



LGMSD 2022/23

Nabilatuk District

(Vote Code: 623)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	68%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	45%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	67%
Educational Performance Measures	60%
Health Performance Measures	69%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	82%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	61%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The evidence provided indicated the following the district only had one project implemented using DDEG funding and it was completed and being utilised.</p> <p>Completion of Fencing District headquarters at Ushs 58,800,000 (Budget page 45 and Q4 report(page 65)</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The average score for the current year was 80%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 77%</p> <p>Percentage change was 3%</p>	2
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 completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>- Completion of Fencing District headquarters at Ushs 58,800,000 (Budget page 45 and Q4 report(page 65).</p>	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 LG budgeted Ugx 73,600,000 and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementation guideline as indicated below; - Completion of Fencing District headquarters at Ushs 58,800,000 (Budget page 45 and Q4 report(page 65) The balance of Ugx 14,800,000 catered for retention as per annual work plan on page 45	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was only one DDEG funded project implemented in the district, it was + 3.59% variation which complied with +/-20% allowable. This was completion of a chain link fence at Nabilatuk District Headquarter, procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023. Estimated cost: Ugx 58,800,000/= Contract cost: Ugx 56,684,250/= Variation: Ugx 2,115,750/= %age variation (2,115,750/58,800,000) x100% 3.59%	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	The information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, Nabilatuk Town Council, Natirae Sub County and Lolachat Sub county were sampled. For instance in Natirae Sub County the following staff were present: 1. Losike Agatha Florence- Senior Assistant Secretary 2. Lomongin Christine- Parish Chief 3. Akol emmanuel - Animal Husbandry Officer 4. Kagal Mark- Parish Chief 5. Aleper Moses- Assistant Agricultural Officer 6. Ngilo Tony- Community Development Officer	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>The LG provided evidence that the infrastructure constructed using DDEG was in place as per reports produced by the Planner dated 14th June 2023 with Ref; CR/209/1 endorsed by the District Engineer.</p> <p>The one infrastructure project completed in FY 2022/2023 was.</p> <p>1. Completion of Fencing District headquarters at Ushs 58,800,000 Annual Budget Performance Report on page 65</p>	2															
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs 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 District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="783 678 1075 936"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">DLG IVA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Lolachat S/C</td> <td>86</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Natirea S/C</td> <td>79</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kosike S/C</td> <td>79</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nabilatuk T/C</td> <td>70</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The performance of three (Natirea, Kosike and Nabilatuk) LLGs was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.</p>		DLG IVA		Lolachat S/C	86	86	Natirea S/C	79	33	Kosike S/C	79	91	Nabilatuk T/C	70	90	0
	DLG IVA																		
Lolachat S/C	86	86																	
Natirea S/C	79	33																	
Kosike S/C	79	91																	
Nabilatuk T/C	70	90																	
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>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0															
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>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0															

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 staffing requirements dated 25th September 2023 were consolidated but submitted late to MoPS on 23rd October 2023.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had not conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance. Whereas the biometric system is in place, the IT officer was taken up by the OPM projects in the communities thus no analytical reports had been drawn from the system for this FY.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG provided only two appraisals for HODs at the time of assessment as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Korobe Paeter Raymond, DEO was appraised on 14th July 2023 by the CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku 2. Lupot Simon Peter, DPO was appraised on 4th September 2023 by the CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku <p>The HR department did not provide appraisals for the rest of the 7 HODs sat the time of assessment.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Nabilatuk DLG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The committee is comprised of Anyakun Paul Jovic, PAS- Chairperson; Korobe Raymond, DEO- Member; Dr. Lokwang Peter, DHO- Member; Angella Becky, PHRO- Secretary; and Longolio John, Town Clerk- Member. 2. The committee sat on 6th January 2023 and from the minutes; Abura Esther a Parish Chief was recommended to be laid off due to abscondment; Domos William, Nursing Assistant was given a reprimand or warning letter for drinking and absenteeism; and Abura Moses was also reprimanded for absenteeism. 	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>Nabilatuk DLG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress on 1st November 2021 in a letter by the CAO Ref CR/202/1 which is functional as evidenced by the issues recorded and addressed in the physical grievances register. The committee was comprised of Akudo Evalyne- Grievance Focal Person; Angella Becky- Secretary; Korobe Raymond- Member; Lokwang Peter-Member; and Lokut Paul -Member.</p>	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>There was no staff recruited by Nabilatuk LG in the FY given the ban on recruitment.</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>There was no retiree in Nabilatuk DLG in the previous FY.</p>	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	Nabilatuk S/C received Ushs 48,320,063	
			Lolachat S/C received Ushs 56,502,792	
			Lorengedwat S/C received Ushs 25,660,199	
			Kosike S/C received Ushs 7,249,059	
			Natirae S/C received Ushs 7,249,059	
			Nabilatuk T/C received Ushs 16,251,663	
			The total transfers to all the LLGs in the LG added up to Ushs 161,232,835 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two installments dated:	
			Quarter 2 paid on 17th October 2022;	
			Quarter 3 paid on 01th January 2023 respectively.	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	There was evidence that the LG did not do timely warranting of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG	
			Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022, warranted on 18th October 2022, warrant was 14 days late.	
			Quarter 3: Release was on 01st February 2023, warranted on 12th February 2023 which was not within the time limit day.	
			Quarter 4: There was no development fund.	

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 as shown below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17 October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 1st January 2023 and the communication was made on 1st January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 LG didn't receive the development fund.</p> <p>Depending on the quarter two the communication was not within the timeline as per the guidelines.</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 LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Q 1 - from 4th October to 6th October 2022</p> <p>Q 2 - 20nd December 2022</p> <p>Q 3 - from 14th April 2023 to 16th April 2023</p> <p>Q 4 - between 6th June 2023 to 9th June 2023</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 LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the District Planner Iriama Charles Lorot and were as below;</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <p>Q 1-Discussed on 27th October 2022- TPC-MIN.04/October 2022-23/NDLG</p> <p>Q 2-Discussed on 25th January 2023 - TPC- Min 04/January 2022-23/NDLG</p> <p>Q 3-Discussed on 26th April 2023 -TPC MIN 06/April 2022-23/NDLG</p> <p>Q 4-Discussed on 12nd July 2023 -TPC- MIN 04/July 2022-23/NDLG</p>	2

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>Nabilatuk LG produced a print copy of the assets register duly reconciled up to June 2023. A soft copy of the register updated with entries of August 2023. The items were categorized into Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment, Machinery, Buildings specialized, among others</p>	2
		<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>		
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>The District provided the Board of Survey for FY 2022/2023 (BoS) dated 31st July 2023, submitted and acknowledged by the Accountant General's Office with date stamped 24th October 2023. BoS was signed by the Accounting Officer, the Committee Chairperson Mr Kezi Charles Lowot, and other three committee members on the Board of Survey who witnessed the physical stock of inventories. The copy of the same was received by the Accountant General's office stamp. The BoS report included the following items; Cash balances and bank reconciliations; District land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment; ICT equipment, office equipment; medical equipment, and machinery. BoS also showed Assets Management decisions on recommending the disposal of existing assets (page 4).</p>	1
		<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The report had the following Annexes;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow-up on the previous recommendations FY 2021/2022. 2. Report on the Board of Survey on cash, cashbooks, and bank balances. 3. Bank reconciliations. 4. Assets and items recommended for disposal 5. Bank certificates and balances duly stamped by the bank. 6. Bank reconciliation statements. 	

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref CR/201/2 dated 27th October 2022.</p> <p>The committee held all the quarterly meetings as per the minutes of the meetings availed to the Assessment team;</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting was held on 31st August 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting was held on 17th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting was held on 20th January 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting was held on 11st May 2023.</p> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows</p> <p>Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 were submitted on 28th June 2023, Quarter 3 was submitted on 09th May 2023 and Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to Ministry on 26th June 2023</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. For the DDEG project was desk appraised on 4nd April 2023 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP and availability of funds in the Approved budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at Sakale HC II - Construction of 2 stance Pit latrine at Sakale HC II - Construction of Staff house ar Sakale HC II. <p>T2he project was derived from the DDP III page 59 under human capital development.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility,</p> <p>(ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects The project field appraisal was conducted on 27th April 2023 and were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at Sakale HC II - Construction of 2 stance Pit latrine at Sakale HC II - Construction of Staff house ar Sakale HC II. <p>The project was appraised by the District Planner, District Environment officer, District Water Officer and other technical team. The project was recommended for funding to improve on the service delivery at the district Headquarters.</p>
----	---	--	--

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>Evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HoDs from different departments and discussed under TPC Min 06/DTPC/03/2023 Presentation of Project Profile with presentation derived from Annual Work plans and Draft Budget Estimates for the FY 2023/24.</p> <p>The projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a two two-unit Stance latrines at Sakale HC II. 2. Construction of a 3 Stance pit latrine at Sakale HC III 3. Construction of a staff house at Sakale HC II 4. Construction of a 3-unit teacher's house at Napohgae Primary School. 5. Rehabilitation of Nakudep piped water system 6. Construction of Waterborne latrine at Nabilatuk Town Council. 7. Desilting of Namata Alopeilap Dam 8. Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes 9. Drilling of 3 boreholes.
----	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no projects in the current FY that were screened for environmental and social risks/impact using checklists although they had been approved for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a three stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII at a cost of UGX. 22,500,000 2. Construction of a two stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII at a cost of UGX. 21,500,000 	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>The consolidated approved procurement plan date 27th September, 2023, signed by the CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku ,submitted to PPDA on 29th September 2023. It had DDEG items as construction of a two unit staff house at Sakale HCII, phase one fencing at Nabilatuk subcounty headquarters and renovation of staff quarters at Lorengedwat subcounty.</p>	1
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 Contracts Committee minutes to show that the DDEG infrastructure projects and their respective bidding documents were approved before commencement.</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 no evidence availed in form of a letter written and signed by CAO establishing a project implementation team for DDEG projects in the FY 20232024.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DDEG project implemented followed technical designs as provided by LG Engineer. This observed when the site at District headquarter was inspected. It was established that the chain link was of G.10, fixed onto the angles with plain wire G10 in three rows at height of 0,7m from each row anchored into concrete 200mm wide, and 2.1M high, with angle irons 65 x 65 x 6mm also anchored in concrete with three rows of barbed wire on top..</p>	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	The was evidence that LG provided supervision by relevant technical officers for the infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works payment. This was in a reported dated 14th June 2023 by liko Elijah the supervisor of works. And also, from the site visitors' book from were it was observed that on 3rd May,2023 the Supervisor of works, liko Elijah, the senior community development officer, Aburi George William and district planner, Iriama Charles Lorot visited the site.	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	There was evidence to show that the LG verified works and initiated payment of contractors within two months, a claim of Ugx 56,684,250/= raised on 8th June, 2023 by the contractor M/s UTOKOI Enterprises limited for completion of chain link fence at the District Headquarters. The District Engineer certified it on 14th June, 2023 and was paid Ugx 52,711,476/= on 28th June, 2023 under voucher No 6440069. Which was within the two months' time as required and they therefore complied.	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	There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each contract with all records as required by PPDA law. The project file reviewed was; Project: Completion of chain link fence at Nabilatuk District headquarters Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00007: It had the following documents therein. 1. Evaluation report dated 25th November, 2022 2. Contracts Committee minutes dated 30th september, 2022 3. signed works contract dated 25th January, 2023 with Namotot General Enterprises limited. 4. PP1 form, call of bids, issue of bids, receipt of bids, letters of bid acceptance, supervision reports, payment and completion certificates among the documents of file.	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0	The District i) designated Ms. Akudo Evalyne the Communications Officer with an appointment letter issued on 10th June, 2019 as the focal personal for grievances handling to coordinate response to feedback and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprising of members from different departments with a appointments letters issued on 1st December, 2021 and these included Korobe Raymond the District Education Officer, Lokut Paul the Probation Officer, Angella becky the Princial Human Resources Officer, Dr. Peter Lokwang the District Health Officer	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	The LG had a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with complaints recorded on 22 June, 2023 for non-payment contractors from the respective departments of health, education for the constructed pit latrines and the case is being handled the district respective heads of departments together with the Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Finance Officer	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	The LG did not publicize the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the DDP III showed that environment and climate change have been integrated on page 63 and this includes tree planting, protection of wetland, the greening of institutions on page and climate-smart agricultural practices on page 64 of LG DDPII, page 43 of approved budget. Social issues captured under community and mindset change on page 17 and 18 of annual work plan.	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines. A meeting held on 30th March 2023 in the District Headquarters' Board Room under MIN no 07/DTPC/03/2023 Presentation of enhanced DDEG guidelines for FY 2023/24 to LLGs and departments.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	A costed Environment and Social Management Plan (ESMP) that was prepared on 1st March, 2023 was integrated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects for the completion of fencing of Nabilatuk district headquarters at UGX. 56, 684,250 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at 300,000 and 200,000	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There was no evidence of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change because they were not planned and or approved as of the LG project list.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was proof of land ownership, access and availability for projects implemented at the district for example, 1. The Construction of a 4 stance pit latrine with shelter at Nabilatuk health centre VI (town council) is secured on land where the LG has proof of ownership with certificate of title for Plot 103, Block 7 at Camp Swahili for Nabilatuk Health centre IV issued on 6th September, 2023 with instrument No. MOR-00000671 2 fencing of Nabilatuk district headquarters certificate of title for Plot 100, Block 7 at Loteede, District headquarters issued on 22nd October, 2020 with instrument No. MOR-00000061	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example, 1. Environment and social monitoring report for projects implemented in Lolachat sub-county prepared on 20th July, 2023 2. Report on environmental screening of irrigation sites prepared on 15th June, 2023 3. Environment and social monitoring report for construction of construction 2 classroom block at Kosike primary school prepared on 27th March, 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	There were inconsistencies in completion and signing of certificates prior to payments of contractors for example, 1. payment certificate No. 2 issued on 6th June, 2023 for the construction of classroom block at Cucu primary school that was not signed by the environment Officer 2. payment certificate No. 1 issued on 17th April, 2023 for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine with urinals and a disability provision in Lorengedwat sub-county that was signed by the DCDO and Environment Officer 3. payment certificate No. 1 issued on 15th may, 2023 for the construction of a 4 unit staff house at Acegeretolim was signed by both the DCDO and the Environment Officer	0

