



LGMSD 2022/23

Nakapiripirit
District

(Vote Code: 543)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	75%
Education Minimum Conditions	30%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	30%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	75%
Educational Performance Measures	65%
Health Performance Measures	58%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	50%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	44%

**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 district only had one project implemented using DDEG funding and it was completed and being utilized.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of Council Hall at the district Headquarters at Ushs 51,508,000 (Budget page 10 and Q4 report(page 81). 	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>A copy of the result assessment presented by the Planner during the assessment indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 13% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 54%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 48%</p> <p>This implies that there was a 6% increase.</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>The DDEG project was implemented in the FY 2022/2023 and was all completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>- Construction of Council Hall at the district Headquarters at Ushs 51,508,000 (Budget page 10 and Q4 report(page 81).</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 51,508,000 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; - Construction of Council Hall at the district Headquarters at Ushs 51,508,000 (Budget page 10 and Q4 report(page 81).	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 no DDEG funded project that was implemented in the FY 2022/23, as the money budgeted in the FY2022/2023 was used to clear an outstanding payment which was carried forward from the FY 2021/2022.	0

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	From the staff list presented at the LG and the attendance reports seen in the three LLGs sampled (Moruita Sub County, Kakamongole Sub County and Nakapiripirit Town Council, there was evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance, for Nakapiripirit Town Council; the following staff as per the staff list were found on ground; Ngiro Stella- Assistant Verterinary Officer, Otukol Tom Health Inspector, Lochuge Floriand- ARO, Nkoobe Ajji-Physical Planner, Nakanyima Apolo -PTA, Lokidi Micheal -PTA, Lokol Everline-Office Assistant.	2
4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.	0

5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>	<p>The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="810 226 1121 483"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>DLG IVA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tokora S/C</td> <td>49 39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakapiripirit S/C</td> <td>60 42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kakamongol S/C</td> <td>64 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moruita S/C</td> <td>91 92</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The performance of Nakapiripirit and Kakamongol LLGs was outside the credibility performance range of +/- 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.</p>		DLG IVA	Tokora S/C	49 39	Nakapiripirit S/C	60 42	Kakamongol S/C	64 20	Moruita S/C	91 92	0
	DLG IVA													
Tokora S/C	49 39													
Nakapiripirit S/C	60 42													
Kakamongol S/C	64 20													
Moruita S/C	91 92													
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</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>There was no evidence that the LG implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY</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>There was evidence from the recruitment plan dated 26th April 2023 that the LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. The plan was submitted to MoPs on 27th September 2023.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the monthly attendance analysis report that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI). For instance the best performer in the DLG was Lowkii Veronika Ilukol, the Principal Human Resource Officer and Nachuge Christine the Personal Secretary to CAO were the best performers with 96% attendance for the period July 2022-June 2023. The worst performers were Anyakun Bernard a Driver with 39% and Kodet Paul, Office Assitant with 39%.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiritpirit DLG had 9 HoDs and they were appraised as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kocho Mark, CFO was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 2. Oketayot Patrick District Engineer, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by CAO Awuye Abdallah 3. Athiyo Denis, DCDO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 4. Lobok Fredrick, Commercial Officer, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 5. Atibu Abdallah Loese, Ag. District Production Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 6. Bako Florence, Ag. Natural Resources Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 7. Putan Molly Risa, Ag. District Health Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 8. Ameil Alice, Ag District Education Officer was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by CAO Awiye Abudallah 9. Kigundu Patrick Musoke, District Planner was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Ag. DCAO Ilukol Jobs Lomenen 	1

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. For instance the committee sat on 4th May 2023 and;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognized Ongoro Simon, Medical Clinical Officer for exemplary teamwork, cooperation, multi-tasking and discipline. He received a token of 20,000/= from the committee 2. Sanctioned Mande Joshua, Public Health Dental Officer for irregular attendance, he was given a last chance to reform 3. Iriama Joyce, Stores Assistant was also sanctioned for failing to keep all stock cards for drugs and sundries updated, a transfer was recommended <p>The committee is comprised of Chairperson Illukol Jobs Lomenen, Secretary- Lokwii Veronical Ilkol, Amei Alice- member, Oketayot Patrick- member, Acio Denis- member, Putan Molly- Member</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>The committee was established on 2nd July 2017 and comprised of Chairperson Illukol Jobs Lomenen, Secretary- Lokwii Veronical Ilkol, Amei Alice- member, Oketayot Patrick, District Engineer- member, Acio Denis- member, Oboth Henry, Information Officer- member, Owalinga Loise, District Health Officer- Member.</p> <p>A register of grievances was maintained by the DLG for instance on 6th October 2023 there was a grievance on the threats on the lives of Lemusui Health Workers reported by the Incharge. The health workers were advised to leave the Health Facility and they were temporarily deployed elsewhere within the DLG Health Centers.</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>The DLG did not recruit any staff during the previous FY.</p>	1

9	Pension Payroll management	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:	The DLG had one staff who retired the previous FY. Angolere Robert Ravas, Deputy Head Teacher retired on 1st September 2022 and accessed the payroll on 17th November 2022.	1
	Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	Score 1.		

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in the previous FY as per the releases below;	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Kakomongole S/C received Ushs 18,835,941</p> <p>Namalu S/C received Ushs 52,841,152</p> <p>Loregae S/C received Ushs 27,486,258</p> <p>Moruita S/C received Ushs 23,161,100</p> <p>Nakapiripiti T/C received Ushs 16,703,596</p> <p>Kaawach S/C received Ushs 4,368,826</p> <p>Loreng S/C received Ushs 4,368,826</p> <p>Lemusui S/C received Ushs 4,368,826</p> <p>Tokora S/C received Ushs 4,368,826</p> <p>The total transfers to all the LLGs in the LG added up to Ushs 156,503,349 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two installments dated:</p> <p>In quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2 paid on 18th October 2022;</p> <p>In quarter 3 was paid on 09th January 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.</p>	

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG did Not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was 3rd October 2022, warranted on 18th October 2022, warrant was 14 days late; and</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January 2023, warranted on 12th January 2023 which was not within the time limit.</p> <p>Quarter 4: There was no development fund.</p>	0
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	<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>In quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>In quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 18 October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>In quarter 3 funds were released on 1st January 2023 and the communication was made on 09th January 2023 which was not within 5 days.</p> <p>In quarter 4 LG didn't receive the development fund.</p> <p>Depending on quarter two the communication was not within the timeline as per the guidelines.</p>	0
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	<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>In quarter one supervision and mentoring report was conducted from 30th July 2022.</p> <p>In quarter two supervision and mentoring report was conducted from 30th November 2022 to 02nd December 2022 as per the report.</p> <p>In quarter three supervision and mentoring report was conducted from 24th March 2023.</p> <p>In quarter four supervision and mentoring report was conducted from 16th May 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. The minutes were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In quarter one report was discussed on 13th October 2022 under Min: 4 DTPC/OCT/FY 2022/2023. - In quarter two report was discussed on 21st March 2023 Min:5/MAR/DTPC/2022/2023. - In quarter three report was discussed on 25th April 2023 Min:4/DTPC/April/FY 2022/2023. - In quarter four report was discussed on 14th June 2023 Min:7/DTPC/JUN/FY 2022/2023. 	2
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripit LG produced a soft copy of the assets register duly reconciled up to 30th June 2023. The items were categorized into Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment, Machinery, Buildings specialized, among others and it was downloaded from IFMIS. However core assets like land were missing details in the register.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District provided the Board of Survey for FY 2021/2022 (BOS) dated 30th June 2022, however, the acknowledged stamp by the Accountant General's Office was missing. BOS was signed by the Committee Chairperson Nayor Teddy Grace, the secretary Twalamoe Ben Bala committee members on the Board of Survey who witnessed the physical stock of inventories. 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 disposal of existing assets.</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 a 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. 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref CR/214 dated 1st August 2021.</p> <p>The committee held all the quarterly meetings as per the minutes of the meetings availed to the Assessment team;</p> <p>In quarter 1 meeting was held on 30th August 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 2 meeting was held on 28th October 2022</p> <p>In Quarter 3 meeting was held on 21st March 2023</p> <p>In quarter 4 meeting was held on 15th May 2023.</p> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows;</p> <p>Quarter 1 , Quarter 2, Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to the Ministry on 03rd July 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. The DDEG project was desk appraised on 25th April 2023 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP, and availability of funds in the Approved Budget</p> <p>- Construction of new Administration Block.</p> <p>The project was derived from the DDP III page 140 under human capital development, approved budget page 11.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects The project field appraisal was conducted on 14th March 2023 and were as follows;</p> <p>- Construction of new Administration Block.</p> <p>The project was appraised by the District Planner, District Environment officer, DCDO and other technical team. The project was recommended for funding to improve on the service delivery at the district Headquarters.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed in a meeting held on 18th May 2023 at Council Hall under TPC Min 04/DTPC/MAY/2022/23 Presentation of Project Profile for development projects and were 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 New Administration Block at District Head Quarters 2. Construction of seed secondary Schools in Moruita and Kakomongole sub counties 3. Supply of School furniture 4. Completion of 3 classroom block at Aoyareng P/s. 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Screening for environmental and social risks/impact was done and mitigation measures put in place for the following projects below however, monitoring using check lists was not adhered to as per the monitoring protocol in the project implementation cycle.</p> <p>Below are examples of projects that were screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng primary school prepared on 21st September, 2022 2. Micro scale irrigation demonstration site at Namalu mixed primary school prepared on 17th April, 2023 3. Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Lomorunyangae HCII prepared on 22nd September, 2022 	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>An approved consolidated procurement plan date 3rd October, 2023, signed by CAO, Wadada Lawrence, was availed as evidence to show that infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using DDEG were incorporated in the plan. This was indicated as staff house construction at Tokora HCIV.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	The Contracts Committee minutes dated 4th October, 2023 under minute 14/10/cc/23-24 (Vii), approving the contracts for all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG before commencement of construction were seen during the assessment.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was no letter by the CAO, establishing the Project implementation team (PIT).	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There were no DDEG project that were implemented in the FY 2022/23, however there was payment made to clear a debt for the FY 2021/2022.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There were no reports in place for supervision by the LG since there were no projects implemented in the FY 2022/23, except there was payment for retention of the project done in FY 2021/2022.	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 no DDEG implemented project in the year under review FY 2022/23, however in there was payment for retention money for the FY 2021/2023.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	There were no files to review as there were no project implemented in the FY 2022/23 under review, however there was payment of retention money for the project done in the FY 2021/2022.	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 Mr. LLukol Jobs Lomenen the Principal Assistant Secretary as the focal person with an appointment letter issued on 2nd June, 2021 and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprising of Mr. Lodoumoe Philip the Town Clerk as the Secretary, Mr. Athiyo Dennis the District Development Officer as a member, Ms. Amei Alice the District Education Officer as a member, Ms. lokwii Veronica the Principal Human Resource Officer as a member, Ms. Owalinga Loise the Ag. District Health Officer as a member, Mr. Oboth Henry the Information Officer and Mr. Okateyot Patrick the District Engineer as a member with appointment letters issued on 2nd June, 2021.	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	There was evidence of a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for on-ward action in handling grievances for example, there were cases registered on 3rd June, 2021 of land disputes where the community complained of encroachment on their land arising from the proposed site for the construction of Mourita seed secondary school. a community meeting was held and the issue was resolved after the community was ably sensitized on the relevance of the project.	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 District did not publicize the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. For example, there was no display of the grievance redress mechanism on the noticeboards, and neither were baazas or radio talk shows presentations conducted.	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 no 74 to 78 and this includes tree planting, protection of wetlands, and greening of institutions and climate-smart agricultural practices of LG DDPII, page 13 of the approved work plan. Social issues are captured under community and mindset change on page 15 of the 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 report held from 16th June 2023 to 28th June 2023. Some of the activity results were dissemination of DDEG guidelines for FY 203/24 to participants which included Sub county chiefs, sub county community development Officers, Parish chiefs.	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) for the construction of a new administration block at Nakapiripirit Town Council was integrated into the Bidding, contractual and BoQs at a cost of UGX. 672,680,850	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There were no examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change because they were not budgeted and listed in the districts' projects profiles	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was proof of land ownership for projects implemented with the district for example, 1. A certificate of title for Plot 83-87, Moroto Road at Kopedur issued on 7th July, 2022 with instrument No. MOR-00000277 where the new administration block at Nakapiripirit Town Council was constructed. 2. A land agreement made on 5th December, 2019 purposely for the construction of Moruita seed secondary school.	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. Monitoring performance report for the construction of Mourita seed secondary school prepared on 24th April, 2023 2. Mmonitoring report for health projects prepared on 30th June, 2023 and these included the completion of fencing at Lomoruyangae HCII, construction of a 3 stance drainable latrine at Lomoruyangae HCII and construction of a gate at DHO's office 3. Monitoring report for health projects prepared on 31st May, 2023 for the completion of fencing at Lomoruyangae HCII, construction of a 3 stance drainable latrine at Lomoruyangae HCII and construction of a gate at DHO's office.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environment Officer and CDO did not complete and sign certification forms prior to payments of contractors 'invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example, 1. Payment certificate number 1 issued on 28th August, 2023 for the construction of micro-scale irrigation schemes was not signed by both Environment and Community Development Officers 2. Payment certificate number 1 issued on 7th June, 2023 for the drilling and sitting of 7 boreholes was not signed by both Environment and Community Development Officers 3. Payment certificate number 1 issued on 15th June, 2023 for the completion of a fence at Lomorinyangai health centre II was not signed by both Environment and Community Development Officers	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 and were up to-date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to Assessment Team as detailed below;</p> <p>A/c name: NAKAPIRIPIT DITRICT REVENUE</p> <p>A/c No: 005430168000001</p> <p>Bank Name: Bank Of Uganda</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 149,993,008</p> <p>A/c name: NAKAPIRIPIT DISTRICT YOUTH</p> <p>A/c No: 3100037128</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 33,462,014</p> <p>A/c name: NAKAPIRIPIT DISRICT UWEP</p> <p>A/c No: 6312100016</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 10,672,988</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 31th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 31st January 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 31st April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 31st 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 the implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows:</p> <p>The quarter-one report was received on 31st October 2022.</p> <p>The quarter two was received on 31st January 2023.</p> <p>The quarter three was received on 31st April 2023.</p> <p>The quarter four report was received on 31st July 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 the CAO, LGPAC, Lg Accountant Office, and RDC/LCV Chair through the Registry on the following dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 31st October 2022 submitted on 31st October 2023 - discussed on 15th May 2023, under MIN 4/NLGPAC/05/2023</p> <p>Quarter 2 report is dated 31st January 2023 submitted on 31st January 2023 - discussed on 15th May 2023, under MIN 4/NLGPAC/05/2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 dated 31st April 2023, submitted on 31st April 2023 – discussed on 21st June 2023 under MIN 4/NLGPAC/06/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 dated 31st July 2023, submitted on 31st July 2023 – discussed on 21st June 2023 under MIN 4/NLGPAC/06/2023.</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 2022/23 was Ushs 128,689,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 31) and the Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 316,959,723 which gave a variance of Ushs (188,270,723) this indicate that Nakapiripit District local Government over collected local revenue which shows good performance.</p> <p>$(188,270,723/128,689,000) \times 100\% = 146\%$</p> <p>The LG managed to correct 146% of its planned revenue which indicates that they underestimated there potential to correct local 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 31 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 102,336,434</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 316,959,723</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 316,959,273- Ushs 102,336,434= Ushs 214,622,839</p> <p>=(214,622,839/102,336,434 x 100= 209%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 increased by 209%.</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>The LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of OSR as indicated by the schedule of collection of LST dated 23rd January 2023 Ref:CR/103/7 by CAO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Namalu S/C received Ushs (503,375) 2. Loregae T/C received Ushs (890,500) 3. Kakomongole S/C received Ushs 1,007,500 4. Moruita S/C received Ushs 1,326,000 5. Kaawach S/C received Ushs 1,718,438 6. Loreng S/C received Ushs 1,509,625 7. Lemusui S/C received Ushs 1,105,000 8. Tokora S/C received Ushs 3,438,500 9. Nakapiripit T/C received Ushs 10,713,750 <p>It was noted by the CFO that For Namalu S/c and Loregae S/c didn't remit their local revenue to the District, the LG decided to chop its share off the revenue to be shared with defaulter sub-counties.</p>	2

