



LGMSD 2022/23

Nebbi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 794)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	76%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	0%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	76%
Educational Performance Measures	84%
Health Performance Measures	5%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The LG budgeted for DDEG worth UG70,608,000 as per page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates on only one project which was the phase IV construction of the main office block. The phase of the block was functional and being utilized by the office of the District Education Officer, the environments office and the physical planner and the registry.</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>From the Analysis of the Lower Local Government Performance assessment report, Nebbi Municipality had an overall performance of 70% in 2022 and 72% in 2023 thus an increase of only 2% which was below 5%.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>The LG budgeted for DDEG worth UG70,608,000 as per page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/23 which was spent on phase IV construction of the main office block. From the summary of page 2 of the budget performance report. The phased constructed of the main office block was completed at 100%. A site visit to the building found the phase completed and being occupied by offices like the office of the District Education Officer, the environments office and the physical planner and the registry.</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.	The LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG, budget and implementation guideline. The LG budgeted for DDEG worth UG70,608,000 as per page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/23 which was spent on phase IV construction of the main office block. Construction of the main office block was eligible for funding under DDEG guidelines 2022/2023 as stated on page 7 provided for in table 7 under Administration which allows for construction, rehabilitation and furnishing of government offices.	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	From the approved procurement plan for FY of 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, the variations in the contract price for these infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within the +/-20% of the LG Engineers' estimates. For instance; 1. For construction of Municipal Headquarters Office block phase iv, the contract price was at UGX 52,999,700 against a Engineer's estimate of UGX 53,000,000 and the variation in contract price was calculated as =0.0%. 2. For construction of Abindu division office block phase 1,the contract price was UGX 29,000,000, against Engineer's estimate of UGX 29,000,000 and the variation in contract price was calculated as 0.0%. 3. For construction of 5-stance VIP Latrine at Jukia Primary School, the contract price was UGX 21,000,000 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 21,000,000 and the contract variation was therefore calculated as 0.0%.	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0

The positions filled for LLGs were accurate. The assessment sampled three Divisions (Abindu, Thatha and Central) confirm the staffing situation. It was noted that the positions filled in the Municipal Divisions was accurate as per the minimum staffing standards. The key staff were found present at the Divisions as per the staff lists at the Municipality

1. Jawambe Edward Town Agent had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk Abindu Division vide letter dated 8th August 2023, NMC/CR/161/3

2. Thomaya Samuel appointed CDO vide letter dated 2nd March 2022 under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/344/2022, NMC/CR/156/8. Deployed at Abindu Division

3. Jawambe Edward Town Agent had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk Abindu Division vide letter dated 8th August 2023, NMC/CR/161/3

4. Okura Stephen Assistant Town Clerk had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk at Central Division, vide letter dated 1st July 2022, NMC/CR/161/3.

5. Gipatho Roseline appointed CDO vide letter dated 1st June 2018, under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/086/2018/3, CR/156/5/3. Deployed at Central Division.

6. Onyai Vergin Maryln Assistant Town Clerk had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk Thatha Division, vide letter dated 1st July 2022.

7. Mandhawun Harriet appointed CDO vide letter dated 13th June 2018, under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/086/2018/4, CR/156/5/3. Deployed at Thatha Division.

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

The LG budgeted for DDEG worth UG70,608,000 as per page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/23 which was spent on phase IV construction of the main office block. From the summary of page 2 of the budget performance report. The phased constructed of the main office block was completed at 100%. A site visit to the building found the phase completed and being occupied by offices like the office of the District Education Officer, the environments office and the physical planner and the registry.