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations. However they were not up to date as per the sampled accounts presented at the time of assessment were reconciled up to 30th June 2023.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 7th November 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 2nd February 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 19th June 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 20th July 2023</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows: Q 1 on 21st August 2023: Q 2 on 30th March 2023, Q 3 on 21st August 2023 and Q 4 on 21st 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>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for FY 2022/2023 by LG were submitted to CAO, LGPAC, Accountant Officer and RDC/LCV Chair through the Registry on the following dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 7th November 2022 submitted on 21st August 2023 - discussed on 16th May 2023, under MIN 4/05/16/LGDPAC/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 2 report dated 2nd February 2023, submitted on 30th March/2023-discussed on 17th May 2023, under, MIN 4/05/17/LGDPAC/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 dated 19th June 2023, submitted on 21st August 2023 - discussed on 18th May 2023 under MIN 3/05/18/LGPAC/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 dated 20th July 2023, submitted on 21st August 2023 - discussed on 22nd June 2023 under MIN 4/06/22/LGPAC/2023.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	----------

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 23,170,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 48) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 276,045,004 which gave a variance of Ushs (252,875,004) this indicate that Nabilatuk District local Government over collected local revenue which shows good performance.</p> <p>$(276,045,004/23,170,000) \times 100\% = 839\%$</p> <p>The LG managed to correct 839% of its planned revenue which indicates that LG underestimated there potential to correct 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 33 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 21,578,668</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 276,045,004</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 276,045,004- Ushs 21,578,668= Ushs 254,466,336</p> <p>= (254,466,336/21,578,668) x 100= 1179%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 increased by 1179%.</p>	2
----	--	--	---	---

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of draft Draft Accounts page 48 that total LST collected was UGX 31,051,000. This collection was by Nabilatuk town council and Lolachat sub county. A review of the payment vouchers showed that the district remitted UGX 6,500,000 on voucher No.1161 to Nabilatuk TC and UGX 4,000,000 to Lolachat s/c with a voucher no 1162.</p> <p>As per the percentage= UGX 10,500,000/ UGX 31,051,000x100=33%</p> <p>The district remitted 33%</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG publicised information to citizens on awarded contracts and amounts this was observed from one document on file that had been removed from the notice board it read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder Notice</p> <p>PROCUREMENT REF: NABI900/WRKS/22-23/00003</p> <p>Subject of procurement: DRILLING OF 3 PRODUCTION WELLS</p> <p>METHOD OF PROCUREMENT: OPEN BIDDING</p> <p>NAME OF BIDDER: KRL(U) LTD</p> <p>TOTAL CONTRACT PRICE: 130,968,495/=</p> <p>DISPLAY DATE: 20TH DECEMBER,2022</p> <p>REMOVAL DATE: 4TH JANUARY,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>A copy of the Performance Assessment results at the notice board showed that the district displayed a copy of the results of the assessments on the notice board. The DLG was ranked No. 56 and it was backed up with a meeting dated on 17th August 2023 under minute no 5/DTPC/08/2023.</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>A review of monitoring and feedback report to local leaders including Parish Councillors on the status of project implementation in the district held from 26th June 2023 to 29th June 2023 proved that the LG gave feedback. One of the objectives of the of the activity was to communicate to the local leaders achievements made by the district to the people, to give feedback on future plans in relation to developmental government priorities and report back.</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 LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal dated 13th August 2022 with ref CR/108/1 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>Reviewed records indicated there were no IGG recommendations about alleged cases of fraud and corruption during FY 2022/2023.</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 190</p> <p>Total absentees were 05</p> <p>Total that sat were (190- 5) =185</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 5+103+51=159</p> <p>Pass rate =(159/185)x 100 =85.92</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 263</p> <p>Total absentees were 69</p> <p>Total that sat were (263- 69) =194</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 7+103+43=153</p> <p>% pass rate= (153/194) x 100</p> <p>=78.8</p> <p>% Decline = 78.8- 85.9= -7.1</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was=71</p> <p>Total absentees were =00</p> <p>Total that sat were = 71</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 05+7+23 =35</p> <p>Pass rate = 35/71x 100 =49</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 207</p> <p>Total absentees were =3</p> <p>Total that sat were (207- 3) =204</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= 2+23+74=99</p> <p>% pass rate= 99/204x 100</p> <p>= 48.5</p> <p>% Decline= 48.5- 49= -0.5</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>The average score of education LLG performance increased by 49% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 70%.</p>	2
Maximum 2 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 	<p>The average score for the previous financial year was 47%</p>	<p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>$= (0.70 - 0.47/0.47) * 100\% = 49\%$</p>	
	<p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>The Education LLG performance assessment for the current year increased by 49% from the previous year's performance.</p>		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>DLG did receive a Sector Development Grant of Ugx 373,156,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Cucu Primary school at Ugx 96,578,000 page 29 of Quarter four report. 2. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kosike Primary school at 96,578,000 page 29 of Quarter four report. 3. Construction of Teacher's house at Acegetolin Primary school at Ugx 140,000,000 page 29 of Quarter four report. 	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of certificates that were assessed but inconsistently approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. payment certificate No. 2 issued on 6th June, 2023 for the construction of classroom block at Cucu primary school that was not signed by the environment Officer 2. payment certificate No. 1 issued on 15th March, 2023 for the construction of 4 unit staff house at Acegeretolim primary school that was signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO 3. payment certificate No. 1 issued on 25th April, 2023 for the a 2 classroom block at Kosike primary school signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO 	0
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three projects were sampled and reviewed. Two were within variation of +/-20% at -12.76%, while the third was outside the variation of +/-20% at -20.61%. The projects were;

Project 1: Construction of four units teachers house at Achegetolim primary school

Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00002.

Project 2: Construction of two classroom block at Cucu primary school

Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00005

Project 3: Construction of 3 stance V.I.P latrine at Nataparenga primary school

Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00013

Project: One

Estimated cost: Ugx 140,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 150,000,000/=

Variation: Ugx -10,000,000/=

%age variation $(-10,000,000/140,000,000) \times 100\%$

-7,14%

Project: two

Estimated cost: Ugx 75,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 84,573,194/=

Variation Ugx - 9,573,194/=

%age variation $(-9,573,194/75,000,000) \times 100\%$

-12.76%

Project: Three

Estimated cost: Ugx 18,500,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 22,314,000/=

Variation Ugx -3,814,000/=

%age variation $(-3,814,000/18,500,000) \times 100\%$

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 that was being implemented in the district in the FY 2022/23</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>Nabilatuk LG Teacher's list was 222 teachers posted in the 16 UPE schools</p> <p>$\frac{16}{222} \times 100$</p> <p>16</p> <p>= 100%</p> <p>This implied that the LG was 100% compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.</p>	3

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

The LG Consolidated Assets register for Nabilatuk LG 2022/2023 that captured assets for 16 registered and 3 Secondary schools was in place signed by the DEO on 22nd June, 2022

This implies that 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format. The assessment further verified this from the 3 sampled Primary Schools of; Acegeretolim, Lokaala and Lolachat where assets registers tallied with those at the DEO's office.

Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;

Total schools that complied X 100

Total (UPE & USE)

19 X 100

19

= 100%

However, there is an issue with a shortage of desks relative to the number of learners in these schools. For example:

The school structures are available, but most require renovations

There is an insufficient number of classrooms to accommodate primary one children, particularly in Natapararengan Primary School, Sakale Primary School among others therefore the basic standards are met but compromised especially in line with the basic furniture for learners.

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

• Else score: 0

On 2nd November 2023, the DLG teacher deployment list dated 23rd August, 2023 differed from the teacher lists found in the sampled schools. On average, for each school visited, only 35% teachers matched the deployment list.

For instance:

At Lokaala Primary School taken as rural out of the 17 teachers in the head teacher's office, only Zachary Moruye, Susan Adeke, and Ritah Kibone matched the deployment list.

Acegeretolim Primary School taken as urban had only Martin Opeje, Juventine Eilar, Joyce Alubo, Kevin Wasike, Christine Aluja, and John Lokiku (6 out of 18) teachers matching the list.

Lolachat Primary School taken as semi-urban had James Oriang, Annet Abarteka, and Betty Akori (3 out of 21) teachers matching the list. The duty roster displayed in the headteacher's office collaborated these findings.

0

5

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

• Else score: 0

Evidence indicated that the DLG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 16 UPE schools and 3 USE schools. However, in the sampled schools, certain information did not align with the records, as exemplified below:

Lokaala Primary School, had 8 classes, 13 latrine stances (instead of 5), 89 desks (instead of 60), and 8 housing units.

Acegeretolim Primary School, had 8 classes, 18 latrine stances (instead of 9) in the DEO'S list, 91 desks (instead of 121) found in the DEO'S list and 18 housing units (instead of 4) that was written in the DEO'S LG list.

Lolachat Primary School, EMIS 7344, featured 8 classes, 10 latrine stances, 103 desks (instead of 60) found in the DEO's LG list and 8 housing units.

During the assessment, it was observed that the aforementioned infrastructure in the three visited schools did not match the information recorded in the DLG's register.

0

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that Head teachers in the schools visited compiled and submitted copies of annual Budget performance reports such as;</p> <p>Acegeretolim taken as urban primary school had budgets for term I & II report dated 14th July 2023 with clear cash flow statements and signed by the SMC chairperson Rev fr: Clement Otim.</p> <p>- Lokaala primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC dated 21st June 2023 basically for term 2 2023 and annual budget report dated 2023/2024</p> <p>- Lolachat primary school had annual report dated 16th February 2023 approved by 09 members of the SMC for term I, 11 & 111 2023 fully signed by the chairperson SMC.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence adduced to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.</p> <p>At schools visited, there were inspection feedback reports that pointed out recommendations of inspections signed by the Inspector and Headteachers where the Headteachers were agreeing to implement the recommendations.</p> <p>From the sampled and visited Schools; Acegeretolim , Lokaala dated 27th, September, 2023 and Lolachat primary school the Headteachers possessed SIPs and implementation was evident for example provision of 4 hand washing facilities , organising health parades for e.g. washrooms for girls , providing facilities that address the needs of boys and girls with special needs, child friendly staff such as senior men and women that conduct regular guidance and counselling at Acegeretolim primary school, responding to child rights violation and timely intervention, regular mobilisation of children to go back to school through SMC meeting and demarcating of walk ways at Lolachat primary school.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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 LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all the 16 primary and 3 secondary registered schools from the previous FY.</p> <p>The submission via email was on 30th November from Assajja Abraham the district inspector of schools..</p> <p>The %age of schools was;</p> $\frac{19}{19} \times 100 = 100\%$	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 LG had budgeted for head teachers and a minimum of 07 teachers per school, as captured from the DEO’s list dated 1st August 2023, which presented 222 primary teachers posted in the 16 UPE schools. Further assessment through school visits confirmed this. For instance,</p> <p>Acegeretolim Primary School (urban) had 18 teachers, with its head teacher being Sister Nassiwa Francis.</p> <p>Lolachat Primary School (semi-urban) had 21 teachers, with its head teacher being Rev. Omukat Godfrey.</p> <p>Lokaala Primary School (rural) had 17 teachers, with the head teacher being Logeli Tadius.</p> <p>For 2023/2024 UGX: 2,191,953,000 has been budgeted to cater for primary education</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 DLG had deployed 222 primary school teachers for the 16 UPE schools which is less than the number by 16.9% required to meet the education sector guidelines.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>Acegeretolim Primary School taken as Urban had 18 teachers.</p> <p>Lokaala Primary School taken as Rural had 17 teachers.</p> <p>Lolachat Primary School taken as Semi-urban had 21 teachers.</p> <p>$\frac{222}{267} \times 100 = 83.1\%$</p> <p>267</p> <p>creating a deficit of 16.9%.</p>	0
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,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The teacher deployment data had been disseminated and is clearly publicized on LG notice board.</p> <p>The LG staff list for 2023, dated June 20, 2023, which includes 222 primary school teachers and 44 secondary school teachers, was discovered posted on the LG Education notice board. The acknowledgment stamp from the DEO is dated August 1, 2023. Additionally, the Head teachers at the visited schools had also displayed their respective staff lists for the calendar year 2023 on the walls of their offices.</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 copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>All 16 primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longoli Scholastica, Head Teacher Kosike Primary School was appraised by SAS on 28th March 2023. 2. Omocat Godfrey, Head Teacher Lolachat Primary School was appraised by SAS on 15th February 2023. 3. Nasiwa Francis, Head Teacher Acegetolim Primary School was appraised by SAS on 7th March 2023. 4. Achia Mary Lorot, Head Teacher Lokaala Primary School was appraised by SAS on 15th February 2023 5. Lokol Mark, Head Teacher Cucu Primary School was appraised by SAS on 15th February 2023 6. Teria Hector Etori, Head Teacher Nabilatuk Township Primary School was appraised by SAS on 15th February 2023 7. Koriang Rehema, Head Teacher Nakuri Primary School was appraised by SAS on 20th February 2023 	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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisal report for secondary school head teachers at the time of assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was evidence from the LG HR department that appraisals form some of the education management staff were conducted in the previous FY as below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Korobe Peter Raymond, DEO was appraised on 14th July 2023 by the CAO Olaboro Emmy 2. Nakiru Hellen Lokeres, Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th July 2023 by the CAO Olaboro Emmy 3. Asaaja Abraham John, Inspector of Schools was appraised on 25th July 2023 by the CAO Olaboro Emmy <p>The appraisals for the Sports Officer, Senior Education Officer, and Education Officer were not provided at the time off assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level as prepared by the SEO Loteng Simon Peter and Approved by the DEO Korobe Peter Raymond.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The DIS prepared the Education department training plan dated 16th february, 2022 was in place. 2. Activities like training on management of schools and governance, support supervision of teaching and learning , strategies to attract students & retaining them in school, training of the SMCs and BoGs in the 3rd Quarter plus the training on use of the TELA system. 	2