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 available to show 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>Subject of procurement: Construction of cattle crush at Lokoma village</p> <p>Type of procurement: Selective bidding</p> <p>Name of best evaluated bidder: Riwoko construction co.ltd</p> <p>Contract price: Ugx 17,936,000/=</p> <p>Date of display: 8th May,2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 19th May, 2023"</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A copy of the Performance Assessment results on file dated 09th August 2023 being addressed to Head of departments, Town clerks (Nakapiripit T/c) and S.A CAO for all the sub counties showed that the district displayed a copy of the results of the assessments on the notice board. The letter was endorsed by CAO.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a Barraza discussion with the entire community of Nakapiripit Town Council dated 15th March 2023 under MIN 05 where the audience were given a room to discuss any issues that affect them.</p> <p>The list of participants registered for their attendance and the photos were also attached on the file.</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 12th July 2022 with ref CR/103/7 on the notice board.</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

It was noted by Clerk to Council no IGG issues was reported during the previous Financial year.

**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 479</p> <p>Total absentees were 09</p> <p>Total that sat were $(479 - 9) = 470$</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = $9 + 237 + 108 = 354$</p> <p>Pass rate = $(354) \times 100 = 75.3\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">470</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 554</p> <p>Total absentees were =17</p> <p>Total that sat were $(554 - 17) = 537$</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3)= $32 + 295 + 116 = 443$</p> <p>% pass rate= $(443) \times 100 = 82.5\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">537</p> <p>% IMPROVEMENT = $82 - 75.3 = 7.2\%$</p>	4

1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.	b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was = 93</p> <p>Total absentees were = 04</p> <p>Total that sat were = 89</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 2+9+23 = 34</p> <p>Pass rate = $34 \times 100 = 38.2\%$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">89</p>	3
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	<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 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was = 54</p> <p>Total absentees were = 1</p> <p>Total that sat were (54 - 1) = 53</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3) = 0 + 11 + 16 = 27</p> <p>% pass rate = 27×100</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53</p> <p>% IMPROVEMENT = $51 - 38.2 = 12.8$</p>	
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.	a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year	<p>The average score of education LLG performance decreased by (52%) compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 26%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 55%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p>= $(0.26 - 0.55/0.55) \times 100\% = (52\%)$</p> <p>The Education LLG performance assessment for the current year decreased by (52%) from the previous year's performance.</p>	0
	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 		
		NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.		

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>LG Budgeted for Ugx 1,900,095,000 in FY 2022/23 and spent as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. Construction of Seed school in Mourita at Ugx 900,095,000 on page 31 of the approved budget.ABPR page 123. 2. 3. Construction of a seed school in Kakomongole at Ugx 1,000,000,000 on page 31 of approved budget ABPR page 123 3. 1. Construction of 3 classroom blocks and supply furniture. ABPR page 56. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Processing and signing of certification forms was inconsistently observed by the Environment Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate number 3 for the construction of Mourita seed secondary school structure issued on 15th May, 2023 both the Environment Officer and CDO did not sign. 2. Payment certificate number 1 for the construction of Kakomongole seed secondary school issued on 10th April, 2023 both the Environment Officer and CDO did not sign. 3. Payment certificate number 2 for the construction of Moruita seed secondary structure issued on 30th March, 2023 signed by only environment Officer signed. 	0

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

One project out of the three sampled was +9.63%, within +/- 20% allowable variation the other two were -195.45%, outside the allowable range therefore did not comply.

The projects were.

1. Construction of two units 5-stance VIP latrine at Kakomongole seed secondary school

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-23/00010:

2. Construction of a Two-class room blocks at Kakomongole seed secondary school

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-23/00003

3. Construction of a three classroom block Aoyereng primary school

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/00009:

Project 1

Estimated cost: Ugx 64,705,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 191,175,346/=

Variation: Ugx -126,470,346/=

%age variation (- 126,470,346/64,705,000) x 100= -195,45%

Project 2

Estimated cost: Ugx 131,753,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 417,974,410/=

Variation: Ugx -286,221,410/=

%age variation (- 286,221,410/131,753,000) x 100% = - 217.24

Project 3

Estimated cost: Ugx 116,535,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 105,313,407/=

Variation: Ugx 11,221,593/=

%age variation (11,221,593/105,313,407) x 100% = 9.629%

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The quarter 4 report dated 14th July, 2023 to the Executive Director PPDA signed by Ilukol Jobs Lomenen for CAO on page 2, indicates that the performance for education projects at Kakomongole Seed Secondary School was at 62%.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Project :1 Construction of Classroom block A	
			Planned amount: Ugx 420,551,410/=	
			Amount spent: Ugx 366,018,968	
			% age spent (366,018,968/420,551,410) x 100%= 87%	
			Project: 2 Construction of classroom block B	
			Planned amount: Ugx 390,639,236/=	
			Amount spent: Ugx 144,957,740/=	
			%age spent (144,957,740/ 390,639,236) x 100% =37%	
			Project: 3 Construction of classroom block C	
			Planned amount: Ugx 402,749,929/=	
			Amount spent: Ugx 254,990,801/=	
			%age spent (254,990,801/402,749,929) x 100% = 63.3%	
			Average (63.3 +37+87)/3 = 62%	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	Nakapiripirit LG current primary Teacher's staff list indicated a total of 266 teachers posted in the 27 UPE schools which was average as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines relative to the ceiling of 511	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	266 X 100	
			511	
			= 52%	
			This implied that the LG was 48% less of the required UPE teachers.	

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 Nakapiripirit LG 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 27 registered primary schools was in place consisting of the following ; 167 classrooms, 171 latrine stances, 2027 desks, 93 teachers houses and no laboratories' prepared by Abura William and approved by the DEO Alice Amei .

This implies that 81.8% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format .

$$22 \times 100$$

$$27$$

$$= 81.8\%$$

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

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

At Namorotot primary school taken as urban had 10 teachers listed on the list posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Aleo Dinnah Rose as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the DEO..

Napiananya Primary School taken as semi urban School had 14 teachers with Andrew Ayopo as head teacher also matched well with the DEO's list..

Okwapon primary school taken as rural had 10 teachers the head teacher Ms. Odunge Dorothy. The list also matched well with that of DEO.

This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was at $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$.

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Evidence indicated that the DLG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 27 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>Namorotot primary school taken as urban had 8 classrooms, 59 desks, 7 stances of latrines and 4 teachers houses .</p> <p>Napianananya primary school taken as semi- urban had 8 classrooms, 13 latrine stances, 40 desks & 4 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Okwapon primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 8 classrooms, 30 desks, 11 latrine stances & 2 teachers houses though in bad shape.</p>	2
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 complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines;</p> <p>Namorotot primary school(urban)</p> <p>Primary school had budgeted for the whole calendar year 2023 dated 7th January, 2023 with clear cash flow statements for term 3 2022 and signed by the SMC chairperson Mr. Loren Simon peter and an asset register having 8 classrooms, 7 latrine stances, 59 desks and 4 teachers houses.</p> <p>,Napianananya primary school taken as semi urban primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC dated 8th February 2023 clearly indicating the annual budget and cash flow for the previous FY that had been drawn on 13th September 2022 following the publicized circular by the DEO's office dated 7th September,2022 of the capitation grant for quarter one FY2022/2023 , they had been signed by the SMC chairperson Mr. Logiel Raphael.</p> <p>Okwapon primary school equally had the necessary annual budget for the previous FY clearly showing the budgeted figures for term III 2022, term I2023, term II 2023 all had been signed by the chairperson SMC Ms. Molu Elizabeth as per report dated 21st March,2023.</p> <p>$2/3 \times 100 = 66.6\%$</p>	0

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

Evidence adduced indicated that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.

At schools visited, there were inspection feedback reports that pointed out recommendations of inspections signed by the Inspector and Head teachers where the Head teachers were agreeing to implement the recommendations.

From the sampled and visited Schools; Namorotot, Napiananya and Okwapon primary school the Headteachers possessed respective SIPs and implementation was evident as shown below;

Namorotot primary school feedback from inspection by Abura William on 20th April 2023, the following SIPs were agreed upon:

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

The district education officers to ensure that the school acquires a sitting centre.

To address the issue of learners absenteeism .

The DLG to recruit more teachers.

To conduct go back to school campaigns so as to ensure more pupils enrolment.