5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The scores obtained from the two Divisions in the District assessment and from the LLG IVA outside the performance range of +/- 10 which implied that the assessment was not credible. The comparative analyzed data was as presented below;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">DLG IVA</p> <p>Abindu Div 72 50 Central Div 71 63</p>	0
<p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>				

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>The District never developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs 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 to show that the Municipality had implemented a performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had consolidated and submitted staffing requirements for FY 2022-2023 to MoPS in a letter dated 30th September 2021 and received by MoPS and MoFPED on 30th September 2021 with total wage of UGX 3,966,826,886. UGX</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>The LG conducted tracking and analysis of staff attendance for quarter 4 of the previous FY with a copy to CAO, for example, analysis showed (6) six officers attending at 90% in quarter 4 analysis;</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Okwaimungu George Senior Records Officer. 2. Kumakech Alfred Office Attendant 3. Aparo Josephine PHRO 4. Jakuma Albert Records Assistant 5. Lemiza Charles Education Officer Guidance and Counselling. 6. Tekisa Emmy Saviour Fisheries Officer. 	
			<p>While (6) six staff attendance were between 85 and 89% in quarter 4. However there were 3 staffs whose attendance were below 50% and 6 staff attendance were at 0%</p>	
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>The LG had evidence that Heads of Departments were appraised for the previous FY but outside the deadline of MoPS against their performance agreements as follows:</p>	0
		<p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principal Treasurer, MEO, Planner, Sen Vet, were appraised on 3rd July 2023. However the DCDO was newly recruited thus not legible for appraisal. 	

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that administrative rewards and sanction committee were implemented.

The committee was appointed vide letter dated 2nd August 2022 and was composed of:

1. Openytho Innocent MEO as Chairperson
2. Okello Felix Senior Human Resource Officer as Secretary
3. Mugisa Joan Ag Clerk to Council as Member
4. Okura Stephen Ag Senior Assistant Town Clerk as Member.
5. Yongchon Andrew Ag Senior Veterinary Officer as Member.

NMC/CR157.

1. The rewards and sanction committee minute dated on 6th December 2022 held at Municipal Council Hall. Where Mr Thuambe Walter was accused of misappropriation of public funds amounting to 14, 760, 368 UGX i.e. Thatha Division (9,460,368 UGX) and (5,300,000UGX) at Abindu Division.

Gross negligence of duty and insubordination. After a fair hearing by the committee Thuambe Water was found guilty by not following the due processes of Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets. Hence the committee recommended a recovery of the said money from Thuambe's salary where he agreed and that he be warned for the last time.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

Score 1 or else 0

The LG established Consultative Committee for staff grievances redress and is functional:

The committee members were appointed vide letter dated 16th June 2022 and will run for 3 financial years , the composition of the committee was as follows;

1. Openytha Innocent MEO (Chairperson)
2. Okello Felix Senior Human Resource Officer (Secretary)
3. Piwun Angle Health Inspector (Member)
4. Mugisa Joan Probation and Welfare (Member)
5. Gipatho Roseline CDO (Member)
6. Okura Stephen Ag Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Member)
7. Okechagiu O Dorothy Education Assistant (Member)

The committee in its 2nd sitting of the Negotiating, consultative and dispute settlement held on 23rd/ 6/2023 at Nebbi Municipal Council Headquarters discussed and resolved a matter between Candiru Edith Education Assistant and Berocan Winne the Head Teacher Abindu Primary School.

Candiru had asked for annual leave but the Head Teacher refused that she could not go for leave at that time since two other teachers were off duty , one on sick leave and the other on annual leave. The matter was reported to Consultative Committee for redress since the Head teacher and Candiru Edith were not in talking terms and this affecting service delivery at school where the committee reconciled the two parties for a peaceful work environment and recommended for planning of annual leaves in advance to avoid inconveniences in future.

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance

Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

The LG provided evidence that showed 100% of staff recruited during the previous FY. All accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. 13 Education Assistants, HRO and Procurement Officer:

1. Cwinyaa Lawrence Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
2. Wawelo Rebecca Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll on August 2023.
3. Ocakacon Rogers Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
4. Iwatung Fred Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll on August 2023.
5. Adubango Emmanuel Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
6. Ongiergiu Philip Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
7. Muber Uness Education Assistant who assumed duty on 24th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
8. Ngomudaga Emmanuel Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
9. Genaro Ongira Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
10. Uyenyboth James Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
11. Kawambe Christine Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
12. Rwothomio Roderick Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
13. Biwinjere Janet Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
14. Atimango Perpetua Education Assistant who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.
15. Nyipir Arnold Griffin Procurement Officer who assumed duty on 27th July 2023 and accessed payroll in August 2023.

Pension Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

Score 1.