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment noted from DEO, that the LG was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data. Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment data.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Nabilatuk LG made allocations of UGX 18,762,000 to Education Department monitoring and inspection captured on page 26 of 47 of LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023 This was in line with sector guidelines (page 18 and 21 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4,000,000 per LG</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 11st August, 2022 which was not within the timeline. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 8th November, 2022 after 36 days. • 3rd Quarter was released on 2nd January 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 9 days which was not within the timeline. • 4th Quarter was released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 19th April, 2023 after 8 days which was not within the timeline. 	0

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 however the release letter was not presented at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 1st January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds were released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 18th April 2023 which was not within 5 days.</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> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>For the FY 2022/2023, the Education department prepared an inspection Plan dated 16th February, 2022 was in place and was signed by the DEO and DIS. The plan prioritized to inspect the Government Schools (16 Primary and 3 Secondary).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow up inspection reports for primary schools for term one 2023 dated 8th June 2023. All the 19 government aided. 2. Inspection report in primary schools and secondary schools checking the asset register dated 22nd June, 2023. All the 16 Primary Schools were inspected and 3 secondary Schools hence 100% 3. Full inspection report for primary schools for term 2 2023 dated 22nd August 2023. All the 16 primary schools and 3 secondary schools were inspected. $19/19 * 100 = 100\%$. 	2

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

The reviewed inspection reports for the previous Financial Year revealed that 100% Government Schools were inspected on a termly basis though no feedback reports were left at the schools assessed.

The term II report 2022 date 25th, July, 2022 was received by DES eastern region offices on 21st, December 2022 by Seera Ann, term III report 2022 was received by DES on 14th, March 2023, term 1 report 2023 dated 27th, July 2023 was received by DES on 19th September 2023 indicated that all the 16 primary and 3 Secondary Schools were inspected .

$$\frac{19}{19} \times 100$$

$$100$$

$$= 100\%$$

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The assessment team noted that inspection reports were not discussed at both the school and the LG (Local Government) levels, as exemplified below.

At Acegeretolim Primary School, there was no file displaying recent inspection reports. The headteacher confirmed that inspectors utilized tablets and did not provide any feedback. However, the visitors' book confirmed that inspections were indeed taking place. For instance, Simon Loteng visited on 25th, March, 2023, for routine supervision but did not leave any feedback. Additionally, Asajja Abraham, the district inspector, appeared in the visitors' book on March 29, 2023, and April 12, 2023, among other dates, but did not leave any reports.

Similarly, at Lokaala Primary School, no inspection reports were available. The explanation given was the use of tablets, which, according to the school, left no tangible evidence.

In the case of Lolachat Primary School, the visitors' book indicated multiple visits by the District Education Officer (DEO). However, there were no minutes available to discuss his visits.

aking place for instance ;

Simon Loteng visited on 25,march,2023 on routine supervision but did not leave feedback.further still Asajja Abraham the district inspector appeared in the visitors book on 29,march,2023 also on 12,April 2023 among others but did not leave reports.

At Lokaala primary school equally no reports for inspection were seen giving the excuse of using tablets that leaves no evidence whatsoever.

Lolachat primary school showed that the DEO visited the school several times according to the visitors book but there were no minutes to discuss about the his visits.

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>No inspection feedback reports were found at the three sampled and visited schools, and there was no evidence of discussion and agreement on the inspection findings between the school administration and the inspectors. For example, on October 24, 2023, Inspector Loteng Simon Peter inspected Lolachat Primary School according to the visitors' book but did not provide any feedback, as confirmed by the headteacher, Rev. Omukat Godfrey. At Lokaala Primary School, the assessment team did not find a single inspection report.</p> <p>In the inspection file seen at Acegeretolim Primary School, the inspection findings were dated March 4, 2019, by DES, March 18, 2021, and the latest on March 29, 2023, and April 12, 2023, among other dates. However, no inspection feedback was left behind.</p> <p>Despite these findings, Assajja Abraham, the DIS (District Inspector of Schools), prepared and submitted all the inspection reports to DES on the dates listed below:</p> <p>The term II report 2022 date 25th, July, 2022 was received by DES eastern region offices on 21st, December 2022 by Seera Ann, term III report 2022 was received by DES on 14th, March 2023, term 1 report 2023 dated 27th, July 2023 was received by DES on 19th September 2023 .</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Council Committee responsible for the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 30th March 2023 at the District Headquarter Board where at least 12 members were present. Under Min no MIN 3/Standing committee/Social services/15/12/2022.Presentation of departments.</p> <p>Under education department major observation in the school included the following enrolment vs attendance in school issues concerning service delivery was tapped on. The monitoring visits were conducted in all schools in the district including 16 primary, community schools and the 3 secondary school.</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence indicates that the LG Education Department conducted activities to mobilize, attract, and retain children in school through the "Go Back to School" campaign, in conjunction with UNICEF.</p> <p>Sensitization meetings conducted are documented as follows:</p> <p>Community campaigns were held between January 28th and 30th, targeting Natirae Subcounty, Nabilatuk, Lorengedwat, and Nabilatuk Town Council. Community members from the mentioned areas totaled 155, as reported.</p> <p>During these meetings, discussions included the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) providing child-friendly schools with necessary facilities to enable learners to stay in school with minimal disruptions compared to staying at home.</p> <p>An example was given of Acegeretolim Primary School, where adolescent girls have been provided with safe, private, and clean bathrooms and latrines equipped with running water.</p> <p>The campaign was spearheaded by the District Education Officer (DEO) Korobe Peter Raymond and Senior Inspector of Schools Lokeris Hellen.</p>
----	---	---	--

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed inaccurate reporting on the assets of 16 primary and 3 secondary schools. The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:

1. Lokaala Primary School:

- 8 classes were reported.
- 13 latrine stances were identified (as opposed to the reported 5).
- 89 desks were counted (compared to the reported 60).
- 8 housing units were observed.

2. Acegeretolim Primary School:

- 8 classes were reported.
- 18 latrine stances were found (instead of the reported 9).
- 91 desks were present (as opposed to the reported 121).
- 18 housing units were observed (contrary to the reported 4).

3. Lolachat Primary School (EMIS 7344):

- 8 classes were reported.
- 10 latrine stances were identified.
- 103 desks were counted (as opposed to the reported 60).
- 8 housing units were observed.

During the assessment, it was noted that the infrastructure in the three visited schools did not align with the information recorded in the District Local Government's register.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG provided evidence showing desk appraisals for all sector projects in the budget. The investments were derived from the LGDP III page 61 and (Approved Budget - pages 29) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding sources. The appraisal reports are dated 5th April 2022. The appraisals were carried out by; the District Education Officer, Inspector of Schools, District Planner, District Community Development Officer, and Senior Environment Officer.</p> <p>The following projects were appraised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Cucu Primary School. 2. Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kosike Primary School. 3. Construction of Teacher's house at Acegetolin Primary School. 	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, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG provided a field appraisal for, technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs. The appraisal date was on 18th April 2022 and 19th April 2022.</p> <p>The appraisals were carried out by;</p> <p>District Planner, District Engineer, District Education officer, SCDO and Senior Environmental Officer.</p> <p>The following projects were appraised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of 2 classroom block at Cucu Primary school. - Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kosike Primary school. - Construction of Teacher's house at Acegetolin Primary school. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School planned for FY 2023/2024</p>	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 was evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the contracts committee before being implemented this was done when the contracts committee sat on 30th September, 2022 when they approved the procurement process under minute 12 NABICC/30-9/2022-2023. All projects implemented were below Ugx 200M the threshold for Solicitor General approval.	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>	There was evidence that the LG did not properly establish the project implementation team (PIT) for school construction projects within the last FY 2022/23 in a letter dated 26th January, 2023 signed by CAO, Laboro Emmy Ejuku. Kobere Peter Raymond was the only person named as the contract manager, leaving out the other members on the team such as; the project engineer, the clerk of works, the labour officer, the environment officer and the community development officer among the members of the team.	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 standard technical designs provided by MoES as was observed at Achegetolim primary school where a 4-unit staff house was constructed with the internal dimensions of the rooms as 3 x 3.1 M with the height of 2.9M from floor to ceiling, the entrance doors was made out of solid metal size 2.4 x 0.9M with PVO and the windows were of size 1x 1.5M. While CUCU primary school the internal dimensions for the classrooms were 6X8m, windows 1.2X 1.2m with burglar proof, doors 2.4X0.9m, the timber roof trusses were made from 150 x75mm, with 50 x 100mm purlins and the iron sheets G.28 pre-painted green.	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 evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY 2022-2023. This was observed in reports dated 15th March, 2023, 10th April, 2022 and 12th May, 2023 all authored by Loduk Emmanuel. While others were dated 25th April, 2023 and 23rd May, 2023 by Bullon Cyprian as supervisors of the school construction projects.	1

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 were reports dated 15th March, 2023, 10th April, 2023 and 12th May, 2023 to show that there was supervision at the various stages of construction by the technical personnel. These reports were signed only by the Engineering assistant civil without other members like the Environment officer, CDO among other technical staff.</p>	0
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 not within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voucher no. 6438726 dated 28th June 2023 for the construction of a 2 classroom Block at Cucu Primary school by Arki Timers Ltd was initiated on 6th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment. - Voucher no. 5875277 dated 15th June 2023 for the completion of a 2 classroom Block at Kosike Primary School at Ushs 72,812,549 by Bethel Contractors company Ltd Nabilatuk was initiated on 25th April 2023 and paid on 15th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment. - Voucher no. 6439526 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of a 4 Unit Teachers House at Acegeretolim at Ushs 56,050,077 by Namorotot General Enterprise L Nabilatuk was initiated on 05th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment 	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department did not timely submit by April 30th a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit as this was done on the 30th June 2022.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had a complete procurement file for each infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA law. The files reviewed were;

Project: 1 Construction of a 4-unit staff teachers house at Achegeretolim

Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00002: It had these documents.

1. a signed works contract dated 25th January, 2023 with Namorotot General enterprises limited.
2. Evaluation report dated 25th November ,2022
3. Contract committee minutes dated 30th September, 2022.
4. PP1 form, call for bid, bid receipt form, bid open forms, letters of bid acceptance, payment certificates among documents therein on the files.

Project: 2 Construction of two classroom block at Cucu primary school. The file had these documents.

Procurement ref: NABI900/WRKS/2022-2023/00005

1. a signed works contract dated 25th January ,2023 with ARKI TIMERS limited.
2. Evaluation report dated 25th November, 2022
3. Contract committee minutes dated 30th September, 2022.
4. PP1 form, call for bid, bid receipt form, bid open forms, letters of bid acceptance, payment certificates among documents therein on the files.

Project: 3 Construction of 3-stance VIP latrine at Nataparenga primary school

Procurement ref: NABI900/WRKS/2022-2923/00013. The file had these documents.

1. a signed works contract dated 25th January, 2023 with Nakobekobe Building contractors and Enterprises.
2. Evaluation report dated 25th November, 2022
3. Contract committee minutes dated 30th September, 2022.
4. PP1 form, call for bid, bid receipt form, bid open forms, letters of bid acceptance, payment certificates among documents therein on the files.