Napiananya primary school the LG education office supported in the following SIPs;

Increasing the number of desks and the target was to at least 450 desks for the 1351 learners to add on the 40 existing desks.

Availing teachers with more residential house.

Construction of a temporarily kitchen.

Okwapon primary school SIPs in place involved the following:

Conducting back to school campaigns within the community through providing incentives such as temporary shelter to accommodate more learners, providing safe drinking water at school, involving in sports, teachers supervision in the teaching process.

This indicated: $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$

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 EMIS return forms for all the 27 primary registered schools from the previous FY totaling to 19,527 learners by 3rd November,2023. Further still there was a reminder on the LG notice board for all schools to update the captured EMIS information before 15th November, 2023. The notice was dated 18th September,2023</p> <p>The %age of schools was;</p> $\frac{27}{27} \times 100$ $= 100\%$	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>There was 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.: The Budget was 3,439,950,000/=</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the staff list that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY.</p> <p>The DLG deployed 266 primary school teachers for the 27 UPE schools which aligns with the education sector guidelines.</p> <p>According to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment, for instance:</p> <p>Namorotot Primary School taken as Urban had 10 teachers.</p> <p>Napiananya Primary School taken as semi urban had 14 teachers.</p> <p>Okwapon Primary School taken as rural had 10 teachers.</p>	3

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,

score: 1 else, score: 0

The teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG notice board as part of the entire LG staff list.

The LG staff list for 2023, dated 7th september,2023, which included 266 primary school teachers, was found posted on the LG Education notice board.

The acknowledgment stamp from the DEO was dated 13th September, 2023. Additionally, the Head teachers at the visited schools had also displayed their respective staff lists for the calendar year 2023 in their offices that matched that the LG notice board. For instance;

Namorot primary school had list displayed as of 5th February, 2023.

Napiananya primary school had list displayed as of 8th February, 2023.

Okwapon primary school had a list dated 11thFebruary, 2023.

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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

- There was evidence that all (25) primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO. For instance;

1. Opio John Robert, Head Teacher Lomorimor PS was appraised on 30th December 2022 by SAS
2. Odunge Dorothy, Head Teacher Okwapon PS was appraised on 6th February 2023 by SAS
3. Nachuge Christine, Head Teacher Moruita PS was appraised on 6th February 2023 by Ag. SAS
4. Alinga Gregory Ogwit, Head Teacher Kakomongole PS was appraised on 1st February 2023 by SAS
5. Asire John Francis, Head Teacher Namalu Mix PS was appraised on 4th January 2023 by SAS
6. Sagal Simon Peter, Head Teacher Kaiki PS was appraised on 6th February 2023 by SAS
7. Aboka Mathew Sam, Head Teacher Nakale PS was appraised on 1st January 2023 by SAS
8. Chapi B. Paul Head Teacher Napapiripirit PS was appraised on 1st January 2023 by SAS
9. Ayopo Ander, Head Teacher Napiananya PS was appraised on 10th February 2023 by SAS
10. Eese Margaret, Ag. Head Teacher Loregae PS was appraised on 30th January 2023 by SAS

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for secondary school head teachers at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The staff in the LG education department were appraised as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lomogin Joseph, School Inspector was appraised on 30th June 2023 by PAS Illukol Jacob Lomenon 2. Nanduru Christine -Sports officers was appraised on 30th June 2023 by PAS Illukol Jacob Lomenon 3. Amei Alice- Senior Education Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by PAS Illukol Jacob Lomenon 	2
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The DEO's office prepared the Education Department training plan dated 7 July, 2022, for the calendar year 2022–2023. The attendance for this period was 12 members, and the breakdown is as follows:</p> <p>From 10 July to 30 September, 2022, a training session for teachers in various schools was conducted on competence-based assessment, as outlined in the training plan.</p> <p>From 10 October to 30 October, 2022, a refresher training for school managers on the use of TELA took place, as specified in the approved training plan.</p>	2

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The 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. The school enrolment and budgets allocations had been put into the system of PBS.</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>Nakapiripirit LG made allocations of UGX 14,080,000 to Education Department for inspection and UGX 7,400,000 for monitoring by the Recaptured on page 31 Of 58 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> <p>Quarter 1 was released on 02nd July 2022 and warranted on 02nd August 2022 which was not within the timeline.</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022, warranted on 18th October 2022, warrant was 14 days late.</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January 2023, warranted on 12th January 2023 which was not within the time limit.</p> <p>Quarter 4; was released on 11th April 2023 and warranted on 26th April 2023 after 15 days which was not within the timeline.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

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

The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:

Quarter 1 funds were released on 02th July 2022 and the communication was made on 26th July 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 18th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 9th January 2023 which was within 5 days.

Quarter 4 funds were released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 13th April 2023 as per the release letters which was not within 5 days.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

For the FY 2022/2023, the Education department prepared an inspection Plan dated 17th March, 2022 it was prepared by Lomongin Joseph the inspector of schools. Was signed by the DEO and DIS. The plan prioritized to inspect the Government Schools (27 Primary and 2 Secondary). Below are the dates on which the pre-inspection plans were carried out;

Term III 2022 meeting was on 26th October, 2022 planned to cover all the 30 schools.

Term I 2023 meeting was held on 17th March, 2023 planned to inspect 27 schools in attendance were 12 members.

Term II 2023 meeting was held on 7th July, 2023 planned to cover 30 schools, in attendance were 12 members.

Term III 2023 meeting was held on 5th August, 2023 planned to cover 27 schools and also discuss the previous findings from earlier inspections. $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>The inspection reports reviewed for the previous financial year revealed that 100% of government schools were inspected for Term III 2022 and Terms I and II of 2023. Feedback reports were provided for only Term III 2022, accompanied by the necessary recommendations, which were delivered to the assessed schools.</p> <p>The report for Term III 2022 and Quarter IV of the fiscal year 2022/2023, dated March 7, 2023, indicated that all 27 primary schools were inspected. This implies a comprehensive inspection coverage of 100% for Term I, II, 2023, and Term III 2022, considering the total number of schools assessed (<u>27</u> schools x 100%). = 100%</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

27

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment team noted that inspection reports were discussed especially at the schools as confirmed from the schools assessed below;</p> <p>At Namorotot Primary School, there was a detailed file displaying recent inspection reports. The head teacher confirmed that though inspectors utilized tablets they managed provide feedback. Such as head teacher to supervise teachers to ensure effective teaching, more teachers needed to beef up the existing ones.</p> <p>Similarly, at Napinananya Primary School, inspection reports were available. With the necessary recommendation s such as more desks, support supervision , improving the class arrangement etc</p> <p>At Okwapon primary school the following recommendations were made in the feedback report carrying out back to school campaigns to encourage more learners to join school and also reduce the high rate of absenteeism</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>At all the visited schools, there was evidence that the District Inspector of Schools (D.I.S), Lomongin Joseph, presented findings from inspections and monitoring results to the Directorate of Education Standards (D.E.S) on the following consecutive dates:</p> <p>15th August 2023: Term II report 2023</p> <p>6th February 2023: Term III report 2023</p> <p>17th June 2023: Term I report 2022, etc.</p> <p>All these reports were submitted by Lomongin Joseph, the Inspector of Schools, and they were received and stamped by Took Victoria on behalf of the D.E.S. Acknowledgment letters were issued in response.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education sat and discussed delivery issues in a meeting that was held on 16th December 2022 at the District Council Hall where at least 32 members were present. Under Min no 06/NDLC/12/2022. Presentation of Committee reports. On Lakeri Jeniffer noted that the roads that were identified as safe one which included Lokoma to Lemusui, Kakomgole to Choasan, Napedepedio to karita and Kakomongole to Nabilatuk. These roads will assist in monitoring security situation. Under education it was further noted that Education received two seed secondary schools in Moruita and Kakomongole sub counties.</p> <p>- Meeting held on 13rd December 2022 under Min no 1/12/2022/WEC presentations and it was noted that the district got 42 learning institutions namely;</p> <p>-Primary school 27</p> <p>-Secondary schools 2</p> <p>-Tertiary 1</p> <p>Private schools 3</p> <p>-Community Schools 2</p> <p>Challenges were also discussed during the meeting</p>	2

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called “Go back to school” campaign from both DLG education office and sampled schools in conjunction with Unicef in minutes dated 4th May,2023 education officer Abura William was given a responsibility of having radio talk shows on heritage fm so as to encourage the communities to take their children to school UGX 14,036,000 was given to him to ensure that he disseminates the information	2
----	--	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	<p>The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed accurate reporting on the assets of 27 primary schools.</p> <p>The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Namorotot Primary School: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 classes were reported. • 7 latrine stances were confirmed • 59 desks were counted • 4 housing units were observed. 2. Napiananya Primary School: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 classes were reported. • 13 latrine stances were confirmed 40 desks were present reported • 4 housing units were observed 3. Okwapon Primary School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 classes were reported. • 11 latrine stances were identified. • 30 desks were counted • 2 housing units were observed. <p>During the assessment, it was noted that the infrastructure in the three visited schools did align with the information recorded in the District Local Government's register.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

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>Desk Appraisals were not on file at the time of assesment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no vidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The was evidence to show that the LG education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the consolidated procurement plan. The plan was approved on 3rd October, 2023, endorsed by the CAO, Wadada Lawrence. The education items were completion of classrooms and construction of staff house at Kakomongole seed secondary school which were costed at Ugx 450,000,000 and 500,000,000/= respectively.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that school infrastructure was approved by the contracts committee and cleared by the solicitor general before commencement of construction this was done when the contracts committee sat on 19th & 20th July,2022 where the contract was approved in Min4/7/cc/2022-2023 (3-10) and in solicitor letter dated 13th March,2023 singed by Magomu David Andrew for solicitor general clearing the contract for construction of Kakomongole seed secondary school.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not properly establish a Project Implementation team for school construction projects in a letter dated 8th July,2022 by the Ag DEO Amei Alice, in which the following officers were named The District Engineer The road inspector The Environment officer The Gender officer The labour officer The community development officer The district Agric. engineer to the project implementation team FY2022/23 without giving specific names of the officers which was not right. The mandate of establishing the PIT is for the CAO.	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>	A visit at Kakomongole seed secondary school established that the infrastructure followed standard technical designs provided by the MoES. It was confirmed that the classrooms where of size 7.2 x 9M internal dimensions, height of 3.5M from floor wall to plate level, door openings of 1.2 x 2.5M with those for windows 1.2 x 1.5M, walls 200mm thick made from concrete blocks, a ramp for access by the diabled to the classrooms.	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 to show that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY, some of the reports showed that site meetings were held on 12th April, 2023 and 13th June 2023, by the roads inspector and others for April, May and June 2023 by the District engineer all for Kakomongole seed secondary school.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY at least one monthly joint technical supervision involving the engineer, environment officer CDDs were held this was in reports dated 30th February, 2023, 27th April, 2023 and 30th June, 2023,signed by Environment officer, DCDO and DEO.	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed however payments to contractors were not within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example; - Voucher no. 5901081 dated 15th June 2023 for the construction of Construction of Moruita seed school at 370,638,000 by Sanitation Africa Ltd was initiated on 15th May 2023 and paid on 15th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment. - Voucher no. 6441304 dated 28th June 2023 for the Construction of Two five Stance toilets in Kakomongole Seed Secondary school at Ushs 71,413,398 by Nyak Totoz Enterprises Ltd Nakapiripit was initiated on 25th May 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days of processing the payment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	The LG education department did not timely submit a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by 30th April, as the submission was done on the 28th September, 2023, which was after the required date.	0

13

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*

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

1. Construction of two 5-stance latrine at Kakomongole Seed Secondary School-Block A

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00010 The file had.

1. Signed works contract dated 13th February, 2023 with Nyaktotoz Enterprise.
2. Contracts committee decision dated 27th January, 2023
3. Evaluation report dated 4-7th January, 2023
4. Form PP1, call for bid, supervision reports, record for payments.

2. Construction of a two classroom block at Kakomongole Seed Secondary School-Block B

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00003: The file had these documents.

1. Signed works contract dated 13th February, 2023 with ENGEDI company.
2. Contracts Committee decision dated 27th January, 2023
3. Evaluation report dated 4-7th January, 2023
4. Form PP1, call for bid, supervision reports, record for payments.

1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of a grievances handling mechanism in the education sector.

