' kitchen at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023
5. Construction of a Drugstore at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023
6. Construction of a 2 stance latrine for OPD at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023

and the respective ESMPs were prepared as below;

- 1) Construction of an Out Patient Department in Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 1,700,000 prepared on 25th November, 2022
- 2) Construction of a VIP latrine for staff at Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 400,000 prepared on 25th November, 2022
- 3) Construction of a latrine for patients at Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 900,000 prepared on 25th November, 2022
- 4) Construction of a patients' kitchen at Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 1,700,000 prepared on 29th November, 2023
- 5) Construction of a Drugstore at Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 1,700,000 prepared on 29th November, 2023
- 6) Construction of a 2 stance latrine for OPD at Panyangara HCIII at UGX. 700,000 prepared on 21st November, 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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department did not timely by April 30, for the current FY submit all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan this was done on 9th August, 2023. The projects planned for implemented were; Construction of drug store, Kitchen and a 2-stance VIP latrine all at Panyagira HCIII.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY. The request was for Construction of drug store, Kitchen and a 2-stance VIP latrine all at Panyagira HCIII, which was submitted on 9th August, 2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee sitting on 18th October, 2022 approved the contract award for construction of the OPD ward at Panyangira HCIII, in minute 6/8/CC/2022 (v).</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG did not established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for all health projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines, This was in a letter dated 14th November, 2022 by the TC in which the following persons were named to the PIT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongom Alex as project manager 2. Cwinyaai Felix as project supervisor <p>The letter left out other members of the team such as CDO, Environment officer and Clerk of works.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the M0H, as was observed at Panyangira HCIII where there was construction of OPD. It was noted that the external dimensions of the ward were 8.2 x 16.6 m with the steel casement windows of 1.5 x 1.2 m. the waiting area 11.5 x 4.2M.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records of minutes by the clerk of works seen during the assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the Town Clerk the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence in form of supervision reports to show 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. These were dated 10th May, 2023 signed by the team.</p>	1

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

There was evidence the MHO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works for sampled health construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the MC made payments to the contractors. For example;

1. Voucher no. 6419829 dated 28th June 2023 for the construction of a 4 Stance Pit Latrine at Panyangara HC III at Ushs 12,955,134 by Elegu Enterprises Limited was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 15th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
2. Voucher no. 6435983 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of a Water Borne Toilet at Bus Park Kotido Municipal Council at Ushs 20,947,314 by Oleez Mechanic Enterprise was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
3. Voucher no. 6441638 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of \$ Stance Pit Latrine in Panyangara HC III at Ushs 14,944,151 by Bladina Memorial Enterprise was certified by MHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 15th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 15th June 2023 was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within the timeline.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

Project: Construction of OPD ward at Panyangira HCIII

Procurement ref: KMC/wrks/2022-2023/100001 had the following documents there in;

- Signed works contract dated 7th November, 2022 with Kogated Technical Services Limited

- Evaluation report dated 12th October, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 18th October, 2022.

- Project: Construction of 4-stance VIP latrine for staff at Panyangira HCIII

Project ref: KMC/wrks/2022-2023/200004 I, with these documents therein

- Signed works contract dated 9th May, 2023 with Ms. Bladina Memorial Enterprises

- Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th April, 2023

Project: Construction of 4-stance VIP latrine for Maternity ward at Panyangira HCIII

- Signed contract dated 9th May, 2023 with Bladina Memorial

- Evaluation report dated 19th April, 2023

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th April, 2023

Environment and Social Safeguards

Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0

There were no recorded grievances in the Health sector since none were observed throughout the project implementation in the previous FY.

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 no evidence on disseminated guidelines on healthcare/medical waste management to health facilities that was availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality had a functional system for medical waste management such as an incinerator, placenta pits, and coded bins in all its health units.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no records on conducted training(s) and created awareness in health care waste management that were availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for the construction of a VIP latrine for staff at Panyangara HCIII at a total BoQ costed at 23,828,175 and with Bill No 1. Preliminaries for environment and social safeguards costed at UGX. 700,000</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no proof of land ownership for health construction projects availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Monitoring report for the construction of an OPD in Panyaranga HCIII dated 19th April, 2023 2) Monitoring report for the construction of a VIP latrine for staff at Panyangara HCIII dated 19th April, 2023 3) Monitoring report for the Construction of a latrine for patients at Panyangara HCIII dated 19th April, 2023 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The environment Officer and CDO completed and signed the certification forms prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Final payment certificate No. 1 issued on 13th June, 2023 for the construction of a 4 stance latrine for maternity ward at Panyanagara HCIII 2) Interim payment certificate No. 2 issued on 24th January, 2023 for the construction of OPD at Panyangara HCIII 3) Completion certificate No. 3 issued on 4th April, 2023 for the construction of OPD at Panyangara HCIII 	2

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

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

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

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
Investment Management				
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 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</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	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	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	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	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	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	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	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

The water
management
for the
Municipality
was under the
National Water
and Sewerage
Cooperation,
management
hence this
indicator not
applicable.