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>Grievances in the education sector were recorded, investigated and responded to for example, a complaint recorded on 22nd June, 2023 for the non-payment of 22,314,000 for the contractors meant for the construction of a pit latrine at Natarerengen primary school and the case is still being handled by the DEO, CAO, and CFO.</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 evidence of a training report for teachers that was prepared on 30th July, 2023 where 19 schools were taken through the guidelines for example, the RTRR (Reporting, Tracking, Referral and Response) guidelines.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Cucu primary school at UGX. 84,573,938 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 200,000 and 300,000 respectively was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of land ownership provided at the time of assessment on school construction projects</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow-up on recommended corrective actions for the following education projects,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment and social monitoring report for construction of a 2 classroom block at Kosike primary school prepared on 27th March, 2023 2. Environment and social monitoring report for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Cucu primary school prepared on 27th March, 2023 	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence of certificates that were assessed but inconsistently approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,

1. Payment certificate No. 2 issued on 6th June, 2023 for the construction of classroom block at Cucu primary school that was not signed by the environment Officer

2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 15th March, 2023 for the construction of 4 unit staff house at Acegeretolim primary school that was signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO

3. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 25th April, 2023 for the a 2 classroom block at Kosike primary school signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>The annual HMIS reports 107 of the 3 sampled facilities, the Annual deliveries FY 2021/22 for Nabilatuk HC IV, Lolachat HC III, and Lorengedwat HCIII were: 703, 618 and 327 respectively.</p> <p>Annual deliveries for FY2021/22 for the same facilities were: 810, 690 and 450 respectively for FY2022/3. Total deliveries for FY2021/22 was 1648, whereas that for FY2022/23 was 1950.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">% Increase $\frac{1950-1648}{1648} \times 100$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1648</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18.3%</p> <p>This represented an increase in deliveries. However, this increase was less than 20% which was the national target.</p> <p>The reason for not achieving 20% was verbally attributed to Insecurity the area people could not move at night due to cattle wrasling.</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 was 82% in 2023.</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the letter from MOH to CAO dated 7th December 2022.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG budgeted for UGX. 131,775,000 (Approved budget page 23), they received Ugx 131,775,000(ABPR, page 51) and spent UGX. 75,930,000 (ABPR. Page 51) on the following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Nabilatuk HC IV. 2. Construction of an Incinerator at Nabilatuk HC IV. <p>The unspent money of Ugx 52,500,000 was sent back to treasury.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The CFO noted that the money for the health projects was swept back to consolidated account by the ministry of Finance as per letter dated 27th September 2023 with Ref no CR/164/5 endorsed by the Ministry of Finance , Planning and Economic Development and therefore no civil works were executed and no Payment certificate was prepared. The certification works was not provided to the assessment team either.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	2
		<p>There were two health projects implemented in the FY 2022/23. Both were within +11.63% variation which is within the allowable +/-20% variation and therefore complied. The projects were.</p> <p>1. Construction of a 4- stance V.I.P latrine with two bathrooms at Nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/000010</p> <p>2. Construction of placenta pit at Nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>Project 1</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 32,500,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx 30,401,800/=</p> <p>Variation: Ugx 2,098,200</p> <p>%age variation $(2,098,200/32,500,000) \times 100\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6.45%</p> <p>Project 2</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 15,000,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx 13,255,075/=</p> <p>Variation: Ugx 1,744,925/=</p> <p>%age variation $(1,744,925/15,000,000) \times 100\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">11.63%</p>	

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	2
		<p>There was no HC upgrade project implemented in the district in FY 2022/23. OPM guided that only Consider projects on the construction of new HC IIIs and those with the upgrade of HC II to HC III. Score the LG if no such project was implemented.</p>	

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>From the Approved Costed Staff Establishment and the staff list, the deployment of health workers for Nabilatuk LG was at 75%. Required = 127 vs Actual = 95.</p>	1
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There were no health facility upgrades in the district in the year under review.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information found on the staff list</p> <p>From the DHO's office, dated 10th July, 2023 was matching with Health staff lists on the noticeboards and the same names appeared on daily attendance register from the 3 sampled Health facilities as indicated below:</p> <p>The List had 58 Staff on it.</p> <p>Attendance registers and Staff Lists from the Health facilities notice boards were verified and found the following:</p> <p>NabilatukHC IV,</p> <p>All the staffs as indicated on DHO's staff list were appearing on the Health facility Notice board and staff attendance list of 2nd Nov 2023 in the Health Centre Daily attendance register .</p> <p>Staff that appeared on the DHO's Staff list and the attendance register included:</p> <p>Dr. Elinau Francis (MO)</p> <p>Olaka Denis (EO)</p> <p>Dr. Iriama Alice MO among others</p> <p>2 staff who did not appear in the attendance register were:</p> <p>Ademun Scovia reportedly on Leave</p> <p>NAkiru Tereza on Leave</p> <p>Lolachat HC III,</p> <p>All the staffs indicated on DHO's staff list were</p>	2
---	--	--	--	----------

appearing on the Health facility Notice board and staff attendance registers

3 staff who did not appear in the attendance register were:

1. Opio Tom (CO) reportedly on Leave
2. Apian Christine (EM) reportedly on Leave
3. Logiel Mark on leave

Lorengedwat HCIII

All the staffs indicated on DHO's staff list were appearing on the Health facility Notice board and staff attendance registers and on the Facility Notice board .

Some of the staff's names found on DHO's staff list and on the Health facility Notice board and staff attendance register for 2 Nov 2023 were :

Lochomo Moses Laboratory Technichician

Aryemo Christine Enrolled Midwife

Pulukol Josephine Enrolled Midwife

Staff that were not present on on the attendance register for that day were

Musau Isaac had gone to Kampala for a meeting

Aguma Joel Laboratory Assistant was on Study Leave

Lomongin Isaac, Driver was on Leave

5

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

The ADHO reported no upgraded or Constructed Health Facility for the previous financial year

However, there was constructions work completed in Nabilatuk HCIV.

A Four stance Latrine e and two bathrooms at a cost of Ug shs 32,500,000 PHC funds ,and placenta pit constructed at a cost of Ug shs 15,000,000, completed and functional

(Annual District Budget performance report 2022/23)

2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>From documentary review, 2 out of 3 sampled Health Facilities complied to the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector of submitting Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO by March 31st of the previous FY. For instance;</p> <p>NabilatukHC IV submitted on 10th March 2023 by Dr.Einau Francis and received by DHO Dr.Peter Lokwang</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lolachat HC III submitted on 20th April,2023 by Solimo Godwin and received by Dr. Peter Lokwang • Lorengedwat HCIII submitted on 23rd March 2023 and received by Dr. Peter Lokwang <p>All their work plans and budgets were approved on their dates of submission.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that all the 3 sampled Health facilities : Nabilatuk HCIV, Lolachat HCIII and Lorengedwart HCIII submitted their Annual Budget performance reports for 2022/23 by July 15th of the previous FY 2022/23 as per the Budget and Grants Guidelines as indicated below:</p> <p>NabilatukHC IV submitted on 7th July 2022, by Health Centre in charge Dr. Einau Francis and received by DHO Dr.Peter Lokwang</p> <p>Lolachat HC III submitted on 13th July 2022 by Solimo Godwin and received by Dr. Peter Lokwang</p> <p>Lorengedwat HCIII submitted on 7th July 2022 and received by Dr. Peter Lokwang</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

All the sampled Health facilities: Nabilatuk HCIV, Lolachat HCIII and Lorengedwart HCIII submitted their facility improvement plans for 2023/24 as below;

Nabilatuk IV submitted its Facility improvement plan on 03/07/2023 and was received by Dr. Peter Lokwang on the same date.

Its plans included performance issues like training staff on use of the new HMIS tools and PHC guidelines . This was identified in the 2 quarter DHMT support supervision of the Health facility . This report was submitted on 9th December 2022 and received by DHO Dr Peter Lokwang

Lolachat HC III submitted its Facility improvement plan as submitted by Musau Isaac on 20/07/2023 and was received by Dr.Peter Lokwang on the same date. Lorachat's plan incorporated issues like Community dialogue, and strategic ordering to reduce Stockout rates. These were issues among others , which were identified in the DHT support supervision which was conducted at Lolachat Health facility on 2nd May 2023.

Lorengedwat HCIII submitted on 20/07/2023 incorporated issues like Community sensitization on Utilization of Health facilities. This issue was identified during the DHMT Support supervision of 2nd quarter DHMT support supervision on the Health facility.This report was submitted on 9th December 2022 and received by DHO Dr Peter Lokwang.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

HMIS reports were submitted as follows;

Their submission dates are indicated below:

Nabilatuk HC IV:

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted on 7th August 2022

Aug 2022 submitted on 9th Sept. 2022

Sept 2022 submitted on 13th Oct. 2022

Oct.2022 submitted on 07th Nov 2022

Nov2022 submitted on 7th Dec 2022

Dec 2022 submitted on 07th Jan 2023

Jan 2023 submitted on 07th Feb 23

Feb2023 submitted on 7th Marc 2023

Marc 2023 submitted on 6th Apr 2023

April 2023 submitted on 5th May 2023

May 2023 submitted on 7th June 2023

Jun 2023 submitted on 7th July 2023

Quarterly Reports

I. Quarter 1 submitted 5th Oct 2022

II. Quarter 2 submitted on 7th Jan,2023

III. Quarter 3 submitted on 2ndApril, 2023

IV. Quarter 4 submitted on 4th July,2023

Lolachat HC III ,

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted on 7th August 2022

Aug2022 submitted on 7th Sept. 2022

Sept2022 submitted on - 7th Oct. 2022

Oct.2022 submitted on 7th Nov 2022

Nov 2022 submitted on 7th Dec 2022

Dec 2022 submitted on 7th Jan 2023

Jan2023 submitted on 7th Feb 2023

Feb 2023 submitted on 6th Marc 2023

Marc h2023 submitted on 4th Apr 2023

Apr il 2023 submitted on 5th May 2023

May20 23 submitted on 7th June 2023

June 20 23 submitted on 7th July 2023

Quarterly Reports

Quarter 1 submitted 4th October,2022

Quarter 2 submitted on 4th Jan 2023

Quarter 3 submitted on 6th April 2023

Quarter4 submitted on 4th July 2023

Lorengedwat HCIII

Monthly reports:

July 2022 submitted 7th August 2022

Aug 2022 submitted 8th Sept. 2022

Sept submitted on 6th October 2022

Oct. 2022 submitted on 7th Nov 2022

Nov 2022 submitted on 7th Dec 2022

Dec20 22 submitted on 7th Jan 2023

Jan 2023 submitted on 7th Feb 2023

Feb 2023 submitted on 5th Marc 2023

March 20 23 submitted on 5th Apr 2023

April 2023 submitted on 5th May 2023

May 20 23 submitted on 5th June 2023

June 20 23 submitted on 7th July 2023

Quarterly Reports

Quarter 1 submitted on 4th October 2022

Quarter 2 submitted on 5th January 2023

Quarter 3 submitted on 5th April 2023

Quarter 4 submitted on 7th July 2023

Not all reports were submitted on time

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 program as per the Letter from MoH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.

0

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

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

RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the Letter from MoH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track the submission date for the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports by the DHO. He noted that the new system doesn't send email notifications compared to the previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the submission of the Approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest-performing Health facilities.</p> <p>There was a plan made by DHMT meeting that took place on 15th' and 16th August 2023, developed and approved the plan for the lowest performing Health Facilities. The plan was approved by DHO Dr Peter Lokwanga on 20th August 2023</p> <p>The lowest-performing Health facilities were Nayonai Angikalio HC II, Natirae HCII and Nabulatuk Mission HC</p> <p>Activities included: Training of Staff in Data management.</p> <p>community engagement,</p> <p>Health promotion</p> <p>Using integrated approach to manage Malaria.</p> <p>Continuous sensitization of Communities to access 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 implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the implementation of the performance improvement plan as indicated in the activities mentioned below:</p> <p>The DHMT 1st quarterly progress dated 25th October 2023, signed by DHO DR.Peter Lokwang reported three 3 days of Community engagements (19th -21st Aug 2023 in the catchment areas of the lowest performing Health Centres.The engagement involved Community Dialogue and sensitization.</p> <p>The same report mentioned a school Health activity which took place on 4th-20th August 2023 in the above mentioned Health facilities catchment areas . The program included immunization, school sensitization on adolescent Health problems.</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>Nabilatuk LG budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The Budget was UGX=1,614,2622,000 per the budget estimates of FY 2023/2024</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>From the Approved Costed Staff Establishment and the staff list, the deployment of health workers for Nabilatuk LG was at 75%. Required = 127 vs Actual = 95.</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 health workers were working where they were deployed.