0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence availed on the dissemination of the education guidelines on environment management at the time of assessment, although a couple of education guidelines were availed including the guidelines on environmental management prepared by the Ministry of Water and Environment plus the National Environmental Management Authority dated November, 2020</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Costed ESMPs were prepared and integrated within the BoQs and contractual documents for the education sector projects for example,</p> <p>1. Construction of Kakomongole seed secondary school with ESMPs prepared on 25th June, 2022. The 2 units of 5 stances latrines had an ESMP with at a cost of UGX. 4,000,000 and integrated within the BoQs at a cost of UGX. 188,300,860 with mitigation measures under Bill No. 1: preliminaries and general conditions, item I on safety, health and welfare for work place costed at UGX. 800,000 and removal of rubbish, debris, and cleaning at completion costed at UGX. 840,000</p> <p>2. Construction of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng primary school with prepared on 22nd September, 2022 at a cost of UGX. 2,000,003 with a total BoQs costed at UGX. 105, 313, 407 and Bill No. 1 item A for environmental safeguards for clearance of the area of all underground growth, small bushes, removal of all trees costed at UGX. 2,250,000</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects for example, a land agreement made on 5th December, 2019 purposely for the construction of Moruita seed secondary school was availed.</p>	1

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>Monitoring reports were availed as evidence to show that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for the following constructed projects in the education sector,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring performance report for the construction of Mourita seed secondary school prepared on 24th April, 2023 2. Monitoring report for the construction of Kakomongole seed secondary projects prepared on 30th June, 2023 3. Monitoring report for the construction of Kakomongole seed secondary project prepared on 27th April, 2023 4. Monitoring report for the demonstration sites at Namalu mixed primary school at Tokora (Acherer) prepared on 27th June, 2023 5. Monitoring report for the construction of a three classroom block at Aoyareng primary school prepared on 28th April, 2023 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>Processing and signing of certification forms was inconsistently observed by the Environment Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate number 3 for the construction of Mourita seed secondary school structure issued on 15th May, 2023 both the Environment Officer and CDO did not sign. 2. Payment certificate number 1 for the construction of Kakomongole seed secondary school issued on 10th April, 2023 both the Environment Officer and CDO did not sign. 3. Payment certificate number 2 for the construction of Moruita seed secondary structure issued on 30th March, 2023 signed by only environment Officer signed 	0

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>From the Statician , HMIS 107 Reports for the three Sampled Health facilities :Tokora HCIV,Namalu HC IIIand Amaler HCIII were assessed and their Annual total deliveries for FY 2021/22 and FY2022/23 compared and computed to ascertain if there is any percentage increase in Health service utilization.</p> <p>The Annual deliveries for Tokora HCIV,Namalu HC IIIand Amaler HCIII were: 510 , 574 ,318 respectively for FY 2021/22 and 542,520 , 376 respectively for FY2022/23.</p> <p>The total delivery attendance during FY2021/22 was 1,402 and whereas for FY2022/23 was 1438</p> <p>This represented 2.6% increase in total deliveries.</p> <p>This indicates a low increase in utilization of Health Care Services as compared to national target indicator of 20%</p> <p>The DHO’s verbal report attributed this low performance to insecurity caused by frequent attack of the community around the health facilities by the warriors in the previous FY.</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 average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 72% as per the OPAMS.</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF program was incorporated in PHC, as the letter from MOH addressed to CAOs, 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. 127,517,000 (Approved budget page28), they received Ugx 127,517,000 (ABPR, page 131) and spent UGX. 127,517,000 (ABPR. Page131) on the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II at Ugx 25,000,000 - Construction of Fence at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II at Ush 40,000,000 - Renovation of DHO's office block including Solar power reinstallation at Ugx 26,017,000. - Construction of Generator shelter at DHO's office at Ugx 10,000,000 - Construction of DHO 's Security Gate/Main Gate at Ugx 10,000,000. 	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0

The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer and District Engineer only certified the projects however District Environment Officer and District community Development did not certify the works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;

1. Voucher no 6433523 with dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 10,845,165; Certificate No 1; dated 13th June 2023; Contract No. Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00018: Project; Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II was certified by DHO and District Engineer on 13th June 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't verify the work.
2. Voucher no 6434450 with dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 30,395,398; Certificate No 1; dated 15th June 2023; Contract No. Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00017: Project; Construction of Fence at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II was certified by DHO and District Engineer on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer and DCDO didn't verify the work.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There were three projects all were within - 7.85% and complied with +/-20% allowable variation. The projects reviewed were;

Project: 1 Construction of chain link fence at Lomorunyangae HCII.

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/22-2023/00017

Project: 2 Construction of a 3-stance latrine at Lomorunyangae HCII

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00018

Project 3: Construction of generator house at DHO's office

Procurement ref: NAB901/wrks/2022-2023/00020

Project 1

Estimated cost: Ugx :40,000,000/=

Project cost: Ugx: 39,170,600/=

Variation cost: Ugx 829,4000

%age variation $(829,400/40,000,000) \times 100\% = 2.07\%$

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 25,000,000/=

Project cost: Ugx 24,618,040/=

Variation: Ugx 381,960/=

%age variation $(381,960/25,000,000 \times 100\% = 1.52\%$

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 20,000,000/=

Project cost: Ugx 21,571,000/=

Variation: Ugx -1,571,000/=

%age variation $(1,571,000/20,000,000) \times 100\% = -7.85\%$

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There were no health upgrade facilities in this district.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	Expected Health workers are 139, actual is 125. The staffing levels are at 91%.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was no health facility upgrade that was implemented in the district in FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	From the DHO staff list dated 20th July 2023, there was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled in Health facilities :Tokora HCIV,Namalu HC III and Amaler HCIII was accurate as indicated below:	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		Tokora HCIV had 22 staff .(DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding with the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health Centre noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on the Health Centre).	
			Namalu HC III had 7 staff, Amaler HCIII had 3.(DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding with the actual number of staff on the facility staff list at the noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on the Health Centre).	

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From report from DHO,there was an upgrade for Namaru HCIII to HCIV.</p> <p>There was construction of the theatre going on and the work had reached the Ring Beam level. The mortuary was also undergoing construction.</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>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the 3 Sampled Health facilities: Tokora HCIV, Namalu HC III and Amaler HCIII prepared and submitted Annual Workplans and budgets 2022/2023 to the DHO.The Documents were not available in DHO's Office.</p> <p>The DHO verbally reported that since the incorporation of RBF into PHC, all facilities in the district were instructed by the MOH to prepare a comprehensive Health work plan and budget which included the facility improvement plan.</p> <p>(No copy of the Letter from MOH was provided by DHO support this.)</p> <p>Therefore, all the 3 health facilities didn't conform to the provided Budget and Grant Guidelines.</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>Tokora HCIV submitted their budget performance report on 14th August 2022. While there was no evidence that Namalu HC III and Amaler HCIII submitted their annual budget performance reports to the DHO's office.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence to show that the sampled health facilities (Tokora HCIV, Namalu HC III and Amaler HCIII developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>While health facilities made monthly submissions, not all reports were submitted within the stipulated timelines. The submissions whereas below;</p> <p>July 2022</p> <p>Tokora HCIV submitted on 11th August ,2022</p> <p>Namalu HC III submitted on 5th August 2022</p> <p>Amaler HCIII submitted on 9th August 2022</p> <p>August 2022</p> <p>Tokora HCIV Submitted on 9th Sept,2022</p> <p>Namalu HC III Submitted on 8th Sept,2022</p> <p>Amaler HCIII Submitted on 5th Sept,2022</p> <p>September 2022</p> <p>Tokora HCIV Submitted on 10th October 2022</p> <p>Namalu HC III Submitted on 5t October ,2022</p> <p>Amaler HCIII Submitted on 7th October 2022</p> <p>October 2022</p> <p>Tokora HCIV Submitted on 10th Nov,2022</p> <p>Namalu HC III Submitted on 4thNov,2022.</p> <p>Amaler HCIII Submitted on 7th Nov,2022</p> <p>November 2022</p> <p>Tokora HCIV Submitted on 6th Dec 2022</p> <p>Namalu HC III Submitted on 7th Dec,2022</p> <p>Amaler HCIII Submitted on 6th Dec,2022</p> <p>December 2022</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 11th Jan,2023.

Namalu HC III Submitted on 9th Jan,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 5th Jan,2023

January 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 9th Feb,2023.

Namalu HC III Submitted on 4th Feb,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 4th Feb,2023

February 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 10th March,2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 5th March 2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 6th March 2023

March 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 13th April,2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 6th April ,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 5th April 2023

April 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 12th May,2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 6th May 2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 6th May 2023

May 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 13th June 2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 6th June,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 6th June 2023

June 2023

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 13 July 2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 6th July,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 6th July ,2023

HMIS 106a (quarterly)

1st Quarter 2022/23

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 10th Oct,2022

Namalu HC III Submitted on 6th Oct,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 7th Oct,2023

2nd Quarter 2022/23

Tokora HCIV submitted on 13th Jan 2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 9th Jan,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 5th Jan,2023

3rd Quarter 2022/23

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 13th April 2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 5th April,2023

Amaler HCIII Submitted on 10th April ,2023

4th Quarter 2022/23

Tokora HCIV Submitted on 13th July,2023

Namalu HC III Submitted on 11th July,2023

Amaler HC III submitted on 11th July 2023

RBF was incorporated in PHC Program as per the letter from MOH addressed 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.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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.

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 in PHC Program as per the letter from MOH addressed to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.

0

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track submission date for the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports by the DHO. He noted that the new system doesn't send email notification compared to 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 implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the district developed and implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities. The plan was submitted and approved on 8th July 2022. The weakest performing Health Facilities were Moruita HCII, Brigade HCIII, Kariga HCII and Nakala HC II. The areas of weakness were Low immunization coverage, low deliveries among others.</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>The DHT progress report dated 30th September 2022 reported the following activities done as corrective actions in the PIP to the weak facilities: Moruita HCII, & Brigade HCIII, Kariga HCII. Nakala HC II.</p> <p>The implemented activities included:</p> <p>Distribution of EPI tools to these Facilities,</p> <p>Initiation of pregnancy screening during the outreaches conducted by the above-mentioned weak Health facilities.</p> <p>Conducted integrated outreaches.</p> <p>A radio Talk show was also organized on 15 July 2022 on Heritage Fm intended to sensitize people about services offered at these Health facilities in order to promote the utilization of health services utilization.</p>	1

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>From the approved costed staff Establishment dated 31 July 2018, Nakapiripirit DLG had budget for Health Workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms at Ugx 2,041,833,000/=.</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>There was evidence to show that Nakapiripirit District deployed health workers as per guidelines, (to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing Norms. The deployment in the 3 sampled facilities is indicated below:</p> <p>St Matia Amaler HCIII had 15 out of 19 required health workers for HCIII, giving over 79% of the required staffing norm for HCIII. (Confirmed Staff at St Matia Amaler HCIII Notice Board)</p> <p>Tokora HCIV had 47 out of 48 required health workers at HCIII giving 98% of the required staffing norm for HCIV (Confirmed staff list at Tokora HCIV noticeboard)</p> <p>Namalu HCIII had 20 out of 19 required health workers, giving 105% of the required staffing Norm for HCIII. (Confirmed staff list at Namalu HCIII noticeboard)</p> <p>Therefore, all the 3 health facilities had over 75% staff deployed at each health at the time of assessment hence Nakapiripit District deployed health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.</p>	2

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Some health workers were not working in the health facilities where they were deployed (as per health staff deployment lists, attendance registers and attendance analysis at the health facilities). Here below are the findings from the sampled health Centres .

Tokora HCIV: 20 out of 22 health workers deployed to Tokora HCIV were present on duty on the day of assessment; 6th November 2023. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included:

1. Kejjo Denis Orthopedic Officer
2. Chiyumba Carolyne Enrolled Nurse
3. Babaraza Rogers Laboratory Assistant

The 2 staff who were not present on the day of assessment were: Titin Jane Nursing Officer who was reported sick and Teko Anyakun Sabina was on leave. There were no documentary evidence to show cause of their absence

(Tokoro staff attendance book).

Namalu HCIII: 6 out of 6 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included.

1. Apuun Alice Enrolled Nurse
2. Akello Evelyne Nursing Officer in-charge
3. Allupo Dina h Health assistant.
4. Tukei Grace Enrolled Nurse. (Namalu HCIII staff attendance book 6th November 2023)

St Matia Amaler HCIII 2 out of 3 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included:

1. Akello Mary Jenvive Enrolled midwife
2. Lokule Suzan Enrolled Midwife

One Staff was found not in attendance book but exist on deployment list. This was Nasambu Catherine Enrolled Midwife, had been transferred to another Health centre but no copy of transfer letter available in H/C Incharge's office.