The LG retired 5 staff in the previous FY and all accessed pension payroll as follows:

1. Acen Florence, Law Enforcement Officer. Retired on 31st December 2023 and accessed pension payroll in January 2023.
2. Mandhawun Charity Pauline, Grade V teacher who retired on 28th March 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.
3. John Ongyer Ogera, Laboratory Assistant who retired on 13th February 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.
4. Omitto Geoffrey, Town Agent who retired on 31st March 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.
5. Leotisa Canongiu, Vaccinator who retired on 31st March 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

The direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in the previous FY. A review at payment vouchers discovered that the LG transferred DDED Funds to LLGS as follows;

1. Abindu Division = UGX330,013,505
2. Central Division = UGX22,729,893
3. Thatha Division = UGX28,840,446

The first transfer was made on 27 October 2022, the second transfer was conducted on 27th January 2023 for the 2 quarters the DDEG fund was released.

10

N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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).

Score: 2 or else score 0

LG timely warranted the DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY. In Quarter 2 the LG received cash limits for the development grant inclusive DDEG worth UGX103,648,595 on 12th October 2022. The principal treasurer wrote a letter declaring the cash limits and went ahead to warrant on 13th October 2022 under warrant code 726-AW-2023-10 which was within one day after receipt of cash limits.

In Quarter 2 The LG received cash limits for the development grant inclusive DDEG worth UGX207,297,190 on 6th January 2022. The principal treasurer wrote a letter declaring the cash limits and went ahead to warrant on the same day under warrant code 726-AW-2023-15 which was on the same day after receipt of cash limits.

Therefore, timely warranting of DDEG transfers as conducted timely by the Municipality.

10

N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

The LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter. The invoicing and communication were conducted at once as follows;

In Quarter 2 the LG received cash limits for the development grant inclusive DDEG on 12th October 2022. The principal treasurer wrote a letter communicating the transfer of DDEG funds to LLGs on 13th October 2022 which was within one day after receipt of cash limits.

In Quarter 3 the LG received cash limits for the development grant inclusive DDEG on 6th January 2023. The principal treasurer wrote a letter communicating the transfer of DDEG funds to LLGs on 6th January 2023 which was on the same day after receipt of cash limits.

Acknowledgement of the receipt was publicized by the principal treasurer on the Municipality Headquarter noticeboard.

2

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Senior planner Mr. Komakech Richard provided mentoring and supervision reports for the activities conducted in each quarter of the year as conducted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In quarter one the LG conducted mentoring and monitoring of LLGs on planning and budgeting which was mainly purposed on establishing gaps in the planning and budgeting and providing guidance on the subject matter. This was evidenced through a report that was dated 28th September 2022 on document quote NMC/CR/213/8. 2. In quarter two, according to a report document quote no. NMC/CR/213/3 the LG conducted mentoring sessions for all the LLGs to identify issues concerning weak budgeting and bridge the gaps. 3. In quarter three, the LG conducting a mentoring exercise that took place between 24th to 25th March 2023. The activity was focused on the planning cycle in quarter three. This was evidenced through a monitoring report dated 30th March 2023 document code NMC/CR/213/4 4. In quarter three, the LG conducting a mentoring exercise that took place on 24th May 2023. The activity usage of sector and funding source guidelines in the planning and budgeting process. This was evidenced through a monitoring report dated 24th May 2023 document code NMC/CR/213/19 <p>Therefore, the LG supervised or mentored all LLGs in the Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines.</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>There was no evidence of discussion of the results or reports of support supervision and monitoring visits by the TPC. At the time of the assessment, it was noted by Mr. Richard Komakech that the TPC discussed when Mr. Makune William Abwooli was still the CAO but minutes were not presented for the assessment.</p>	0

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG maintains an updated assets register with the current assets recorded, the most recent procured assets that Included Asset no. 543359 which were the office desks for the Administration procured at UGX9,900,000, Motorcycle Yamaha no. LG0007-150 for the inspector of the schools, The DDEG admin block which had so far costed UGX50,349,715.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had used the Board of Survey Report (NMC/CR/108/2) of the FY 2021/2022 to make Assets Management Decisions. According to the recommendations on page that were put into action included titling, fencing and keeping of the land title register. The land title for Abindu Seed school was in the process and an amount worth UGX4,000,000 was paid to obtain the title. Other recommendations included engraving the physical assets which was also done according to page 3 of the board of survey report.</p>	1

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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.