A comparison of the DHO deployment list dated 10th July 2023, and the names in the facility attendance book/register in the 3 sampled Health facilities the following was observed:

Nabilatuk HC IV,

Most of the staff indicated on DHO's deployment list were appearing on the health facility Notice board and staff attendance list of 2nd Nov 2023 in the Health Centre Daily attendance register. for instance;

Dr. Elinau Francis (MO)

Olaka Denis (EO)

Dr. Iriama Alice MO among others

Staff who did not appear in the attendance register were:

Ademun Scovia reportedly on Leave

NAkuru Tereza on Leave

Lolachat HC III,

3 staff who did not appear in the attendance register were:

1. Opio Tom (CO) reportedly on Leave

2. Apian Christine(EM) reportedly on Leave

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

The LG publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY. There was also evidence on the staff list and monthly payroll at the LG notice board.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG has 5 Health Center In-charges and all were appraised as below although after 30 June 2023;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Narieng Rebecca Loduk, In-Charge Nayonaiangikalio HCII was appraised on 4th July 2023 by DHO 2. Onyang Christine, In-Charge Natirae HCII was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by DHO 3. Solimo W. Godwin, In-Charge Lolachat HCIII was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by DHO 4. Musau Isaac, In-Charge Lolengedwart HCIII was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by DHO 5. Einau Francis, In-Charge Nabilatuk HCIV was appraised on 4th July 2023 by DHO 	0
			<p>They therefore did not comply with the deadline of 30th June 2023.</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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. The 10 Health workers sampled were;For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agan Adam, Anaesthetic Officer, Nabilatuk HCIV was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge 2. Ademun Scovia, Enrolled Midwife, Nabilatuk HCIV was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge 3. Mosing Josephine, Nursing Assistant Lolengedwart HCIII was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge 4. Angela Robert, Health Assistant Nayonaiangikalio HCII was appraised on 1stt July 2023 by the In-charge 5. Amolo Jacinta, Nursing Assistant - Nabilatuk HCIV was appraised on 1st July 2023 by the In-charge 6. Ayunda Christine Gladys, Nursing Assistant -Nabilatuk HCIV was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge 7. Lokol Agnes Natacia, Health Information Assitant, Lolachat HCIII was appraised on 6th July 2023 by the In-charge 8. Leese Asunta, Enrolled Nurse Natirae HCII was appraised on 31st March 2023 by 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>There was evidence that corrective actions based on the appraisal reports had been taken as evidenced in the health workers appraisals.</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG had conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District level</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training on the roll out of the Management of HIV Integration of Non Communicable Diseases held on 22nd August 2023 2. SMC Refresher Training of Health Workers held on 19th April 2023 3. Supply Chain Training on Nutrition Commodities held in March 2023 	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>The training activities for Health Workers were documented in the training/CPD database. They included; further studies by health workers, training workshops in Mbale and Soroti, among others.</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 no evidence for the letter notifying MoH of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants for the current FY.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG allocated 49% of the NWR budget for FY2022/23 towards monitoring service delivery and management of LG Health services in line with Health Sector Guidelines</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2022/23</p> <p>Page 23 PHC NWR UG 435,032,000</p> <p>Page 24 - 0883 Health Management and Supervision = UGX 214,923,000</p> <p>Calculation</p> <p>$MSMSS/NWR*100$</p> <p>$214,923,000/435,032,000*100=49%$ (the 15% maximum allowed in Sector Grant Guidelines).</p> <p>The allocation of 49% above the recommended 15% was a good practice</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 11th August, 2022 after 22 days. • 2nd Quarter was released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 18th October, 2022 after 15 days. • 3rd Quarter was released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 10 days. <p>4th Quarter was released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 18th April, 2023 after 7 days.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 02th July 2022 however the release letter was not presented at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th 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 01th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 18th April 2023 which was not within 5 days</p>	0
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence on the notice board that the LG 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.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that some of the resolutions of the Performance Review meetings were addressed, for example,</p> <p>The quarter 1 Performance review meeting that took place on 26th October 2022 reported an issue of low immunization and low deliveries at Health facilities. It recommended increasing outreach and community sensitization as well as the provision of IEC material at all different care points to increase community awareness of Health Centre services as one of the strategies to promote health service utilization.</p> <p>Provision of Hand washing Facilities in Nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>DHT Progress Report dated 18th May 2023 over 100 IEC material at all different care points at all Health Centers, provision of Hand washing facilities at various points in Nabilatuk HCIV</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Performance review meetings involved all Facility in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, and key LG departments.</p> <p>For example, Quarter 1 Performance review meeting that took place on 26th October 2022 involved Participants like:</p> <p>Dr. Solomon Godwin MO I/C Lolachart HCIII, Dr Einau Francis MO I/C Nabilatuk HC IV,</p> <p>Other Departmental Heads, District Planner, Chief Finance Officer, and representatives from a Development Partner (PMI MRA) among others.</p> <p>Quarter 3 Performance review meeting which took place on 18th May 2023 included participants; EN i/c Natirae HCII, Ayojacinta DRDC, Dr. Solomon Godwin MO I/C Lolachart HCIII, Dr Einau Francis MO I/C Nabilatuk HC IV.</p> <p>Other Departmental Heads like Iriama H . District Planner, PA Okello Chief finance officer, Kigongo Stephen Representatives from a Development Partner (PMI MRA), TASO, and a representative from USAID among others.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that Nabilatuk LG supervised Nabilatuk HC IV at least every quarter.</p> <p>Quarter 1 support supervision was done on 4th October 2022, the report was received by DHO Dr. Peter Lokwang on 6th October 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 supervision was done on 6th December 2022 reported by DHO on 9th Dec 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 Supervision was done on 28th March,2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 supervision was done on 19th June and the report was received on 23rd June 2023</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured Health sub districts carried out Support supervision to lower level.</p> <p>In the DHO's office, there was a Workplan for Pian Sub District's Support supervision, drawn by Dr. Francis and received by Dr . Peter Lokwang on 10th March 2023, indicating Health facilities that were going to be visited and areas of focus.</p> <p>3RD April 2023, There were feedback reports from DHO to HSD indicating steps to improve utilization of Health services which included increased immunization outreaches and public sensitization.</p> <p>On 27th June 2023 there was a submission of another HSD support supervision Report by Olaka Denis and received by Dr . Peter Lokwang. From Lolarchart HC support supervision book there was evidence that HSD Team visited the Heath unit on 24 April 2023 and highlighted areas of improvement for example staff punctuality, provision of mama kit, clients detail not filled well.</p> <p>In Natirae HC II, the team reported gaps like inadequate staffing and recommended task shifting</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>A support supervision by DHMT on 4th May 2023 recommended the provision of IEC material in all sampled Health facilities Lalachat, Nabilatuk HCIV, and Lorengedwart HC III, for various diseases display. it also recommended the Provision of Hand washing facilities in Nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>The DHMT support supervision carried out on Nabilatuk HIV on 23rd Jan 2023 indicated that there is improvement in this area, over 100 IEC materials were distributed to these Health centers, and Hand washing facilities were provided at different points in Health Centers</p> <p>immunization services done on daily basis all vaccines are available and refrigerated, and all essential medicines are in place. These were some of the issues which had been raised among others in the Quarter 1 performance review meeting.</p>	1
----	---	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of support to health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY</p> <p>There was a support supervision report on essential medicine, dated 10th June 2023, written by Adoch Carorine Health sub-District Medicine monitoring Supervisor. Relatedly, support supervision books at sampled at the Health Center of Lolachart and Nabilatuk HC IV there was evidence for MMS support supervision carried out on 9th March 2023</p> <p>There was a report on the Delivery of Essential medicine received by DHO on 20th March 2023 written by the Health sub-District Medicine monitoring Supervisor.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the performance report showed that DHO budget was UGX 94,133,000. A review of the report showed that there was no clear allocation for Health promotion. However, a summary from the payment vouches showed that was UGX19,830,760 was spent on Health promotion.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = $19,830,760 / 94,133,000 \times 100$. This was 21%</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>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 of DHT-led health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization activities by way of a report on Sanitation and Hygiene promotion by Okwaput Martin Enior Health Inspector dated 30th March 2023. Another report on School health activities conducted by the DHE from 4th Aug to 20 Aug 2023 . Similarly, report on activities done by DHE from 19th to 21st Aug 2023</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no Progress reports on follow up on Health Promotion and Disease prevention</p>	0

Investment Management

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Abilatuk LG had an updated Assets register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.

The District had an updated electronic Assets register.

It included assets for the DHO's office and for the Health facilities.

For example, the DHO's office had Toyota Hilux UG6689M, Engine Number 2GD076287 purchases2020,

Land cruiser PradoUAJ510Y,engine type; 4 cylinder, date purchased 2020

Other vehicles in the register include 3 Ambulances,2 Pickups Double cabins, 3 Vans, 9 motorcycles, and assets for the Health facilities, computers, assets for health facilities like fridges, computers among others

1

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

(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 LG provided evidence showing desk appraisals for all sector projects in the budget. The investments were derived from the LGDP III –pages 59 and (Approved Budget on pages 26) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. The appraisal reports dated 5th April 2022. The appraisals were carried out by; DHO, District Planner, SCDO and District Environment Officer.

Appraised projects were.

- Construction of Incinerator at Nabilatuk HC IV.

- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Latrine at Nabilatuk HC IV.

1

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence showed the LG conducted field Appraisal to check technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability and customized designs to site conditions for FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>These were from LG DP III, pages 59 Approved budget page 25 and the projects were appraised on 18th April 2022 by; DHO, District Planner, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer.</p> <p>Appraised projects were.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of Incinerator at Nabilatuk HC IV. - Construction of 5 Stance Pit Latrine at Nabilatuk HC IV. 	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health facility investments were screened in the previous FY for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist for example the construction of 4 stance pit latrine with shelter at Nabilatuk health centre VI (town council) prepared on 13th February, 2023</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department timely submitted by April 30th all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to the PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans. This was done on the 15th April, 2023. It had six items therein some of which were; construction of a two-unit staff house at Sakale HCII and renovation of staff house at Natirae HCII.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the health department submitted its procurement requests form (form PP1) to the PDU in the 1st quarter of the current FY 2023/24.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health investments for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement of construction this was done when the committee sat on 30th September, 2023 in which the procurement method was approved in minute 12 NABICC/30-9/2022-2023.</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>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>The LG did establish a project implementation team in a letter dated 26th January 2023 signed by CAO. Members included; Dr. Lokwang Peter DHO was the named as contract manager, Teko Ruth was member, Ms Mudo Gabriella as Eenvironment Officer and Bullon Cyprian, the Assistant Engineering Officer as ember. However, CDO and Clerk of works were missing.</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 no health facility upgrade implemented in the LG during FY 2022/2023.</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>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 records on the infrastructure implemented during the year for assessment FY 2022/23. These were in the form of reports by Assistant Engineering Officer dated 4th April, 2023, 20th April, 2023 and 25th April, 2023. However, these were not for health centre upgrade.</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>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 upgrade of health facilities upgrade in the LG during FY2022/23</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were records on the infrastructure implemented during the year for assessment FY 2022/23. These were in the form of reports by Assistant Engineering Officer dated 4th April, 2023, 20th April, 2023 and 25th April, 2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The CFO noted that the Ugx 51,727,308 for the health projects was swept back to consolidated account by the ministry of Finance as per letter dated 27th September 2023 with Ref no CR/164/5 endorsed by the Ministry of Finance , Planning and Economic Development therefore no payment voucher was on file.</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records required by PPDA law. The files reviewed were;:</p> <p>1. Construction of a 4-stance VIP latrine at Nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00010: had the following documents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. contracts committee minutes date 30th September, 2022 2. Evaluation report dated 25th November, 2022 3. Signed works contract dated 25th January, 2023 with Nabilatuk Good feeding restaurant 4. PP1 form, call for bids, bids receipt record, letters of award, acceptance letter, supervision reports, among the documents on file. <p>2. Construction of placenta pit at nabilatuk HCIV</p> <p>Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00011, had the following documents therein;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. contracts committee minutes date 30th September,2022 2. Evaluation report dated 25th November,2022 3. Signed works contract dated 25th January,2023 with Naupala General supplies and constructors limited 4. PP1 form, call for bids, bids receipt record, letters of award, acceptance letter, supervision reports, among the documents on file.
----	--	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Grievances were recorded, investigated and responded to as of the minutes of grievances committee meeting held on 22nd June, 2023 at the district health office (Min. 02/G/6/June. Communication from the Chairperson for non-payment of the contractor worth UGX 27,361,620 for construction of 4 stance drainable pit latrine at Nabilatuk HCIV awarded to Good Feeding Restaurant Company Limited during the FY 2022/23. The issue was handled by the CAO, DHO and CFO and some payment was done on VIDE VR/EFT Health on 27th June, 2023 but the CAO wrote to PSST on 27th July, 2023 regarding the funds that were encumbered to be sent back to the district since the FY 2022/23 had ended</p>
----	---	---	--

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>The LG disseminated guidelines on healthcare/medical waste management to health facilities through a one week mentorship/dissemination of infection prevention and control guidelines at health facilities at the Nabilatuk district health facilities of Lorengedwat HCIII, Lolachat HCIII, Nabilatuk Mission HCII, Natirae HCII, Nayonai-Angikalio HCII and Nabilatuk HCIV respectively from 5th to 12th December, 2022. The facilitators used the Ministry of Health National Infection, prevention and control guidelines December, 2013 to train and coach health workers.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a functional system for medical waste management such as incinerators at Health Centre IV, dug pits for burning non-wet waste at all health units, coded bins for sorting the different medical waste, and placenta pits at all health centre III and IV</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>A one week mentorship on infection prevention was held at the Nabilatuk district health facilities of Lorengedwat HCIII, Lolachat HCIII, Nabilatuk Mission HCII, Natirae HCII, Nayonai-Angikalio HCII and Nabilatuk HCIV respectively from 5th to 12th December, 2022. The facilitators used the Ministry of Health National Infection, prevention and control guidelines December, 2013 to train and coach health workers.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP prepared on 1st March, 2023 for the construction of a 4 stance latrine with shelters at Nabilatuk health centre IV at UGX. 30,401,800 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 100,000 and 100,000 respectively was incorporated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.</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>Health sector projects such as the construction of 4 stance pit latrine with shelter at Nabilatuk health centre VI (town council) and the construction of a placenta pit at Nabilatuk health centre IV were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access and availability without any encumbrances for example, a certificate of title for Plot 103, Block 7 at Camp Swahili for Nabilatuk Health centre IV issued on 6th September, 2023 with instrument No. MOR-00000671 was availed.</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>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>No projects in the current FY had been screened therefore implementation was not done that would warrant monitoring and or supervision although projects had been planned and approved as of the project list assessed for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a three stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII at a cost of UGX. 22,500,000 2. Construction of a two stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII at a cost of UGX. 21,500,000 	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>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>No certification forms had been processed and or presented at the time of assessment since there were no projects implemented.</p>	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 percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Nabilatuk District Local Government was 66%</p> <p>This was below 80%.</p>	0
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees was 89%</p>	1
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 average score of Water and environment LLG performance increased by 154% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 84%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 33%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>$= (0.84 - 0.33 / 0.33) * 100\% = 154\%$</p> <p>The Water and environment LLG performance assessment for the current year increased by 154% from the previous year's performance.</p>	2

N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2
- o If 80-99%: Score 1
- o If below 80 %: Score 0

The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 49% were:-

Drilling of 2 deep boreholes, 1 production well and one block of five stances pit latrine in Lolachat S/C with a safe water coverage of 36%, drilling of 2 deep boreholes and construction of five stances pit latrine in Kosike S/C with 44%, drilling of 2 deep boreholes and drilling of 1 production well in Natirae S/C with 47%, drilling of 1 production well in Nabilatuk S/C with a safe water coverage of 49%.