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

The displayed list of staff at Tokoro HCIV had noticeboard had a total of 47staff including those staff not paid by the District and volunteers.

whereas the one displayed at Namalu HCIII had a total of 30 staff,including 4 seconded by TASO and 6 cleaners Namalu HCIII noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 and were stamped.

St Matia Amaler HCIII had a complete list of 15 staff including the 3 deployed by the District ,on the Notice board .

2

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

There was evidence that the DHO had conducted annual performance appraisals of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO. For instance;

1. Epou Emmanuel, incharge for lemusui Health Center- was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
2. Akello Evelyn Mercy, incharge for Namalu Health Center- was appraised on 6th July 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
3. Amei Hellen Rose, incharge for Nakapiriprit Health Center- was appraised on 5th July 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
4. Abura Raphael, incharge for Lomorunyangae Health Center- was appraised on 31st October 2022 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen, the staff was on probation
5. Ojaro Alex, incharge for Karinga Health Center- was appraised on 31st October 2022 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen, was on probation
6. Nakuwam Kizito,incharge for Nabulenger Health Center- was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen

1

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that 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. For instance;

1. Lowakori Walter, Laboratory Assistant was appraised on 31st October 2022 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
2. Dengel Mark, Laboratory- Theater Assistant was appraised on 15th November 2022 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
3. Loteng Judith- Enrolled Mid-wife was appraised on 2 September 2022 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
4. Nansambu Catherine- Mid-wife Namalu was appraised on 8th July 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
5. Simo Jackson- Cold Chain Assistant - Tokoro was appraised on 11th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
6. Lochoro Grace- Midwife - Lemsui was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
7. Ajwang Clementinah- Enrolled Nurse - Lemsui was appraised on 2nd July 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
8. Anago Naume- Health Information Assistant - Namalu was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
9. Nangiro Scholastica- Mid wife - Namalu was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen
10. Koryang Irene Angolere- Mid wife - Namalu was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the PAS Ilukol Jobs Lomenen

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence from the reviewed appraisals that corrective actions based on the appraisals were taken. They included training on immunization practices, Safe Male Circumcision procedures and administrative skills.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training plan for health workers provided by the HR office.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training attendance registers for health workers provided by the HR office.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence for the copy of the letter notifying MoH of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants for the current FY. Obtain and review the Budget and Grant Guidelines 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 more than 15% 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 FY2022/2023</p> <p>Page 26 PHC NWR UG 260,110,000</p> <p>Page 28- Health Management and Supervision = UGX 43,460,000</p> <p>Calculation</p> <p>$MSMSS/NWR*100$</p> <p>$43,460,000/260,110,000*100=16.7%$ (the 15% maximum allowed in Sector Grant Guidelines)</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter 1 was released on 02nd July 2022 and warranted on 02nd August 2022 which was not within the timeline. 2. Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022, warranted on 18th October 2022, warrant was 14 days late. 3. Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January 2023, warranted on 12th January 2023 which was not within the time limit. 4. Quarter 4 was released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 26th April 2023 after 15 days which was not within the timeline. 	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9

N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0

The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:

Quarter 1 funds were released on 02th July 2022 and the communication was made on 26th July 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 18th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 9th January 2023 which was within 5 days.

Quarter 4 funds were released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 13rd April 2023 as per the release letters which were not within 5 days.

0

9

N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases which were all displayed on the notice board for the public to view.

Quarter 1 releases were publicized on 26th July 2022.

Quarter 2 releases were publicized on 18th October, 2022.

Quarter 3 releases were publicized on 9th July 2023.

Quarter 4 releases were publicized on 13th April 2023.

1

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Nakapiriprit District health department conducted performance review meetings and implemented action (s) recommended by the MHT quarterly performance review meeting(s) held during the previous FY.

1st Quarter performance Review meeting took place on 23rd October 2022

It raised a number of issues like: Inadequate T.B screening and inadequate linkage of T.B Clients to care.

This issue was implemented by the district with assistance from IDI. The district introduced a system of Continuously screen TB at entry points. IDI also introduced CORPs and Community Link facilitators to link Clients to Facilitators (2nd Quarter Report2022 submitted on 26 th April 2023.)

The 2nd Quarter performance Review meeting took place on 26th April 2023. Recommended some sensitization programs on Malaria. This was implemented in Namalu and Loringae Sub counties and was reported in the 4th Quarterly Review meeting which took place on 06th July,2023.

The 3rd quarter performance review meeting took place on 13 April 2023

The 4th Quarterly Performance Review meeting took place on 6th July2023 reported implementation of the resolution that came in the 1st quarterly meeting where Stock out rates were reported in some Health facilities like Namalu. In the previous quarter.

The implementation done to minimize stock out rate was to redistribute drugs from over stocked to understocked.

(4th Quarter DHT performanceReport2022 submitted on 26 th June2023.)

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that DHT Quarterly performance Review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners, key departments. Example of the attendance is shown below:</p> <p>The 1st Quarter performance Review meeting dated 23rd October, was attended by :</p> <p>Dr. Dr. Tapem Phillip, MO in charge Tokora H CIV,</p> <p>Sister Elitherbeth,Sister In- charge St Matia Amaler HC III</p> <p>Amel Hell Rose Nursing Officer in-charge Nakapiririt HCIII</p> <p>Awil Bea Betty Enrolled Mid wife in-charge Loregae HC II</p> <p>Representatives from development Partners like TASO,CARITAS,CUAMM, AFI, members from other departments like District Finance office, District water Officer, Community Development Oficcer ,ARDC 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 Nakapiririt District carried out Support supervision on Tokora HC IV atleast once every quarter in the FY 2022/23, as indicated below:</p> <p>On 30th October 2022 there was a support supervision done on Tokora HCIV and established that some Health workers were not Putting on Uniforms among other issues</p> <p>On 3rd Dec 2022, there was another Support supervision on Tokora Health Centre IV and found inadequate amount of equipment at OPD for example Growth monitoring Board and some workers again were not putting on Uniform. The Team recommended the DHO to initiate the Procurement process for the Uniform.</p> <p>On 12th April,2023 there was a District support supervision on Tokora HCIV and observed limited space especially in OPD and recommended that the DHO should lobby for assistance for extension of an OPD.</p> <p>On 15th June ,2023 there was a 4th quarter support supervision on Tokora HCIV and identified lack of some critical cadre for example An Aesthetic Officer,Entomologist and a Senior Medical Officer.</p> <p>It also observed that that there was a delay in filling of Staff appraisal forms.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that Health Sub-Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY as detailed below :</p> <p>On 26-30th September 2022 HSD carried out support support supervision to lower Health Facilities. The Health facilities covered included:407Bridgate HCII, Morutta HCII,</p> <p>Karinga HCII, Nakapiripiti HCIII, Nakale HC II, Namaru HCIII, Amare HCIII, Lemusui HCII, Namalu Prison HCII.</p> <p>Among the key issues noted Health workers of 407 Brigade raised an issue of unclear job description.</p> <p>In the same support supervision Morita HC II was also visited there was no Health unit management Committee</p> <p>In Kaliga Health Centre II it was found that staff don't carry out self-assessment on quality.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Nakapiripit district used 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.</p> <p>On the issues raised by staff of 407 Brigade in the support supervision of 26-30th September 2022 It was recommended that the DHO takes on this issue with the Human District Human Resource Manager to give standard guidelines and job description to the Facility.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Nakapiripit district provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the year 2022/23</p> <p>There was no Report provided, No MMS file in the DHO's office</p>	0

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	A review of the performance report showed that DHO received UGX 43,459,418 as per page 27 of the approved budget. A review of the report showed that there was no clear allocation for Health promotion. However, a summary of the payment vouchers showed that Ugx19,830,760 was spent on Health promotion. Expressed as percentage = $\frac{Ugx\ 13,472,419}{Ugx\ 43,459,418} \times 100$. This was 31%.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence That Nakapiripit DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per the ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY 2022/23 as indicated below: on 15 July 2022 DHE conducted a Radio Talk show on Heritage FM . He educated people on the importance of MCH and immunization and also encouraged people to utilize Health services.(Report by DHE dated 20 July 2022) on 30th November there was socio mobilization on polio Vaccine conducted in 22 villages in the District which included:Moruit, Namalu, Lemsui among others. There was vaccination campaign for girls against HPV. It was conducted in the integrated outreaches led by The DHT and participated in by all Health facilities of the district.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	No evidence of follow up and no follow up report seen on health promotion	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Nakapiripirit District had updated Assets register 2023, which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. For Example:</p> <p>The Register had assets attached to DHO Office for example 2 Double Cabins Pickups), 3 CPU, Ambulance. There were also 5 motorcycles,</p> <p>Health facility reequipments like fridges, computers and other equipment attached to health facilities were in the register.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Desk Appraisals for Health Projects were not on file at the time of Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Field Appraisals for Health Projects were not on file at the time of Assessment.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health facility investments listed below were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures using the checklist</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Screening for the completion of fencing of Lomorunyangae HCII was done on 22nd September, 2022 2. Screening for the construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Lomorunyangae HCII was done on 22nd September, 2022 3. Screening for the construction of a maternity ward at Nabulenger HCII was done on 2nd August, 2023 4. Screening for the construction of a staff house at Tokora HCIV was done on 2nd August, 2023 	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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department did submit timely by April 30th all their infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans as they did so on 3rd October, 2023. The request was for construction of maternity ward at Nabulenger HCII and staff house at Tokora HCIV.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG health department submitted procurement request form PP1 to PDU by 1st quarter of the Current FY.</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>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 by the contracts committee when it sat on 17th March 2022, in minute 17/03/CC/2022-2023 under 3(v)-(VII). In which they approve construction of; 3- stance VIP latrine and chain link at Lomorunyangae HCII and generator house at DHO's office</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	The LG did properly establish a project implementation team (PIT) in a letter dated 8th July,2022 signed by Putan Molly Risa, the DHO, were the following persons were named to PIT.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	<p>The District engineer</p> <p>The road inspector</p> <p>The Environment officer</p> <p>The Gender officer</p> <p>The labour officer</p> <p>The community development officer</p> <p>The district Agric. engineer</p> <p>to the project implementation team FY2022/23.</p>	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	At Lomorinyangai HCII it observed that the chain link fence constructed was of G 10, 2.1m high fixed on 50 x 50 5mm angles using gauge 10 plain wire in four rows at 0.6m c/c anchored into concrete at the bottom of 200mm width, which was in compliance with the designs by the LG Engineer.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0	There were no records for infrastructure upgrade that was implemented during the year for assessment FY 2022/23.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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 undertaken in the LG during the year for assessment 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 was no upgrade of health facilities undertaken in the LG during the year of assessment FY 2022/23</p>	1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence provided indicated that DHO verified the work and initiation of payments to contractors were within specified timeframes.

1. Voucher no 6433523 with dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 10,845,165; Certificate No 1; dated 13th June 2023; Contract No. Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00018: Project; Construction of 3 Stance Pit latrine at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II was certified by DHO and District Engineer on 13th June 2023, the payment was initiated on 13th June 2023 and the payments were done on 28th June 2023 which was within the 30 days.
2. Voucher no 6434450 with dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 30,395,398; Certificate No 1; dated 15th June 2023; Contract No. Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00017: Project; Construction of Fence at Lomorinyangai Health Centre II was certified by DHO and District Engineer on 15th June 2023, the payment was initiated on 15th June 2023 and the payments were done on 28th June 2023 which was within the 30 days.

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

1. Construction of a 3-stance VIP latrine at Lomorunyangae HCII

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00018.It had the following document:

1. Signed works contract dated 22nd May, 2023 with Isurae tech stationery and photo lab ltd
2. Contracts Committee decision dated 8th May, 2023
3. Evaluation report dated 5th May, 2023
4. PP1 forms, supervision report, record of payments among the documents of file.