0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0

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

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0
Investment Management				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.</p>	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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 municipality did not implement the MIS program and was not eligible for assessment.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Principal Finance Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Lokwang Aron was substantively appointed as Senior Planner on 30th November 2021 under Minute No. 6/DSC/KTD/NOVEMBER/2021(12).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Principal Engineer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Senior Veterinary Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Lemukol Lilly was substantively appointed as Principal CDO on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD//2019B(58).	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 MC had neither substantively appointed a /Principal Commercial Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Hassan Mohamed Lamwar was substantively appointed as Municipal Procurement Officer on 23rd February 2018 under Minute No. 29/DSC/KTD//2018.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The MC customised staff structure did not provide for a Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer.	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. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	Ngorok Emmanuel Noding was substantively appointed as Senior Human Resource Officer on 29th September 2020 under Minute No. 05/DSC/KTD/SEP/2020(2).	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 MC had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</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>Lokawa Mauro Innocent was substantively appointed as Physical Planner on 3rd March 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(56).</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>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC had neither substantively appointed a Senior Accountant nor was there a seconded staff. The previous Senior Treasurer Akengo Florence retired on 31st July 2023.</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>Akello Deo Nyanga was substantively appointed as Senior Internal Auditor on 30th November 2021 under Minute No. 6/DSC/KTD/NOVEMBER2021(13).</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>The MC had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0

2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG	a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).	The LG had substantively appointed one out of four Senior Assistant Town Clerks. Ekemem Patrick Longoli as Senior Assistant Town Clerk- South Division on 30th November 2021 under Minute No. 6/DSC/KTD/NOVEMBER/2021(1).	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG	b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The MC had substantively appointed all the four Community Development Officers as below; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Erabu Josephine Ruth, Community Development Officer- North Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(63) 2. Kiyonga Isa Safiyah, Community Development Officer- South Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(60) 3. Lemu Anol Richard, Community Development Officer- West Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(61) 4. Anguyo Henery, Community Development Officer- Central Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(59) 	5
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The MC had substantively appointed all the four Division Treasurers as below; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awor Immaculate, Division Treasurer - Central Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(27) 2. Akello Joyce, Division Treasurer - North Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(26) 3. Langol Denis, Division Treasurer - West Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(25) 4. Owiny Ben, Division Treasurer - South Division on 3rd May 2019 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(24) 	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 100% to Natural Resources as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	The Warranted amount was UGX 94,440,124 The actual received by the LG from MoFPED by 30th June 2023 was UGX 75,334,935 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 18). Actual transfer by LG was UGX 75,334,935 (UGX 75,334,935 /75,334,935 *100=100%.	
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the MC released 100% for community-based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	The warranted amount was UGX 143,907,145. The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 83,738,677 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 18). Actual transfer to the department was UGX 83,738,677 (UGX 83,738,677/UGX 83,738,677)*100=100%	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out by the Environment Officer and CDO for the construction of a water borne toilet at Kotido Central Bus park prepared on 24th November, 2022. And a costed ESMP prepared at UGX. 400,000 on 25th November, 2022.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The project that was implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning</p>	4
---	---	--	--	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the construction of a water borne toilet at Kotido Central Bus park was incorporated into the BoQs at total cost of UGX. 33,912,375 and Bill No. 1, Element A and B for environmental mitigation costed at UGX. 1,543,000</p>	4
---	---	---	--	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG obtained Unqualified audit opinion on its operations for the previous FY.</p>	10
---	--	--	---	----

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>MC provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 2nd November, 2023. The submission date was after the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC submitted an annual performance contract on 30th June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 28th August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kotido Municipality submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 05th July 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 5th July 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 5th July 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 11th August 2023.</p> <p>From the above submission dates the MC submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

Education Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Principal Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Okengo Denis was substantively appointed as a Municipal Inspector of Schools on 3 May 2023b under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019B(35). 2. The MC had neither substantively appointed a Senior Inspector of Schools nor was there a seconded staff. 	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education sector projects was carried out as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation of a classroom block at Kotido Girls primary school prepared on 23rd November, 2022 2. Renovation of boys' dormitory at Lomukura Primary school prepared on 24th November, 2022 3. Rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block at Kotido Army primary school prepared on 24th November, 2022 	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	The projects that were implemented in the Education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they were categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

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

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The MC had neither substantively appointed a Principal Medical Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	Awar Calisto was substantively appointed as Principal Health Inspector on 3rd May 2023 under Minute no. 18/DSC/KTD/2019(13).	20
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	Acheng Dorcus was substantively appointed as Health Educator on 3rd May 2023 under Minute no. 18/DSC/KTD/2019(32)	20

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for all Health sector projects as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a patients' kitchen at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 2. Construction of a Drugstore at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 3. Construction of a 2 stance latrine for OPD at Panyangara HCIII prepared on 25th October, 2023 	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The projects that were implemented in the Health sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they were categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	n/a	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	n/a	0

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator was not applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator was not applicable.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator was not applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator was not applicable.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	n/a	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.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator was not applicable.	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.	Not applicable	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.	Not applicable	0
---	---	--	----------------	---

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable	0
---	---	--	----------------	---