There was evidence that the Municipality had a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of the Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. From the appointment letters issued by William Makume Abwooli the town clerk; it was provided that the following member were appointed on 12th August 2020;

1. Atona Stephen - Architect (Private practice)
2. Oyikyo Tom - Staff Surveyor
3. Kadhumbula Herbert - Health Inspector
4. Odingo Wathum Emilio - Environments Officer
5. Flavia Oyeny Rhoda - Senior Physical planner
6. Drakuma Malik - Deputy Town Clerk

The physical planning committee had submitted four sets of minutes to MoLHUD as follows;

Quarter one minutes were submitted on 29th September 2022

Quarter two minutes were submitted on 21st November 2022

Quarter three minutes were submitted on 17th February 2023

Quarter four minutes were submitted on 30th June 2023

2

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d. For DDEG financed projects;

Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was only one DDEG investment that was the Phase IV construction of the main office block at UGX70,608,000 as stated on page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/2023. According to the desk appraisal report prepared by Mr. Komakech Richard, the project was desk appraised on 28th November 2022 and the report indicated that the project was found to have been generated from the Development Plan and eligible for expenditure under DDEG guidelines.

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 only one DDEG investment that was the Phase IV construction of the main office block at UGX70,608,000 as stated on page 37 of 51 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/2023. According to the field appraisal report prepared by Mr. Komakech Richard, the project was field appraised on 29th November 2022 one day after the desk appraisal and the report indicated that the project was found technically feasible, Environmentally and socially acceptable and fits the customized designs of the project.</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>The Project profiles with costing were not availed for the assessment. Mr. Richard Komakech indicated that the profiles had not yet been discussed by the TPC and therefore there were no minutes provided to ascertain if the discussions were done or not.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty screeing was done on 15th February, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer</p> <p>Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality on 22nd March, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer</p> <p>Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV E &S screening was done on 13th April, 2023 endorsed by both the Ag PCDO and EO</p> <p>However, The CDO did not avail any ESMPs for the projects citing that the Environment officer had left a month back for another job and the acting one was not around during the time of assessment to provide the documents.</p> <p>The assessment however never accessed an official record from the Accounting officer.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan	In the consolidated annual procurement and disposal plan for FY 2023/2024 for Nebbi Municipal Local Government dated 17th October 2023, there was evidence of inclusion of DDEG funded infrastructure projects. For example;	1
		Score 1 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Animal Market Construction at Namrwodho by Engineering Department at an estimated cost of UGX 13,000,000 was indicated on page 1. • Construction of Abindu Office block-phase II at an estimated cost of UGX 30,000,000 was indicated on page 1. • Construction of Office block at Thatha division phase VII at an estimated cost of UGX 10,000,000 was indicated on page 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	No evidence showing that the infrastructure projects to be implemented in the FY 2023/2024 using DDEG were approved by the contracts committee was presented at the time of assessment. The procurement process for projects in FY 2023/2024 was still in process at the time of assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	<p>There was evidence that the LG established the project implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines. The team included the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Municipal Engineer –Olere Kasamba Joseph; 2-Principal Community Development Officer – Gipatho Roseline, 3-Environment Officer – Emilio Odongo, 4-Municipal Officer of Health – Angel Othuba, 5-Senior Human Resource Officer / Labour Officer – Okello Felix, 6-Senior Assistant Engineering Officer / Clerk of works – Kibwoto Benjamin, 7-Senior Procurement Officer – Adukuwun Consolate. <p>This team was to handle the DDEG funded projects.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the site visits to the DDEG funded projects conducted, there was evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG. For example;</p> <p>1-For construction of Municipal Headquarters office block phase IV which included plastering of internal walls, fixing of timber doors of size 900x2400mm, fixing of casement windows of size 1500x1350mm.</p> <p>2-For construction of Abindu office block phase 1 whose plan was according to the designs, was roofed with maroon pre-painted 28mm gauge iron sheets. It was fitted with steel doors of size 900x2400mm and the floor was finished with cement screed.</p> <p>3-For phase IV construction of Office block at Thatha Division, the works done included construction of the ceiling using expanded wire mesh fixed on timber braces, fixing of hardwood internal door of 900mmx2400mm and fixing of 6 steel windows and steel casement external doors.</p> <p>From the findings, all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>For the sampled projects, there was evidence that the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in the previous FY. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For construction of Municipal Headquarters office block phase IV, the Municipal Engineer, Environmental officer and <p>CDO supervised works as per reports dated 13th April 2023 and 30th June 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For construction of Abindu office block phase 1, the Municipal Engineer, Environmental officer and CDO supervised works as per reports dated 13th April 2023 and 30th June 2023. <p>From the findings there is no evidence that supervision by relevant technical officers was done prior to verification and certification at the time of assessment.</p>	2