2. Construction of Chain link at Lomorunyangae

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00017

1. Signed works contract dated 22nd May, 2023 with Nakemillian construction compnay
2. Contracts Committee decision dated 8th May, 2023
3. Evaluation report dated 5th May, 2023
4. PP1 forms, supervision report, record of payments among the documents of file

3. Construction generator house at DHO

Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00020

1. Signed works contract dated 22nd May, 2023 with Lila Enterprises co.ltd
2. Contracts Committee decision dated 8th May, 2023
3. Evaluation report dated 5th May, 2023
4. PP1 forms, supervision report, record of payments among the documents of file

1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had a grievance redress mechanism for handling grievances for example, a complaint on the development of cracks in the Out Patient Department (OPD) which was a threat to both the patients and the health staff recorded at Lomorunyangae HC on 26th May, 2023.

2

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a couple of guidelines for example, the National guideline for WASH in health care facilities dated 2022 and the Social, Safety and Health Safeguards Guideline for local governments but there was no indication of their dissemination.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had put in place a functional mechanism of managing medical waste by putting in place coded bins for assorted wastes in all health units, placenta pits and incinerators for HCIV and dug up pits for generated non-wet waste where emphasis is put on burning to control it's accumulation.</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 report dated 1st February, 2023 following environmental health activities that were carried out at Nakapiripirit HCIII that included the inspection of public premises such as offices, health facility and the abattoir in the months of January 2023. An activity of training of teachers, PTAs and SMCs on hygiene/sanitation (safe human and solid water disposal) as basic primary health care and the objective was to engage participants to participate and practice basic hygiene and waste management. The content of the training covered the definition of hygiene and sanitation majoring in waste management.</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 for the completion of fencing of Lomoruyangae HCII dated 28th September, 2022 at a cost of UGX. 3,600,000 was integrated into designs, BoOs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects at a total cost of UGX. 38,420,417 with Element A: Sub structure; item A, as environmental safe guards for clearance of fencing with 800mm of all underground growth, small bushes, tree excavation at UGX. 360,000.</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment on proof of ownership of health sector projects because the titling process hadn't been completed.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for the following health projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring report for health projects prepared on 30th June, 2023 for the completion of fencing at Lomoruyangae HCII, construction of a 3 stance drainable latrine at Lomoruyangae HCII and construction of a gate at DHO's office 2. Monitoring report for health projects prepared on 31st May, 2023 for the completion of fencing at Lomoruyangae HCII, construction of a 3 stance drainable latrine at Lomoruyangae HCII and construction of a gate at DHO's office 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All certification forms for the health infrastructure projects were not completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO for example, the following certificates listed below were not signed by both.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate number 1 for the construction of Lomorinyangae health centre II issued on 13th June, 2023 2. Payment certificate number 1 for the construction of a 3 stance pit latrine at Lomorinyangai HCII issued on 13th June, 2023 3. Payment certificate number 1 for the completion of a fence at Lomorinyangai health centre II issued on 15th June, 2023 	0

**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 Nakapiripirit DLG in the previous FY was 90%</p>	2
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Nakapiripirit DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 97%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG average in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current year under review was 50% as per the OPAMS.</p>	0

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 of 53% were:-

Drilling of 2 deep boreholes rehabilitation of 3 boreholes and construction of one rain water harvesting tank in Kakomongole S/C with a safe water coverage of 50%, drilling of 1 deep borehole and construction of a piped water supply system in Loregae S/C with a safe water coverage of 52%, drilling of 3 deep boreholes and rehabilitation of 5 boreholes in Moruita S/C with a safe water coverage of 47%.

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

Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, rehabilitation of 15 boreholes, protection of 2 springs, and construction of 1 piped water supply system, and construction of 2 rain water harvesting tanks.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 20 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 27 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was $20/27 * 100\% = 74\%$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling and installation of 7 boreholes in various Lower Local Government:

Engineer's estimate = UGX
198,381,675

Contract Sum = UGX 159,872,300

Various = UGX 38,509,375

Percentage variance =
 $38,509,375/198,381,675 \times 100\% = 19\%$

2). Construction of a piped water supply system Nakaale village in Loregae sub-county.

Engineers estimate = UGX
226,139,444

Contract price = UGX 216,127,800

Variation = UGX 10,011,644

Percentage variation =
 $10,011,644/226,139,444 \times 100\% = 4.4\%$

3). Protection of 2 spring wells in Kalapata village in Namalu S/C

Engineers estimate = UGX
17,898,820

Contract price = UGX 17,778,390

Variation = UGX 120,430

Percentage variance =
 $120,430/17,898,820 \times 100\% = 0.7\%$

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY as captured on page 16 and 17 of the Annual Budget Performance Report (ABPR) included the following:-</p> <p>Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, Construction of a piped water supply system in Loregae S/C, protection of two spring wells in Namalu S/C, rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in various sub-counties, and construction of 2 rain water harvesting facilities. Basing on the sampled facilities all of them were completed and were functioning well implying that the percentage of projects completed as per the annual work plan was: $27/27*100\% = 100\%$</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>There was 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 82% and FY 2022/2023 was 90% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage change was $90\% - 82\% = 8\%$</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. 	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of water and sanitation facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 97% and 97% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage change was $97\% - 97\% = 0\%$</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 DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY as per the examples below;

- 1). Drilling of deep borehole in Kakomongole Seed Secondary School in Kakomongole sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 74849 and completed on 18th June, 2023.
- 2). Construction of a piped water supply system in Nakaale village in Loregae sub-county, funded under DWSCG and UGIFT and the water supply system was completed at the end of the Financial year with 22 number PSPs.
- 3). Drilling of a borehole in Kobenyon village in Namalu Siub-county funded under DWSCG with a DWD number 74914 completed on 20th June 2023. These projects were completed as per the plan,

Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place 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.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 17th October, 2022, in annex 1 (the form 4), there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Government.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 19th January, 2023 on pages 27; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties in the District.</p>	
			<p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 21st April, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found in annex 1.</p>	
			<p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 31st August, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages annex 1.</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>	
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO did not present any copy of form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. There was no trace of whether there was a submission of the same to the Ministry of Water and Environment for inclusion in the national data base.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY 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 was shared by the Planner at the time of assessment, and the following LLGs were the least performing Kakomongole, Namalu, and Moruita 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 LIG.</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>There was evidence from the wage estimates for 2023/20224 that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff at Ugx 53,282,000/=</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>There was evidence from the wage estimates for 2023/2024t the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff at Ugx 110,475,000/=</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>There was no evidence that the district water staff were appraised during the previous FY.</p>	0

7

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 no evidence that the district water staff were appraised for the previous FY, and consequently the capacity needs of staff were not identified. There was no capacity needs report presented at the time of assessment.

0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO allocated over 70% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 53%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Loregae S/C with safe water coverage of 52% was allocated rehabilitation of 4 boreholes and construction of a piped water system, Kakomongole S/C with safe water coverage of 50% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 4 boreholes, Moruita S/C with safe water coverage of 47% was allocated rehabilitation of 4 boreholes, drilling of 2 boreholes and protection of 1 spring well.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 458,205,709.

The total annual development budget for Nakapiripirit DWO for the current FY was UGX 618,242,856.

Therefore the percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was = $458,205,709/618,242,856*100\% = 74\%$

1

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

In this file there was a letter dated 24th August 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Loregae, Kakomongole, Moruita and Namalu.

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

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and a monitoring plan which was dated 26th August 2022, together with quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 17th October, 2022, it was noted that 200 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 19th January, 2023, a total of 212 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 21st April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 189.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 30th August, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 210.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $200 + 212 + 189 + 210 = 811/4 = 203$.

Nakapiripirit DLG had a total of 263 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $203/263*100\% = 77\%$

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

The DWO presented 4 sets of DWSCC meeting minutes to be reviewed by the assessor.

For quarter 1 the meeting was held on 30th September, 2022 and issues of importance were discussed under minute Min.5/DWSCCM/2022, Presentation from the development partners; Community Integrated Development Initiative (CIDI) gave the issue of poor soils in some of the areas that they were carrying out implementation of their projects which made it difficult for them accomplish especially the construction of sanitation facilities and were seeking guidance of the way forward from the DWO.

In quarter 2 the meeting was held on 15th March, 2023. The issues of concern were discussed under minute Min.6/DWSCCM/2023; remarks from the DWO. The key issue discussed here was the sanitation coverage, the DWO emphasized that the latrine coverage in Moruita sub-county where the sanitation program was implemented was still low so he recommended that let there be exchange visits to the sub-counties that are doing well or to the neighbouring districts that are in a better position than them, so that they can pick a leaf to help them improve.

For quarter 3 the meeting was held on the 12th April, 2023, during this meeting the main issue of discussion was noted under minute number Min.6/DWSCCM/2023; Discussion of the plan for the celebration of the world water day. It was agreed that the development partners help the district to cost share the budget of the celebration and the DWO was tasked to share the detailed budget with the partners.

In the 4th quarter the meeting was held on 28th June, 2023, during this meeting the main issue of discussion was in minute number Min.6/DWSCCM/2023; presentation by the DWO. The DWO presented the projects implementation status updates as at June 2023.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 53% as per the letter dated 24th August, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties Moruita, Loregae, and Kakomongole whose safe water coverages were 43%, 52%, and 50% respectively.</p> <p>The letter detailed the projects allocated to these various LLGs together with their budgeted amounts.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Nakapiripirit DLG water sector was UGX 66,528,146. The DWO allocated UGX 26,619,661 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $26,619,661/66,528,146 \times 100\% = 40\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 30th June, 2023. The training period spanned from 16th to 26th June, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others.</p> <p>The trainers were Ms Angella Sharon the ADWO in charge sanitation, Kotol Sentimo ADWO in charge mobilization and Loitakori Jushua the DWO.</p>	3

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented the District water office asset register and upon review it was found out that the newly constructed water sources were not included anywhere in the register, hence the asset register was not up dated.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no 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)</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>All the budgeted investments for the current FY had completed application forms from the beneficiary communities as per the records reviewed from a file of community application forms presented by the DWO to the assessor. Some of the sampled community applications included:</p> <p>1). Application from Looi village in Kakomongole S/C, the application was dated 27th June 2023, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 21st August, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LC I Mr. Logit Simon Peter and the following community members: Logiel Veronica, Koriang Lucy, and Lomongin Augustino.</p> <p>2). Application from Karwataluk village in Namalu S/C, the application was dated 22nd June, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI Lokalei Peter with the following community members Loput Lucy, Anyakun Mariko and Nangiro John. The application was cleared by the DWO for implementation in 2023/2024 financial year on 24th August 2023.</p> <p>3) Application from Rangi village in Moruita S/C, this application was dated 1st November, 2022, endorsed by the LCI Kizito with the following community members: Chepochepkai Lokorinyang and Dukwee Chepuropom. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 24th August, 2023 by the District Water Officer.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that 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.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>All water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a pipe water system phase III at Nakale prepared on 3rd August, 2023 2. Construction of a spring protection well prepared on 3rd August, 2023 	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The approved and updated procurement plan dated 20th June, 2023, signed for by CAO, had water infrastructure investments included as sitting and drilling of 7 boreholes, construction of phase III of Nakale pipe water system among them.</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>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 were approved by the contracts committee before commencement, this was done by the committee when they sat on 17th March, 2023 where the contracts were approved in Min17/3/cc/2022-2023 3i&ii.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was no evidence in form of a letter signed by the CAO establishing the PIT for the water sector.</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 to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example a Boreholes in Kakomongole Seed Secondary School of Kakomongole S/C, 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 were no record of supervision reports to show that the relevant technical officers did supervision for the water infrastructure projects.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts

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

There was evidence that the DWO did verify works and payments were initiated and paid to the contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts as per the only payment voucher which was on file;

- Voucher no.6437467 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 143,885,070 certificate no. 1 Dated 7th June 2023; contract no.Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00002; Drilling and Sitting of seven boreholes by Skylight Africa Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 15th June 2023, payment was initiated on 7th June 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

- Voucher no.5897688 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 183,232,179 certificate no. 1 Dated 24th April 2023; contract no.Nakp543/Wrks/21-22/00001; Construction of phase three of Nakale Piped water supply System by Watermax EngineeringLtd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 24th April 2023.