The projects that were implemented during the year under review were:-

Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, drilling of 3 production boreholes, rehabilitation of 20 boreholes, and construction of 2 blocks of five stance latrines.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 28 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 32 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was $28/32 * 100\% = 88\%$

N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- o If within +/-20% score 2
- o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling of 7 deep boreholes in different LLGS

Engineers estimate = UGX 182,175,000

Contract price = UGX 174,483,444

Variation = UGX 7,691,556

Percentage variation = $7,691,556/182,175,000*100\% = 4.2\%$

2). Drilling of 3 production wells in various sub-counties.

Engineers estimate = UGX 135,000,000

Contract price = UGX 130,968,495

Variation = 4,031,505

Percentage variation = $4,031,505/135,000,000*100\% = 3\%$

3). Construction of 1 block of 5 stances latrine in Lopie village in Kosike S/C

Engineers estimate = UGX 26,000,000

Contract price = UGX 28,755,300

Variation = UGX (2,755,300)

Percentage variation = $(2,755,300)/26,000,000*100\% = -10.6\%$

N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- o If 100% projects completed: score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1
- o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY as captured on page 6 of the AWP included the following:-

Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps in various sub-counties in the LG, drilling of 3 production wells in selected RGCs and construction of 2 blocks of 5 stances at Kosike s/c and Lolachat s/c and rehabilitation of 20 boreholes in various LLGs. Basing on the sampled projects which were all found to be completed and working.

Hence we can conclude that all the projects were implemented as planned and the percentage of completed projects was $= 32/32*100\% = 100\%$

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 65% and FY 2022/2023 was 66% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage change was 66% - 65% = 1%</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 was 89% and 89% respectively</p> <p>Hence percentage change was = 0</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The sample projects included:-

- 1). Drilling of a deep borehole in Nasinyonoit C village in Lolachat sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 86333 and completed on 6th June 2023.
- 2). Construction of 1 block of 5 stances in Lopie village in Kosike sub-county, funded under DWSCG and completed on 8th May, 2023
- 3). Drilling of a production well in Ariamawoi village in Nabilatuk sub-county, funded under UGIFT, with a DWD number 78855 and completed on 28th May, 2023.

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

The projects were completed as per the plan.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 24th October, 2022, on page 16, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 27th January, 2023 on page 20; the District Water Officer had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties in the District.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 5th May, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on page 21.</p> <p>Finally for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 7th August, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on page 208.</p> <p>Therefore it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment together with the fourth quarter report on 7th August, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented a print out of all the WSS facilities by sub-county which included even the newly constructed facilities in the entire district.</p>	3

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LIG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The copy of the LIG assessment report with verified result was availed at the time of assessment, and there was only one LIG that was least performing namely Natirae S/C; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the LLGs at the time of the LIG assessment exercise.</p> <p>Therefore there was no evidence for justifying any score for this indicator for the LG.</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 DWO had budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance. The total Budget was UGX 35,359,000/=</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2. Total Budget was UGX 35,359,000/=</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Louse Joseph, Borehole Technician, was appraised on 3rd January 2023. by PAS Anyakon Paul Jovic, had been on probation. 2. Lokoroi Charles, Engineering Assistant Water was appraised on 30th June 2023, by Ag. DCAO Longolio John 3. Lokiru Charles, Civil Engineer Water was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. CAO Olobaro Emmy Ejuku 	3

Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence from the appraisals that District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process. The capacity needs report was contained in a correspondence Ref. CR/WAT/750/4 by the DWO, addressed to CAO for the attention of the HR and it was dated 26th July, 2022. The training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database as evidenced in the attendance registers for the trainings that included;

- Training of the Assistant Engineering officer Water (Lokoroi Charles) in water quality testing and analysis conducted by C&D
- Training of the Borehole Maintenance Technician (BMT) (Louse Joseph) in water quality testing and analysis

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO allocated over 65% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 51%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Lolachat S/C with safe water coverage of 34% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and Rehabilitation of 2 boreholes, construction of two stance VIP latrine, Nabilatuk T/C with safe water coverage of 50% was allocated rehabilitation of a piped water supply system, Kosike S/C with safe water coverage of 47% was allocated rehabilitation of 2 borehole.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 435,759,652.

The total annual budget for Nabilatuk DWO for the current FY was UGX 636,894,642.

Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =
 $435,759,652/636,894,642 * 100\% = 68\%$

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<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>There was evidence that DWO communicated to the LLG their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY.</p> <p>The DWO presented a letter dated 24th July, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs. Some of the details in this letter indicated for example that the DWO had allocated projects worth 106,748,577 to Natirae S/C and 75,202,371 to Lolachat sub-county.</p>	3
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>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>There was evidence that the DWO monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly.</p> <p>The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 24th October, 2022, it was noted that 208 water facilities were monitored.</p> <p>In the second quarter as per the progress report dated 27th January, 2023, a total of 208 water sources were monitored during this quarter.</p> <p>Likewise for quarter 3 report dated 5th May, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 218.</p> <p>In quarter 4 as per the report dated 7th August, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 218.</p> <p>On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $208 + 208 + 218 + 216 = 852/4 = 213$.</p> <p>Nabilatuik DLG has a total of 242 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.</p> <p>The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $213/242 * 100\% = 88\%$</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

A meeting held on 15th September, 2022 this was during the first quarter. The key issues discussed during this meeting were found in minute number Min.3 where the DWO emphasised on the interventions that were planned for implementation in the cause of the financial year for the consumption of the members present.

During the second quarter the meeting was held on 1st December, 2022 and key issues discussed in minute Min.5 among the key issues discussed was the roles of the DWSCC and the WASH policies explaining their close linkage with health issues and the participation of the Development Partners in software activities.

For the third quarter the meeting was held on 11th February, 2023 and major issues of discussion were found in minute Min.6. The main issue of discussion was partner project implementation specifically Innovation Africa who were drilling water supply facilities in the sub-county of Lolachat and Kosike.

In quarter 4 the meeting was held on 22nd June, 2023, and key issues discussed under minute Min.5. The specific issue discussed here was the situation of the water and sanitation status in the district. The other key issue was discussed under minute Min.8. Where the DWO emphasised to the Development Partners to include Hygiene and sanitation in their implementation plans.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which is 63%.

This was seen in a letter dated 24th July, 2023 which detailed the allocation of projects including the resources to the various LLGs among which was Nabilatuk sub-county with a safe water coverage of 54% and Nabilatuk T/C with a safe water coverage of 58%

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Nabilatuk DLG water sector was UGX 57,311,973. The DWO allocated UGX 23,342,044 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $23,342,044/57,311,973*100\% = 40.7\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3
----	---	--	---	----------

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 29th December, 2022.</p> <p>The major topics that were reflected in the training report included Operation and Maintenance, Roles and responsibilities of the Various members of the WSC, book keeping and safe water chain.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	----------

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were seen on page 2 and 6 for instance</p>	4
----	--	---	--	----------

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 4 or else score 0.

The evidence showed the LG's DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted a desk appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget. It was established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage). The desk appraisals were conducted and discussed on 4th April 2023. The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 64 and Approved Budget pages, 43.

Projects appraised were;

- Construction of 5 Stance water borne toilet at Nabilatuk Town council.
- Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes.
- Desiting of Namatalopelab Valley dam.
- Rehabilitation of Lorengedwat piped water system.
- Rehabilitation of Nakudep Piped water system.
- Drilling of 3 boreholes.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

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

1). Application from Ajijjim Cell in Nabilatuk T/C, the application date was 17th August, 2023, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 25th August, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LCI Mr. Lomer Domenic.

2). Application from Lonyangatur village in Kosike S/C, the application was dated 6th June, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI Mr. Loru Marako.

The DWO cleared it for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on the 25th August, 2023.

3). Application from Loteede village in Nabilatuk S/C, this application was dated 15th August, 2023 and was endorsed by the LCI Mr. Loucho Kizito Lochopo. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 28th August, 2023 by the District Water Officer.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>LG conducted field appraisals and checked for technical feasibility environmental social acceptability, and customized designs for WSS projects for FY 2023/2024. LG DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer, and DCDO conducted field appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget and established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The LG District Water Officer conducted field appraisals for water projects on 26th April 2023 and 27th April 2023.</p> <p>The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 64, and Approved Budget pages, 43.</p> <p>Projects appraised were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5-stance water-borne toilet at Nabilatuk Town Council. 2. Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes. 3. Desiting of Namatalopelab Valley dam. 4. Rehabilitation of Lorengedwat piped water system. 5. Rehabilitation of Nakudep Piped water system. 6. Drilling of 3 boreholes. 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence of projects screened for environmental and social risks/impacts and neither were costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents but yet they had been approved as of the procurement process under the respective project profiles. For example, borehole drilling and rehabilitation at Lorengedwat, Nabilatuk sub counties costed at UGX. 50,000,000 under project profile NO. 2; Piped water construction at Lorengedwat costed at UGX 156,798,000 under project profile 3; Borehole drilling and rehabilitation at Lorengedwat, Lolachat and Nabilatuk sub counties costed at UGX. 84,906,000 under project profile 5.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated into the consolidated LG approved procurement plan for the FY 2022-2023. It was dated 12th October 2022, signed by the CAO, Oloboro Emmy Ejuku, received by PPDA on 17th October 2022. The WSS items where; Rehabilitation of 20 borehole, Deep borehole drilling hand pumps and Construction of a public latrine with disability at Lorendedwat subcounty.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure was approved by the contracts committee before commencement of construction this done by the contracts committee which sat on 30th September,2023 where the procurement method was approved in Min12NABICC/30-9/2022-2023.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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 project implementation team was not properly established as required according to a letter dated 26th January, 2023 where the water officer, Lokim Charles named Ms Teko Ruth as the labour officer and did not name other members on the team like the environment officer, CDO, clerk of works among other members on the team.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity with the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer, for example a Boreholes in Nasinyonoit village of Lolachat S/C was constructed with the following dimensiions, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm as prescribed on the designs.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as was indicated in reports dated; 20th December, 2022, 6th April, 2023, 17th June, 2023 and 23rd June,2023 by district water officer and another dated 1st June,2023 by engineering assistant.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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>There was evidence that the DWO did verify the work and payments to the contractors were certified and recommended for payment as per contract and payment requests.We managed to sample only one voucher which was on file.</p> <p>1. Voucher no.5875229 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 17,576,797 certificate no. 1 Dated 17th April 2023; contract no.NAB1900/Wrks/22-23/00009; Construction of 5 Stance Pit latrine with Urinal and Disability in Lorengedwat Sub-county by Berosicky Business Investment Uganda Nabilatuk Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer, District Engineer, District Environment Officer and DCDO on 17th April 2023, payment was initiated on 17th April 2023 and payments were made on 15th June 2023.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that complete procurement files for water infrastructure investment were in place for each contract with all records required by the PPDA law. The files reviewed were;

Project 1: Constuction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Kosike subcounty

Procurement ref: NABI900/wrks/2022-2023/00008 : Had these documents

1. signed works contract dated 25th January,2023 with MORUANGIBUIN DISABLED ENTERPRISES
2. Evaluation report dated 25th November,2022
3. Contract committee minutes dated 30th September,2022
4. PP1 form, call for bids, records of bid issue and receipt, supervision reports, payment records, certificates completion among other documents on file.

Project 2: Drilling of 3-production wells at Nabilatuk, Lolachat and Natirai Sub counties

Procurement ref: NABI/wrks/2022-2023/00003: This file had the following documents therein;

1. signed works contract dated 25th January,2023 with MORUANGIBUIN DISABLED ENTERPRISES
2. Evaluation report dated 25th November,2022
3. Contract committee minutes dated 30th September,2022
4. PP1 form, call for bids, records of bid issue and receipt, supervision reports, payment records, certificates completion among other documents on file.