13

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

f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):

Score 1 or else score 0

The LG had complete procurement files for each sampled contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For instance;

1. For construction of Municipal Headquarters Office block phase IV, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 13th April 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute Min04-059/5-04-2023 and awarded to Ongeyowun Busiess Solutions Limited at a contract price of UGX 52,999,700 the contract between the parties was signed on 4th April 2022.

2. For construction of Abindu office block phase 1, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 19th May 2022. The evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 5th June 2022 under minute Min04-062/19-06-2023 awarded to Leko GL Nuti Construction and Engineering works Limited at a contract price of UGX 29,000,000. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th June 2023.

3. For construction of Thatha office block phase IV, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 29th May 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 29th May 2023 under minute Min04-060/29-05-2023 and awarded to Mola and Sons Trade Supplies Limited at a contract price of UGX 21,523,747. The contract between the two parties was signed on 6th June 2023.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had complete procurement files for each sampled contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For construction of Municipal Headquarters Office block phase IV, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 13th April 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute Min04-059/5-04-2023 and awarded to Ongeyowun Busiess Solutions Limited at a contract price of UGX 52,999,700 the contract between the parties was signed on 4th April 2022. 2. For construction of Abindu office block phase 1, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 19th May 2022. The evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 5th June 2022 under minute Min04-062/19-06-2023 awarded to Leko GL Nuti Construction and Engineering works Limited at a contract price of UGX 29,000,000. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th June 2023. 3. For construction of Thatha office block phase IV, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 29th May 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 29th May 2023 under minute Min04-060/29-05-2023 and awarded to Mola and Sons Trade Supplies Limited at a contract price of UGX 21,523,747. The contract between the two parties was signed on 6th June 2023.
----	---	--	--

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The letter of appointment dated 3rd July, 2023 with the Principal CDO being the secretary and focal perosn. The committee has five members; the Principal Municipal Education officer who is the chairperson, the senior planner, the human resource officer and, the finance officer.</p> <p>The last meeting of the GRC was on 22nd June, 2023 at the Municipal headquarters.</p>
----	---	---	--

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.	The district has a clearly defined grievance redress framework. It had different stages namely; registration, assessment, appeal and tribunal committee among others	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	The grievance redress mechanism is/was posted on the notice board of the district headquarters on a manila chart and it is visible	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	The Local Government Integrated Environment, Social and Climate change interventions into LG Development Plans, annual workplans and budgets complied for the Current Financial year. A review of the Approved Local Government Development Plan on page 55 under program (Environment and Natural resources management). The government provided for the following interventions;	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development and implementation of integrated catchment management plans for water sources 2. Demarcate, gazette and conserve degraded wetlands 3. Maintain natural water bodies and reservoirs to enhance water storage capacity to meet water resource use requirements. <p>All the investments were provided for on page 55 of the Local Government Development Plan.</p>	