- Voucher no.6427428 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 16,377,453 certificate no. 1 Dated 7th June 2023; contract no.Nakp901/Wrks/22-23/00014; Protection of two springs at Kalapata by Action Contractors and Suppliers Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 7th June 2023, payment was initiated on the same date and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p>	<p>There was a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investment in place for each contract with all records in place as required by the PPDA law.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project 1: Construction of 10 CC water tank at Kakomongole</p> <p>NAK901/wrks/22-23/00015: Had;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Singed works contract dated 22nd May, 2023 with ASICCO General Enterprises. 2. Contracts Committee decision dated 22nd May, 2023. 3. Evaluation report dated 31st March, 2023, 4. PP1 for, call for bids, record of bid issue among other documents therein. 	
			<p>Project 2: Construction of two spring protections at Kalapata in Kaiku parish</p> <p>NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00014: had;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Singed works contract dated 22nd May, 2023 with Action Contractors and Suppliers Company limited, 2. Contracts Committee decision dated 22nd May, 2023 3. Evaluation report dated 31st March, 2023, 4. PP1 for, call for bids, record of bid issue among other documents therein. 	

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>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment showing the DWO handling grievances related to water and environment as per the LG grievance redress framework.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</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>There was evidence of an environmental guideline to local governments for strengthening compliance with safeguards requirements in development projects dated November, 2020 but no evidence of its dissemination to the CDOs was availed.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<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>There was evidence availed on prepared and implemented E&S screening forms for water source protection and natural resource management for WSS infrastructure projects for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of water quality lab at water office prepared on 23rd September, 2022 2. Construction of 2 spring protection sites at Kalapata village, Kaiku parish prepared on 23rd September, 2022 <p>However, the respective environment social and management plans and the monitoring reports were not prepared and implemented.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Land agreement signed on 11th November, 2022 between Lopeyok Fidela and the community of Naminit village of Kakomongole S/C. This agreement was signed by Okong Benson the LCI on behalf of the community. 2). Land agreement signed on 9th November, 2022 between Aleper Paul and the community of Aoyalira Village of Namalu S/C, and was signed by Ngorok Mandela on behalf of the community. 3). Land agreement signed on 20th November, 2022 between Losike Nakapel and the community of Katukumok village of Moruita S/C, it was also signed by Lochoriait Munyoreng on behalf of the community. 	3

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	E & S certification forms were not on file.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	The CDO and Environment Officers did not underscore monitoring and supervision of water sector projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs despite the fact that screening had been done.	0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

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

Local Government Service Delivery Results

1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no 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.</p> <p>However, MOUs were presented for the two (2) UgFIT Demo sites that were established covering a total of 1.85 acres in the FY 2022/2023. i.e</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The host farmer’s site in Tokora Sub-County (1) acre signed on 21st April 2024. 2. Host institution (Namalu mixed P/s) in Namalu Sub County (0.85) acre signed on 21st April 2023. <p>SAE reported Zero (0) acreage in FY 2021/2022 since the DLg is the first year of implementation.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	----------

1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>= (1.8-0)/1.8 (100)</p> <p>= 100%</p>	2
---	--	--	--	----------

2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4	<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 	The average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 67% as per the OPAMS.	2
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 SAE 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, on 24th April 2023.</p> <p>The Annual Budget performance report dated 16th October 2023 showed that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demo site establishment and safety tools cost was Ugx 11,948,704. 2. Farmer awareness creation at local lower local governments cost was Ugx 13,225,641. 3. farm visits and capacity building of farmers cost was Ugx 8,816,960. 	2
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>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided and the CFO noted that the LG was still in the first year of implementation of micro-scale irrigation program.</p>	1

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates excluding the cost of agricultural inputs was calculated as follows.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>SAE costed figure = Ugx 45,268,000</p>	
			<p>Contractor's costed figure = Ugx 45,268,000</p>	
			<p>Variation = $(45268000 - 45268000) / 45268000 \times 100$ = 0%</p>	
			<p>Hence the variation is within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates.</p>	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</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>	<p>The completion of the Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation was below 80% since the installations at Namalu mixed P/s were still ongoing. However Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation contracts were signed during the previous FY and partially installed.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>A signed supplier contract (Part 4 section 9 contract form), ref: NAK901/wrks/2022 dated 22nd May 2023, with Wotamax Engineering Limited and Nakapiripirit DLG.</p>	
			<p>Goods received note (GRN) were not available.</p>	
			<p>Payment vouchers were not available.</p>	
			<p>Completion certificates were not available.</p>	

4

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

Maximum score 6

a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure

- If 100% score 2
- If 75 - 99% score 1
- If below 75% score 0

From the staffing structure and the staff list, the LG 's staffing levels for extension workers was 38.8%. approved positions were 162 and 63 were filled at the time of assessment.

0

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

Maximum score 6

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

- If 100% score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs met standards as defined by MAAIF by 100%.

Upon visiting the site, the acreages for the two Demo sites were in line with MAAF standards i.e. The host farmer's site in Tokora Sub-County was 1 acre and the one in Namalu mixed P/s was 0.85 acres.

The two sites demonstrated the three irrigation techniques. Pressurized drip irrigation, drag hose irrigation system, and Sprinkler technology with the following specifications.

Pressurized Drip irrigation demo.

Main Delivery line Dia = 50mm HDPE pipe

Drip lines Dia = 16mm black tubing

Drip line Wall thickness = 1.0mm

Emitter spacing = 30cm

Laid drip line distance of separation = 60cm

Solar pump power rated capacity = 750W

Installed solar panel wattage = 1425W (3 panels each of 475W)

Pressurized micro sprinkler was installed on 0.75 acres connected with outside diameter (OD) 8 mm stake and 4/7mm PVC pipe, GI pipe of Dia, 40mm for supply and wash outlet.

The drag hose irrigation system installed had a hose pipe of Dia = 0.75in, length of 30M, adjustable garden Nozzles and two (2) hydrant assembly.

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>At the time of assessment, the two sites visited were not functioning properly. The site in Tokora Sub-County had a problem with the MPPT solar controller. The site at Namalu Primary School was incompletely installed and the driplines were poorly laid.</p> <p>The Inventory of the installed MSI equipment was not available.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	----------

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the attendance books there was evidence that the LG had deployed extension workers as per guidelines. The three LLGs sampled were Moruita Sub County, Kakamongole Sub county and Nakapiripirit Town Council.</p> <p>The staff included Ngiro Stella Joy Assistant Veterinary Officer at Nkapiripirit Town Council, Adome Simon Peter- Agricultural Officer at Moruita Sub county, Opiolo Evans- Agricultural Officer and Idima Sekiudina- Animal Husbandry Officer at Kakamongole Sub county.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	----------

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that information on installed micro-scale irrigation systems was functioning accurately. The inventory report of installed MSI equipment was not available.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	----------

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services and farmer EOI. Only two quarterly reports were presented and dated after June of the last FY. i.e., Q2 was dated 16th October 2023.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was not available on up to-date LLG information entry into the MIS.</p> <p>The SAE was unable to log into his Irri Track app as well as MIS Data base.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>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>Evidence was not presented on preparation of quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. All quarterly reports did not have MIS generated data and information.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence of a developed and approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs was not presented by the LG.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was presented on Implementing Performance Improvement Plans for lowest performing LLGs.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	From the wage estimates 2023/2024, the LG budgeted for extension workers at Ugx 493,258,000/=.	1
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	From the attendance books there was evidence that the LG had deployed extension workers as per guidelines. The three LLGs sampled were Moruita Sub County, Kakamongole Sub county and Nakapiripirit Town Council. The staff included Ngiro Stella Joy Assistant Veterinary Officer at Nakapiripirit Town Council, Adome Simon Peter- Agricultural Officer at Moruita Sub county, Opiolo Evans- Agricultural Officer and Idima Sekiudina- Animal Husbandry Officer at Kakamongole Sub county.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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

Maximum score 6

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

There was evidence from the performance appraisal reports that the extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed. For instance;

1. Apiolo Andrew, Agricultural officer- Kakomongole Su-County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah
2. Adome Simon Peter- Agricultural officer- Moruita Su-County was appraised on 24th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah
3. Idima Sekudina- Assistant Animal Husbandry officer- Kakomongole Sub-County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah
4. Okullo Daniel- Assistant Animal Husbandry officer- Namalu Sub-County was appraised on 28th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah
5. Amoti Titus- Agricultural Engineer- was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah
6. Arionga Simon Peter- Senior Veterinary Officer was appraised on 26th June 2022 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah

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

Maximum score 6

c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0

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

1. Ngiro Stella Joy
Assistant Veterinary Officer at **Nakapiripirit Town Council,**
2. Adome Simon Peter-
Agricultural Officer at **Moruita Sub county,**
3. Opiolo Evans-
Agricultural Officer and
Idima Sekiudina- Animal
Husbandry Officer at
Kakamongole Sub county.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. For instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apiolo Andrew, Agricultural officer- Kakomongole Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah 2. Adome Simon Peter- Agricultural officer- Moruita Sub County was appraised on 24th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah. 3. Idima Sekudina- Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Kakomongole Sub-County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah. 4. Okullo Daniel- Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Namalu Sub-County was appraised on 28th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah. 5. Amoti Titus- Agricultural Engineer- was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah 6. Arionga Simon Peter- Senior Veterinary Officer was appraised on 26th June 2022 by Senior Agricultural Officer Atibu Abdallah. 	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that corrective actions from the appraisals were identified. Some of the corrective actions were; Food safety and management, data science, artificial insemination techniques, animal husbandry practices, and vector control.</p>	1

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of a training plan for extension workers provided by the HR team. However, some extension workers completed the six modules of MSI program as a requirement.	0
---	--	---	---	---

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There were no training activities uploaded in the training database except for trainees' certificates for those who completed the six modules. These reports were found in the MIS database.	0
---	--	--	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines.	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG was still in the first year of implementation since it is under phase II district.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented that the LG had disseminated information on the use of farmer co-funding, for example;</p> <p>Social safeguards compliance monitoring report for Ugift projects compiled by the district community development officer dated 25th May 2023.</p> <p>Awareness raising report for the meetings held in Kakomongole and Tokora Sub-County dated 03rd April 2023.</p> <p>Monitoring report for the MSI projects dated 18th July 2023.</p> <p>A report on benchmarking /exchange visit made to Tororo DLG acknowledged by the DPMO on 24th April 2023.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>The DLG was in its first year of implementation had not reached the farmer field school and was still at the demonstration stage.</p> <p>However, for the demonstrations, there was evidence that the DPO has monitored monthly installed micro-scale irrigation equipment.</p> <p>Social safeguards compliance monitoring report for Ugift projects compiled by the district community development officer dated 25th May 2023.</p> <p>Site-specific environment and social safeguard management plan by district environment officer dated 20th April 2023.</p> <p>Monitoring report for the MSI projects by DPO dated 18th July 2023.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>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>Not applicable to Nakapiripirit DLG since this district is part of the phase II districts.</p>	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	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	At the time of assessment, 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.,	2
	Maximum score 8		Training certificates for the MSI online modules completed by the extension workers.	
			A report on benchmarking /exchange visit made to Tororo DLG acknowledged by the DPMO on 24th April 2023.The purpose was to learn from phase one district on how they implemented their Microscale irrigation projects.	
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	There was no evidence presented that LG had established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines.	2
	Maximum score 8		The DLG is in her first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects	
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	Evidence was presented that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines for example,	2
	Maximum score 4		Social safeguards compliance monitoring report for Ugift projects compiled by the district community development officer dated 25th May 2023.	
			The awareness events dated 3rd April 2023 at lower local governments with one town council with 50 participants of which 20 female, 20 male and 10 youth.	

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was no report to provide evidence that the district has trained political leaders.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The DLG was still in the first year of implementation and had not reached the farmer co-funding stage. Therefore, there was no evidence that the LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence to prove the DLG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	At the time of assessment, insufficient evidence was presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).	0
	Maximum score 8			
			There were no farm visit reports to farmers who completed expression of interest.	
			There was no documentation indicating an agreement to proceed with the quotation form.	