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>The DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee had recorded, investigated, responded to and reported water grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework for example,</p>	3
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A complaint recorded on 18th February, 2023 from Cucu primary school on water crisis as result of breakdown of the borehole affecting enrolment from 655 to 485. The complaint was handled on 28th February, 2023 and it was agreed water supply would be reinstated 2. A complaint recorded on 17th August, 2023 from Loteede B cell of breakdown of a hand pump borehole. The complaint was handled on 20th August, 2023 and it was agreed that the borehole will be rehabilitated 	
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p>	<p>Water source Plan for the Water Source of Lolachat Health Centre III that was prepared on May, 2020 along with the Water Source Protection Messages and Guide (Water Source Protection Plan (WSPP) 2013 a statutory instrument for planning and protection measures within the framework of integrated water resources management were disseminated in the meeting of district, sub-county leaders and potential ASP on National Framework for O & M of rural water facility held at the Town Council Hall on 9th February, 2023. The dissemination was captured under Minute 04/09/2/2023. Opening Remarks. The dissemination was captured under Minute 06/09/2/2023. Preparation on Water supply Services Board Operational Manual and also in Minute 07/09/2/2023. presentation on operational Manual for ASP</p>	3
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented as indicated in the budget allocations from District water and sanitation conditional grant (DWSCDG) for each individual sub-county for example, all water source protection plans were prepared and implemented on 24th July, 2023 for Lorengedwat sub-county at a cost of UGX. 96,449,912; Nabilatuk Town Council at a cost of UGX. 9,930,000; Nabilatuk sub-county at a cost of UGX. 100,128,577; Kosike sub-county at a cost of UGX. 16,550,000; Lolachat at a cost of UGX. 75,202,371 and Natirae sub-county at a cost of 106,748,577</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent without any encumbrances for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A consent form dated 5th April, 2023 for the handover of land by the community of Nasinyoit, Sakale village for borehole drilling 2. A consent form dated 10th May, 2023 for the handover of land by the community of Loteede, Achegetolim village for borehole drilling 3. A consent form dated 4th April, 2023 for the handover of land by the community of Nataparengan, Nabilatuk village for borehole drilling 	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>E&S certification forms were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether they were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officers monitored the water projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example, the following report were prepared,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment and social monitoring report for drilling of production wells at Aramaoi village, Acegeretolim parish, Natapararengan parish, Nabilatuk sub-county in Nabilatuk sub county prepared on 19th July, 2023 2. Environment and social monitoring report for drilling boreholes at Lorengendwat sub-county prepared on 18th July, 2023 3. Environment and social monitoring report for drilling of production wells at Lotaruk parish, Nathinyanoit village in Lolachat sub-county prepared on 20th July, 2023 	2

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG presented data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. A report on roll out of the microscale irrigation program FY 2022/23 with a Ref: CR/220/1 written by the CAO to the permanent Secretary MAAIF dated 30/12/2021 provided a summary of the Rapid water resources and irrigated agriculture capacity assessment.</p> <p>Another report showed zero acreage for irrigated land under individual micro irrigation system, group small scale irrigation scheme, beneficially farmers on shared pumped system for the FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>MOUs were presented for the two (2) UgFIT Demo sites that were established in one primary school and one Seed Secondary School covering a total of 1.5 acres. i.e</p> <p>Lolachat P/S (0.5 acres) signed on 29th march, 2023.</p> <p>Lolachat SEED SS (1.0 acres) on signed on 29th march, 2023.</p>	2
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>This district LG had Zero (0) acreage in FY 2021/2022</p> <p>LG had installed two (2) Ugift Demo sites as the total irrigated land in the FY 2022/2023</p> <p>Increase in acreage.</p> <p>= (1.5-0)/1.5 (100)</p> <p>= 100%</p>	2

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 average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 93% as per the OPAMS.</p>	4
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 DAO followed the latest Grant guidelines version 3, April 2023.</p> <p>The approved work plan and budget for the production and marketing department FY 2022/2023 was presented and signed by the CAO, Olaboro Emmy Ejuku on 1st August 2022.</p> <p>It was evident that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. E.g</p> <p>Approved annual work plan and budget FY 22/23 prepared by the DAO, verified by the District Production Officer and approved by the CAO on 1st August 2022. The workplan reveals that;</p> <p>i). Awareness raising of leaders at parish, LLG and LG was costed at Ugx 14,741,257 (15% of the budget).</p> <p>li). Awareness raising and farm visits cost UGX 49,137,524 (50% of the budget).</p> <p>iii). Demos, equipment, and machinery were costed at UGX24,568,762</p> <p>The annual budget performance report dated 18th August 2023 showed that LG spent UGX30,400,000 on irrigation equipment which was an eligible activity.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that was provided and the CFO noted that the LG is still under the implementation stage micro scale irrigation.	0
---	---	---	---	----------

Maximum score 6

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	The contract price variations, calculated as the difference between the Agriculture Engineer's estimates and the Contractor's costed figure, fall within a range of +/-20%.	1
---	---	---	---	----------

Maximum score 6

Specifically, the Agricultural Engineer's estimated cost, denoted as the SAE costed figure, amounts to UGX 24,558,587. In comparison, the Contractor's costed figure is UGX 25,387,000.

The variation percentage is computed as.

$(\text{SAE costed figure} - \text{Contractor's costed figure}) / (\text{Contractor's costed figure}) * (100)$

$(24,558,587 - 25,387,000) / 25,387,000 * (100)$

-3.26314%

Therefore, the observed variation is well within the acceptable range of +/-20% of the Engineer's initial estimates.

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>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>The was evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment contracts were signed during the previous FY and installed.</p> <p>Supplier contract with Ref. No: NABI900/SUPLS/22-23/00011 was signed by the CAO on behalf of NABILATUK LG and Ikori Micheal on behalf of JIKO Holdings Ltd on the 14th March 2023</p> <p>Goods received note (GRN) with Serial numbers; 0170, 0169, 0171, were acknowledged by Lemukol, the assistant Inventory mgt Officer, Nabilatuk LG. on the 24th of May 2023.</p> <p>System generated payment voucher was also presented, dated 29th June 2023,</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>The LG staff structure provided for 25 extension workers and 9 (36%) were filled at the time of assessment.</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs met standards as defined by MAAIF. Site acreages were in line with MAAF standards i.e Lolachat P/S (0.5 acres) and Lolachat Seed Secondary School(1.0 acres). The installed systems were drip, sprinkler, drag hose and rain gun both solar and generator powered, which is in line with MAAIF standards with the following specifications.</p> <p>Drip irrigation demo.</p> <p>Main Delivery line Dia = 50mm HDPE pipe</p> <p>Drip lines Dia = 16mm black tubing</p> <p>Drip line Wall thickness = 1.0mm</p> <p>Emitter spacing = 30cm</p> <p>Low flow micro sprinkler was installed on 1/2 an acre, storage tank of 5000L, tank stand structure made from Steel, head of 7M, GI pipe of Dia, 40mm for supply and wash outlet.</p> <p>Drag hose irrigation installed had a hose pipe of Dia = 0.75in, length of 30M, adjustable garden Nozzles and 3 hydrant assembly.</p> <p>The installed systems also met standards as per the inventory report of installed MSI equipment Submitted to MAAIF on 5th April 2023 by Sadam, Senior Agricultural officer.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Only two demo sites are available</p> <p>Upon site visits on the 2 Demos, it was found that all 4 systems (drip, sprinkler, drag hose, and rain gun) were tested and found functioning.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, Lolachat Seed Secondary School had a water scarcity problem and had limited water in the reservoir tank. This resulted in a low flow rate for the drag hose and rain gun during testing.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The inventory report of installed MSI equipment submitted to MAAIF on 5th April 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer, presented installed components.	2
Maximum score 4				
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The inventory report of installed MSI equipment submitted to MAAIF on 5th April 2023 by the Senior Agricultural Officer, presented installed components.	2
Maximum score 4				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	<p>There was evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services and farmer EOI.</p> <p>For example, the quarterly progress reports compiled by SAE and forwarded by the CAO dated 27th June 233 (Quarter 4).</p> <p>For example, Q4 report indicated that 28 farmers had expressed interest in the 4 LLG (Sub counties).</p>	2
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	<p>There was an up-to-date LLG information entry into the MIS.</p> <p>For example, 52 farm visits, 258 EOI, and 1,976 attendees for the awareness-raising events.</p> <p>The hard copies of EOI for applicants and the up-to-date MIS database for EOI were found tallying at 73 candidates.</p> <p>SAE logged into his Irri Track application, and I verified data on farm visit as shown as an output in the MIS database.</p>	1
Maximum score 6				

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the preparation of quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p> <p>The quarter 4 progressive report submitted by SAE- Sadam and signed by the CAO where presented with graph Data generated from the MIS dashboard. For example, Page 9 showed a bar graph on preparation of farm visit clustered per Sub- County, Page 8 showed a bar graph with farmers' EOI clustered per sub-county and Page 19 showed the online training certificates to LG and LLG extension staff who completed the online training in the 6 modules.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG that Production department through SAE developed and approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs. This plan was evident in the Q4 progress report dated 27th June 2023 on page 12 herein referred to as Action Plan for the lowest performing LLGs.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs.</p> <p>However, the LG presented several Awareness reports, training reports, and awareness-raising reports. E.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A report on the exchange visit made to Tororo DLG approved by CAO on 22nd May 2023. 2. A report on farmer awareness raising - The radio talk show, Spot Messages and Village Barazers acknowledged by the DPMO on 29th May 2023. 3. Beneficially hands-on training submitted to DPMO and acknowledged by the DPMO on 28th June 2023. 4. Awareness raising report for sub-county level acknowledged by DPMO on 17th February 2023. 	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

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	From the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/23 the LG had budgeted for extension workers. The total budget was 196,346,000/=.	1
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	There was evidence that the LG Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines and deployed extension workers as per guidelines from the staff payroll and staff list displayed on the DLG notice board. There was evidence of positing instruction on file for instance for Luduk Paul, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Kosike Sub-County; Alinga Miriam Awas, assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Nabilatuk Sub-County, Icuero Dominic- Animal Husbandry, Lorengedwat Sub-County; Muya Emmy Assistant Agricultural Officer- Lorengedwat Sub County; Awany Bob Assistant Agricultural Officer- Natirae Sub-County.	1
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence from the staff lists that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed. The three LLGs that were sampled Lolachat, Natirae and Nabilatuk Town Council.	2

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that extension workers' deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by displaying the extension workers on the LG notice board.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>Natirae Sub County</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Akol Emmanuel - Animal Husbandry Officer 2. Aleper Moses- Assistant Agricultural Officer 	
			<p>Lolachat Sub County:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hillary R. Topos - Veterinary Officer 2. Ammarrie Prossie- Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer 3. Meri Joseph- Assistant Agricultural Engineer 	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DLG conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amarie Prossy Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Lolachat Sub County was appraaised on 26th May 2023 by the DPMO Loput Simon Peter. 2. Meri Joseph Assistant Agricultural Engineer was appraised on 26th May 2023 by the DPMO Loput Simon Peter. 	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was evidence from the performance appraisals of the extension workers of corrective actions for instance enrollment of practical artificial insemination training, pest and disease management training, plant clinics and crop protection, early wrning systems, and agricultural development programs. These corrective actions were seen from the appraisals of the following extension workers; 	1
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awas Miriam - Animal Husbandry Officer 2. Akol Emmaneul - Animal Husbandry Officer 3. Icuro Dominic - Animal Husbandry Officer 4. Amarie Prossy - Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer 5. Meri Joseph - Assistant Agricultural Engineer 	

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of a training plan at District Level or provided by the HR department.	0
	Maximum score 4			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	At the time of assessment evidence that training activities were documented in the training database in Irri Track and MIS data was captured such as the online training on the 6 modules.	1
	Maximum score 4			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Last FY, Nabilatuk DLG allocated 100% (Ugx 98,275,047) for MSI and 25% (Ugx 24,568,762) for complementary services and 75% (Ugx 73,706,286) for capital development as per the correspondences to Permanent secretary of Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries dated on 15th August 2022.	2
	Maximum score 10			

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	<p>LG which was in phase 2 ,100% micro scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.10,182,964</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.33,943,214</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.15,274,446.3</p> <p>15% farmer visits was Ushs 10,182,964</p> <p>According to Page 7 Of Sector Grant guidelines</p>	2
	Maximum score 10			

9 Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 No evidence was provided at the time of assessment of co funding in the budget since Nabilatuk LG is still in phase one of implementation. **0**

Maximum score 10

9 Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. 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 LG was still in stage one of implementation. **0**

Maximum score 10

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

e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0

Evidence was presented that the LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding e.g.,

1. A report on the exchange visit made to Tororo DLG acknowledged by the DPMO on 22nd May 2023.
2. A report prepared by SAE-Sadam regarding farmer awareness activities, including radio talk shows, spot messages, and village discussions on the micro-scale irrigation project, was recognized by the DPMO on 29th May 2023.
3. A report compiled by SAE on Beneficially's hands-on training submitted to DPMO and acknowledged by the DPMO on 28th June 2023.
4. Awareness raising report for sub-county level on Ugift program acknowledged by DPMO on 17th Feb 2023.
5. The report on awareness raising for the Ugift Micro irrigation program at the parish level was presented, compiled by SAE - Sadam, and acknowledged by DPMO on 25th February 2023.

Other Evidence included -

Utilization of Ugift Banners and Teardrops: These visual aids were employed during awareness meetings to enhance the visibility and understanding of the Ugift Micro irrigation program.

Distribution of Brochures to Farmers: Brochures were distributed among farmers to enhance the outreach of Ugift irrigation programs and to inform them about co-funding opportunities.

Signed Attendance Lists: Official attendance records were maintained for the awareness meetings held at Natirae Parish on 25th February 2023 and in Lolachat Sub-County on 23rd February 2023.