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government or Senior Agricultural Engineer / Secretariat publicized the list of the approved eligible farmers. According the Work plan and budget for the financial year 2022/2023, the DLG should have completed this activity.</p> <p>The reviewed noticeboards included; Namalu LLG noticeboard, Tokora LLG noticeboard, and the production department noticeboard.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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 and updated procurement plan was dated 3rd October, 2023, signed by the CAO, Wadada Lawrence did not contain any MIS project in the FY2023/2024</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG requested for quotations from prequalified suppliers as per undated list signed by CAO, and not those prequalified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>			
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	The LG called for bids from and issued bid document to four companies namely; Kadam Construction company limited Nakobekobe building contractors and suppliers. Nakemilian construction company limited Wotamax Engineering I Limited	0
	Maximum score 18		From bid receipt records only Wotamax Engineering ltd returned the bid and a contract was signed with this company, without having compared other bids and therefore did not comply with the set criteria of signing a contract with the lowest bidder.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	The Micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee when it sat on 8th May, 2023 in Min 23/05/cc/22-23 (23) that approved the contract approved.	1
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Best Evaluated Bidder (BEB) with date of displayed 8th May, 2023 and removal as 19th may, 2023 does not have names of other suppliers who did not succeed, it only shows the successful bidder: Wotamax Engineering limited, also the bid receipt records show the company as the sole bidder and therefore no comparison of prices was made.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed was in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App). All phase II district were provided with the demonstration designs that they could edit to suit their site specifications.	2
	Maximum score 18			

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	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence presented to prove that the LG was conducting regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence indicating that the Local Government (LG) supervised the testing of the installed irrigation equipment for functionality. The absence of technical, supervisory, or monitoring reports from the LG further fails to substantiate the efficient execution of the testing process.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	At the time of the assessment, the hand-over of the equipment to the approved host farmers had not been done since the installation is still ongoing.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the Local Government has made payment to the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form.	0

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	The file reviewed was for; Construction of Microscale Irrigation Scheme. Procurement ref: NAK901/wrks/2022-2023/00024, which had	2
	Maximum score 18		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed contract dated 5th May, 2023, with Wotamax Engineering Limited, 2. Evaluation report dated 5th May, 2023 3. Contracts Committee decision dated 8th May, 2023 4. Best Evaluated Bidder, bid issue and receipt record PP1 among documents on file. 	

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	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	There was no evidence of the display of grievance cases or matters related to micro-scale irrigation grievances on the notice board. This absence suggests that the Local Government did not prominently present information about the nature of grievances and the available avenues to address them in various public areas.	0
	Maximum score 6			
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	There was no record on grievances registry for the micro scale irrigation sector	0
	Maximum score 6			
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	There was no record on grievances registry for the micro scale irrigation sector	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no record on grievances registry for the micro scale irrigation sector.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no record on grievances registry for the micro scale irrigation sector.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence on the dissemination of Micro-irrigation guidelines for proper siting, land access and safe disposal of chemical waste containers.	0
	Maximum score 6			

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following micro scale irrigation projects below was carried out. 1. Irrigation demonstration site at Rainbow primary school with screening done on 24th March, 2023 and the respective ESMP prepared on 4th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 1,000,000 2. Screening was done for the Irrigation demonstration site at Namanator primary school on 28th March, 2023.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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	<p>There was evidence on monitoring of irrigation impacts for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A monthly report on environmental social safety measures for micro-irrigation demonstration sites at Nawanatau primary school May, 2023 2. A monthly report on environmental social safety measures for micro-irrigation demonstration sites at Nawanatau primary school June, 2023 3. A monitoring report for rainbow and Nawanatau primary schools irrigation demonstration sites prepared on 6th October, 2023 	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Project certification forms were not completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages for example, the payment certificate number 1 for the construction of micro scale irrigation schemes issued on 28th August, 2023	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Project certification forms were not completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages for example, the payment certificate number 1 for the construction of micro scale irrigation schemes issued on 28th August, 2023	0

**Crosscutting
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Chief Finance Officer Kocho Mark on 1st September 2025 under Minute No. 101/NDSC/2005.	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	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Senior Planner Kigundu Patrick on 6th March 2020 under Minute No. 06/NDSC/2020.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited District Engineer, Oketayot Patrick on 1st March 2003 under Minute No. 50(b)/NDSC/2003.	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.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Nakapiripirit DLG had neither substantively appointed a District Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Senior Veterinary Officer, Arionga Simon Peter on 29th March 2021 under Minute No. 10/3/NDSC/2021.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited District Community Development Officer, Athiyo Denis on 2nd June 2021 under Minute No. 20/NDSC/2021.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had neither substantively recruited a District Commercial Officer nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had neither substantively recruited a Senior Procurement Officer nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Procurement Officer Ngiro Joseph Kelae on 15th August 2008 under Minute No. 53(1)/NDSC/2008.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Principal Human Resource Officer, Lokwii Veronica Ilkol on 6th August 2010 under Minute No. 53/1/NDSC/2010.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Senior Environment Officer, Odeng Emmanuel Robert on 13th November 2020 under Minute No. 37/7//NDSC/2020.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Physical Planner, Opel Cornelius Valentine on 17th April 2018 under Minute No. 30/5/NDSC/2019.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Senior Accountant, Twalamoe Ben Bela on 3rd December 2021 under Minute No. 65/2/NDSC/2021.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had neither substantively recruited Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively recruited Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), Yeko Stella on 1st June 2021 under Minute No. 28/1/NDSC/2021.</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed 5 out of 9 Senior Assistant Secretaries as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lorika Ronnie- Loregae Sub-County appointed on 17th February 2011, Min. No. 27/7/NDSC/2011 2. Okong Benson-Moruita Sub-County appointed on 17th February 2011, Min. No. 27/5/NDSC/2011 3. Okello Tony Agaza- Namalu Sub-County appointed on 17th February 2011, Min. No. 27/6/NDSC/2011 4. Naylor Teddy Grace- Tokora Sub-County appointed on 17th February 2011, Min. No. 27/4/NDSC/b/2011 5. Lodomoe Phillip- Nakapiripirit Town Council, appointed on 20th November 2021, Min. No. 65(1)/NDSC/2021 	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed all the Community Development Officers as below;

1. Ngiro David- Loregae Sub-County appointed on 6th July 2022, Min. No. 38/NDSC/2022
2. Lemkol Suzan Napeyo -Moruita Sub-County appointed on Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/1
3. Alupo Suzan- Namalu Sub-County appointed on 5th February 2021, Min. No. 44/NDSC/2020
4. Walakori Esther- Tokora Sub-County appointed on 29th April 2022, Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/4
5. Kotol Setimo Ogwang- Nakapiripirit Town Council, appointed on 2nd June 2021, Min. No. 28/47/NDSC/2021
6. Abura Simon Peter- Kawaach Sub-County appointed on 29th April 2022, Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/2
7. TebaynagKizito- Loreng Sub-County appointed on 29th April 2022, Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/6
8. Aboka Florence- Kakomomgole Sub-County appointed on 29th April 2022, Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/5
9. Lokorio Phillip- Lemusui Sub-County appointed on 29th April 2022, Min. No. 29/NDSC/2022/3

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed all the Senior Accounts Assistants as below;

1. Lokol Sam- Loregae Sub-County appointed on 26th May 2023, Min. No. 28/15/NDSC/2023
2. Maruk Immaculate -Moruita Sub-County appointed on 1st June 2021 Min. No. 28/49/NDSC/2021
3. Nyanga Atoneita- Namalu Sub-County appointed on 26th May 2023, Min. No. 28/18/NDSC/2023
4. Loru Tom- Tokora Sub-County appointed on 26th May 2023, Min. No. 28/17/NDSC/2023
5. Kotol Setimo Ogwang- Nakapiripirit Town Council, appointed on 2nd June 2021, Min. No. 28/47/NDSC/2021
6. Nanjala Leah- Kawaach Sub-County appointed on 16th August 2010, Min. No. 53/3/NDSC/2010
7. Akope Noah- Loreng Sub-County appointed on 22nd February 2019, Min. No. 20/NDSC/2019
8. Okello Denis Emmanuel- Kakomomgole Sub-County appointed on 26th May 2023, Min. No. 28/16/NDSC/2023
9. Kolibi Mosese Chaon- Lemusui Sub-County appointed on 29th March 2022, Min. No. 20/1/NDSC/2022

Environment and Social Requirements

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0

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;

The warranted amount was UGX 125,469,213

Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 125,469,213 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13).

$(UGX\ 125,469,213 / 125,469,213) * 100 = 100\%$.

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for community based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	The Warranted amount was UGX 112,373,084 Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 112,373,084 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13).	
		score 2 or else 0.	$(UGX112,373,084/UGX112,373,084)*100=100\%$	
			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 Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening on 3rd August, 2023, for the construction of a new administration block at Nakapiripirit Town Council implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)	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 of UGX. 3,840,000 prepared on 28th September, 2022 for the construction of a new administration block at Nakapiripirit Town Council and this was integrated in the bidding, contractual and BoQs at a cost of UGX. 672,680,850</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 08th May 2023. The submission date was after the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	0

7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 16th June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		
8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY2022/23 on 09th August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.	4
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		
9	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	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>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 27th December 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 3rd March 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 30th April 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 09th August 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
	Maximum score is 4	score 4 or else 0.		

Education Minimum Conditions

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

Human Resource Management and Development

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The DLG had neither substantively appointed a District Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOES.	0
---	---	---	--	----------

The Maximum Score of 70

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Inspector of Schools, Lomongin Joseph on 31st July 2017, Min No. 19/1/NDSC/2017 The DLG had neither appointed a Senior Inspector of Schools nor was there a seconded staff from MOES.	0
---	---	---	--	----------

The Maximum Score of 70

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.	Screening for Environmental, Social and Climate Change was done for the Education sector projects for example, 1. Construction of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng primary school prepared on 21st September, 2022 2. Construction of seed secondary schools prepared on 6h June, 2022 3. Construction of 10 cubic litre water tanks at Kakomongole and Naplananya primary schools prepared on 22nd September, 2022 4. Construction of a 2 unit staff house at Kakomongole senior secondary school prepared on 2nd August, 2023 5. Completion of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng prepared on 2nd August, 2023 6. Construction of a 3 stances drainage pit latrine at Kagata primary school prepared on 21st September, 2022	15
---	---	--	--	-----------

The Maximum score is 30

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

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed District Health Officer Anguzu John, on 28th March 2008 under Min. No. 18(A)/NDSC/2008	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>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, Putan Molly Risa, on 13th November 2020 under Min. No. 34/8/NDSC/2020	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>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, Owalinga Loise Odeke, on 17th February 2011 under Min. No. 27/9/NDSC/2011	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>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The DLG had substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer, Odeng Emmanuel Robert on 13th November 2020 under Min no. 34/7/NDSC/2020	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>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The DLG had neither appointed a Senior Health Educator nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.	0

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Biostatistician, Waiswa Peter, on 17th August 2009 under Min. No. 53/NDSC/2009.	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.	The DLG had neither appointed a District Cold Chain Technician nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for the following health sector projects for the current FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a maternity ward at Nabulenger HCII prepared on 2nd August, 2023 2. Construction of a staff house at Tokora HCIV prepared on 2nd August, 2023 	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The projects that were implemented in the health sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The LG did not have a substantively appointed Senior Agriculture Engineer nor a seconded staff. The DLG customized structure provides for an Agricultural Engineer instead of Senior Agricultural Engineer. Agricultural Engineer Amoti Titus was appointed on 17th April 2018 under Min no. 30/7/NDSC/2019.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for the following micro-scale irrigation projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micro scale irrigation demonstration site at Namalu mixed primary school prepared on 17th April, 2023 2. Micro scale irrigation demonstration site at Agan John Achele village prepared on 17th April, 2023 <p>and their respective ESMPs prepared and costed as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micro-sscale irrigation project at Namalu trading center with ESMP prepared on 20th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 1,600,000 2. Micro-scale irrigation project at Achelel village with ESMP prepared on 20th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 1,600,000 	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.	Nakapiripirit DLG substantively appointed Civil Engineer (Water), Loitakori Joshua, on 17th April 2019 under Min. no. 30/11/NDSC/2019.	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.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, Lobunei Luke, on 18th February 2019 under Min. no. 12/A/NDSC/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>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Borehole Maintenance Technician, Logit Joseph, on 20th June 2000 under Min. no. 62/DSC/2000.	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.	Nakapiripirit DLG had neither 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.	Nakapiripirit DLG had substantively appointed Environment Officer, Bako Florence, on 31st July 2017 under DSC Min. no. 20/NDSC/2017	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.	Nakapiripirit DLG had neither appointed a Forestry Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOWE.	0

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was done for all civil works in the water sector for the following projects; 1. Renovation of water quality lab at water office prepared on 23rd September, 2022 2. Construction of 2 spring protection sites at Kalapata village, Kaiku parish prepared on 23rd September, 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.	There were no abstraction permits provided at the time of assessment. The LG has a completed piped water system with 22 PSPs located in Nakaale village in Loregae sub-county, these 22 PSPs supply water to the surrounding villages neighbouring Nakaale.	0