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>Nabilatuk DLG is in her first year of implementation and has not reached a stage of farmer field schools.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG is in her first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had provided hands- on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines. E.g,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A report compiled by SAE- Sadam on Beneficially hands on training submitted to DPMO and acknowledged by the DPMO on 28th June 2023. - A benchmarking visit / exchange visit report that was done to Tororo DLG acknowledged by the DPMO on 22nd May 2023. The purpose was to learn from phase one district on how they implemented their Microscale irrigation projects. 	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk was in phase II district of implementing MSI projects and has not reached the stage of farm field school	0
	Maximum score 8			
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducts activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines for example, the awareness report acknowledged by DPMO, dated 18th February 2023, at the sub-county level, presented data on attendees from the six sub-counties and report data provided details on participants from six sub-counties, categorized by gender: 78 males, 47 females, and 8 attendees with disabilities (PWDS).	2
	Maximum score 4			
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Evidence was presented about the training of staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels, for example;	2
	Maximum score 4		The awareness-raising report dated 20th January 2023, under the Ugift Micro Irrigation Program for Nabilatuk DLG, was compiled by SAE and acknowledged by DPMO. The report aimed to familiarize all district stakeholders with the stages of the MSI program. A total of 60 stakeholders were invited to the event, and minutes were recorded. Additionally, an attendance list was presented during the assessment.	

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The consolidated approved procurement plan was availed dated 27th September, 2023, signed by the CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku and was submitted to PPDA on 29th September 2023.</p> <p>Evidence was presented that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment.</p> <p>supplied to farmers in the previous FY, i.e a report (Inventory) outlining the Microscale irrigation equipment installed in Nabilatuk DLG was submitted to Ugift and MAAIF in Excel format on 15th April 2023.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file and verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence was presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the MIS database showed that out of the 78 complete Expressions of Interest (EOI) submitted, only 13 farm visits had been conducted and due to budget constraints 28 visits were already prepared but not done.</p> <p>There is no documentation indicating an agreement to proceed with the quotation form. These forms will only be created after submission to the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC), provided that a farmer has paid the commitment fee of UGX 1,000,000, which has not been done yet.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no publicized eligible farmers on the any notice boards in the LG</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 approved consolidated procurement plan dated 27th September 2023, signed by the CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku ,submitted to PPDA on 29th September 2023, had no item for MIS for curent FY2023/2024</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>There was no evidence that the LG requested for quotations from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided for approval by the Contracts Committe for MIS for suppliers in the district in the year under review FY 2022/23.</p>	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 MIS program had not started being implemented in the district during the year under review FY 2022/23.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence was presented that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App), or the approved workplan by MAAIF. This is because the DLG is in its first year of implementation, and for Ugift demonstrations, the DLG receives approved designs from MAAIF that they customize to fit site conditions.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence presented on the LG conducting regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers. E.g., A report on field supervision and monitoring, compiled by the SAE dated 30th June 2023. During the assessment, the site books were confirmed to be present in the two schools hosting the demonstrations. However, the Ugift site books had recently been received by the DLG, and up until that point, they had been utilizing a regular visitors' book as their site record.	2
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	Evidence that LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during testing the functionality of the installed equipment- was presented. These included. A supervision and monitoring report, compiled by the SAE and recognized by the DPMO, was dated 28th June 2023. Additionally, there is a technical supervision report by SAE dated 30th June 2023.	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence that the LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during the hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer.	1
	Maximum score 18		However, SAE presented a payment voucher for the contract, dated 29th June 2023 and Good received note (GRN) for the supplies and equipment dated 24th May 2023 and approved by district ass. Inventory management officer.	
			The handover had not been done yet since the contractor still have some site work to complete such as construction of the manholes.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	No evidence was provided since the LG was still in implementation stage	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had complete procurement files for each contract and with all records as required by the PPDA law.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no proof displayed on the notice board indicating that the Local Government had prominently showcased information about the nature of grievances and the available avenues to address them in various public areas.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>During the assessment, a letter was provided that outlined the appointment of various officers as members of the grievance committee. This memo, dated April 12th, 2023, detailed the assignment of additional responsibilities as members of the grievance redress committee, and it was approved by the CAO.</p>	
			<p>The SAE mentioned that they had not previously encountered or addressed grievances related to micro-scale irrigation since they had recently commenced their involvement in the program.</p>	
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances recorded, Investigated, responded reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances recorded, Investigated, responded reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances recorded, Investigated, responded reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances recorded, Investigated, responded reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
----	---	---	--	----------

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented on the dissemination of the UgFT micro-scale irrigation program-improving farmers' livelihood technical guideline version 3, April 2023 for proper siting, land access and safe disposal of chemical waste containers. For example,</p> <p>The report on the awareness raising and registration of interested farmers, acknowledged by DPMO, and dated 18th, February, 2023, at the subcounty level, provided data regarding attendees from the six sub-counties.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	----------

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out prior to installation of irrigation equipment for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lolachat primary school Irrigation demonstration site prepared on 30th March, 2023 2. Lolachat seed micro irrigation demonstration site prepared on 30th March, 2023 3. Liko Elijah micro-Irrigation prepared on 31st October, 2023 	1
----	---	--	---	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence for monitoring of irrigation impacts since the micro scale irrigation projects had not been implemented	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Since the micro scale irrigation projects had not been implemented, hence E&S certification forms were not completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Since the micro scale irrigation projects had not been implemented, hence E&S certification forms were not completed and signed by the CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	1

Crosscutting Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Chief Finance Officer, Okello James Andrew Onyango on 13th May 2021 under minute 38/NABDSC/2021(7)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited District Planner, Iriama Charles Lorot on 23rd May 2019 under Minute No. 28/NABDSC/2019(1).	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	Nabilatuk DLG had neighter substantively recruited a District Eginer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer at the time of assessment 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	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited District Production Officer, Loput Simon Peter on 13th May 2021 under minute.43/NABDSC/2021.	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited a District Community Development Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a District Commercial Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	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.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Senior Procurement Officer, Nyeko Julius on 2nd June 2021 under minute.69/NABDSC/2021.	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	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a Procurement Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	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	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Senior Land Management Officer, Ilukol Raphael Lorika on 23rd May 2019 under Minute No. 45/NABDSC/2019(1).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited a Senior Accountant nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited a Principal Internal Auditor nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Principal Human Resource Officer, Angella Becky on 13th May 2021 under minute.37/NABDSC/2021.	2

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).	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited a Senior Assistant Secretary for 5 out of 6 LLGs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Losike Agatha Frances on 30th June 2022 under minute (26)/DSCNAB/2022 (2) - Natirae Sub-County 2. Sagal Ben Paul on 15th August 2008 under minute 53(b)/NDSC/2008 - Nabilatuk Sub-County 3. Munyes Gabriele on 30th June 2022 under minute (26)/DSCNAB/2022 (1) - Lorengedwat Sub-County 4. Topos Hillary Ramson on 1st June 2022 under minute18/DSCNAB/2022(1) - Lolachat Sub-County 5. Longolio John on 23rd June 2021 under minute 61/NDSC/2021- Nabilatuk Town Council 	0
	Maximum score is 15		<p>Nabilatuk LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Assistant Secretary nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS for Kosike Sub county.</p>	
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.	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Senior CDO, Awas Deborah Iram on 18th April 2019 under minute. 4/NABDSC/2019(4).</p> <p>No Evidence was provided for CDO appointments in the rest of the 5 LLGS.</p>	0
	Maximum score is 15			

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited a Senior Accounts Assistant for all 6 LLGs, as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aleper Joyce on 23rd May 2019 under minute. 26/NABDSC/2019(2). Senior Accounts Assistant- Natirae Sub County 2. Lokwapa Francis Loyor on 8th July 2013 under minute.43/7/NDSC/2013. Accounts Assistant-Nabilatuk Sub County 3. Teko Thomas on 23rd May 2019 under minute. 60/NABDSC/2019(1) ,Accounts Assistant - Lorengedwat Sub County 4. Loit Denis Award on 23rd May 2019 under minute. 27/NABDSC/2019(2)., Accounts Assistant-Lolachat Sub County 5. Lolem Emmanuel on 23rd May 2019 under minute. 27/NABDSC/2019(1).,Accounts Assistant-Kosike Sub County 6. Kolibi Robert on 22nd May 2019 under minute.56/NABDSC/2019 (1), Senior Accounts Assistant- Nabilatuk Town Council 	5
---	---	--	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;</p> <p>The Budgeted amount was UGX 828,729,686</p> <p>Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 823,024,184 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 19).</p> <p>(UGX 828,729,686/823,024,184)*100=100%</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 57% for community based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	The Budgeted amount was UGX 1,033,000	
		score 2 or else 0.	Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 1,033,000 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 20).	
			(UGX 1,033,000/UGX 1,033,000)*100=100%	
			The giving a variance of UGX 0. Therefore, released was; 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,	The LG carried out screening for environmental, social and climate change for the fencing of Nabilatuk district headquarters prepared on 8th February, 2022	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		
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.	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),	The projects that were 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	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The LG had a costed ESMP prepared on 1st March, 2023 for the completion of fencing of Nabilatuk district headquarters at UGX. 56, 684,250 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at 300,000 and 200,000 respectively</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>LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 29th December 2022. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	10
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 19th August 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY2022/23 on 31th July 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 20th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 7th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 6th May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 31th July 2023</p> <p>From the above submission dates the LG 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. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited District Education Officer, Korobe Peter Raymond on 18th April 2019 under minute.4/NABDSC/2019(9)	30
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	1. Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited District Inspector of Schools, Nakilu Hellen Lores, on 23 May 2019 under minute.35/NABDSC/2019 2. Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Inspector of Schools, Assaja Abraham John, on 23 May 2019 under minute.38/NABDSC/2019	40

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was done for the following education sector projects, 1. construction of two classroom block at Kosike sub county prepared on 15th February, 2023 2. construction of 4 unit staff house at Acegeretolim primary prepared on 8th February, 2023 3. Construction of two classroom block at Cucu primary school prepared on 1st February, 2023 4. Construction of a two classroom block at Kosike primary school prepared on 15th February, 2023 5. Construction of two stance pit latrine with urinal at Napongag primary school prepared on 11th February, 2023 6. Construction of a three stance pit latrine at Natapararagan primary school prepared on 2023 7. Construction of staff house at Nabilatuk town council primary school prepared on 4th February, 2022 8. Construction of 2 stance pit latrine at Acegeretolim primary school prepared on 11th February, 2022 9. Fencing of Naweet primary school prepared on 7th February, 2022	15
	The Maximum score is 30			
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	The projects that were implemented in the education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because 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	15
	The Maximum score is 30			

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited a District Health Officer nor was there a seconded staff MOH.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Health Inspector nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Senior Health Educator, Lolem Erick on 3rd July 2023 under minute.5/NDSC/2023(7).</p>	10

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Biostatistician, Aleper Kevin on 1 June 2022 under minute.18/DSCNAB/2022(b).	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively appointed Kwebelawo Recheal as a Cold Chain Technician on 13th May 2021 under minute.41/NABDSC/2021.	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<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 not done for projects in the current FY, in spite of the fact that they were approved and planned as in the project list provided for example, the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a three stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII costed at UGX. 22,500,000 • Construction of a two stance pit latrine at Sakale HCII costed at UGX. 21,500,000 	0
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 evidence provided in the project profile list of the 2023/4 projects shows that those projects did not meet the schedule 5 requirements for ESIAs assessment of the National Environment Act 5, 2019</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Senior Agriculture Engineer, Kwemboi Sadam on 30th June 2022 under minute.33/DSCNAB/2022.	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following micro scale projects, 1. Lolachat seed micro irrigation demonstration site prepared on 30th March, 2023 2. Liko Elijah micro scale irrigation project prepared on 31st October, 2023	30

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively appointed Lokiru Charles as Civil Engineer (Water) on 29th June 2018 under minute.21/18/NDSC/2018.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively recruited an Assistant Water Officer for mobilization nor was there a staff seconded from MOWE. The role was being executed by Agan Tito who was engaged on contract by CAO Olaboro Emmy Ejuku, on 29th June 2018.	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.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively appointed Louse Joseph Borehole Maintenance Technician on 30th June 2022 under minute.30/DSCNAB/2022.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had neither substantively appointed a Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOWE.	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.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Environment Officer, Modo Gabriella on 23 May 2019 under minute.46/NABDSC/2019.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Nabilatuk DLG had substantively recruited Forestry Officer, Lokwara Jovan Kelvin on 30 June 2022 under minute.31/DSCNAB/2022.	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for civil works on all water sector projects as listed below, 1. Drilling and installation of 7 boreholes prepared on 14th February, 2023 2. Drilling and casting of 3 production wells at Ariamaoi, Natirae and Nachete villages prepared on 17th February, 2023 3. Construction of water supply system at Nataparararengan village phase two prepared on 10th February, 2022	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	The projects that were implemented in the water sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because 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	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Abstraction permits were not presented at the time of assessment and the District Water Officer also confirmed that there was no abstraction permit. However, the DWO presented a drilling permit for the driller who drilled the boreholes for the previous FY. The permit details were: permit number was KAM64/DP-03031/2022/RR, it was issued on 28th June, 2022, valid for one year from 1st July, 2022 to 30th June 2023. It was issued to SKYLIGHT AFRICA LTD; the contractor who drilled the boreholes.	10