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence provided to ascertain that the DLG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management. The DDEG Guidelines were disseminated in the TPC meeting that was held on 27th April 2023. According the minutes that were prepared on the same day and discussed under minute no. 183/NMCTPC/4/2023 under part B titled Dissemination of the DDEG guidelines. The minutes were prepared by the planner Mr. Komakech Richard.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV, the costed Environment and Social Management Plans were included into designs BoQs of the contract document dated 4th May,2023</p> <p>Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty screeing was done on 15th February, the costed Environment and Social Management Plans (500,000) were included into designs BoQs of the contract document dated 26th April, 2023</p> <p>Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality costed Environment and Social Management Plans (500,000) were included into designs BoQs of the contract document dated 22nd March, 2023</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change implemented by the Municipal council.</p>	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV has a land title dated 9th May, 2023 Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty freehold offer the application was made on 3rd October, 2016 Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality, the District land board acknowledged receipt of application of freehold land on 11th May, 2022	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 monitoring reports provided were only for one project; Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV monitoring took place from 16th - 17th July, 2023 Environmental compliance inspection report for construction of the office block. Assessment was done on 28th June, 2023 by the Environmental Officer. The two projects below lacked evidence of support supervision; Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty screening was done on 15th February, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality was screened by the both Ag CDO and Environment Officer on 22nd March, 2023	0
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	Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV E & S certification forms as of 12th June, 2023 Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty s E & S certification forms as of 30th June, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality on 22nd March, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer	1

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>The municipality had conducted bank reconciliations as at 30th September 2023. The following accounts were reconciled and had balances as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The General fund Account number 9030012189566 had an account balance UGX0.00 2. UWEP Recovery Account number 7612100051 had an account balance UGX4,588,400 3. Youth Livelihood account number 7612100054 had an account balance UGX1,775 	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>The Municipality availed all the four quarterly internal audits reports as Required. The audit reports were produced on different dates as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter One internal audit report was produced on 9th November 2022 2. Quarter Two internal audit report was produced on 14th February 2023 3. Quarter Three internal audit report was produced on 10th May 2023 4. Quarter Four internal audit report was produced on 1st August 2023 <p>All the reports were produced by Mr. Odaga Noel Internal Auditor.</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 LG PAC and Speaker on 2nd August 2023. This was done through a report titled "Nebbi Municipal Council implementation status report for the financial year 2022/2023" This was received by the PAC Chairperson Mr. Obima Kitts on 2nd August 2022.</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>All the internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to the LG PAC and the LG accounting officer for a review. The reports were submitted on different dates as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter one report was submitted to the LG PAC, the Mayor, the town clerk on 14th November 2022 2. Quarter two report was submitted to the LG PAC, the Mayor, the town clerk on 14th February 2023 3. Quarter three report was submitted to the LG PAC, the Mayor, the town clerk on 10th May 2023 4. Quarter four report was submitted to the LG PAC, the Mayor, the town clerk on 2nd August 2023 <p>The PAC chairperson Mr. Obima Kitts wrote back to the Municipality on 2nd August indicating that the PAC had reviewed and the queries followed up by the PAC included poor performance of contracted revenue sources, absence of comprehensive revenue register.</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>From Page 17 of the final accounts of the Previous FY 2022/2023, The total budgeted local revenues including tax and Non tax revenue = UGX822,250,000 whereas the actual revenue collection was = UGX393,857,996 which converts to 47% thus out of the threshold of +/-10%.</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>From Page 17 of the final accounts of the Previous FY 2022/2023, The Revenue collection was = UGX393,857,996. From Page 13 of the Previous FY but one 2021/2022. The revenue collection was = 512,596,367. Therefore, there was a decline in OSR worth UGX118,738,371 thus no increase achieved due to reasons of unrealistic budgeting.</p>	0

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the municipality remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY. From the Local Revenue Collection and 50% Remittance Report for the Financial Year 2022/2023 that was prepared on 14th July 2023 by William Kibirige the Principal treasurer, it was indicate that the Municipality collected a total amount of UGX354,918,925 from Abindu, Central and Thatha Divisions in the financial year 2022/2023. A total amount of UGX177,459,462 worth 50% was remitted to the Abindu, Central and Thatha Divisions. This was validated with payment remiitamnce payment vouchres on file no. NMC/CR/104/3.	2
----	---	---	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts for projects in FY 2022/2023 were published. For example; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyacara Primary School, the best evaluated bid notice dated 13th April 2023 with the best evaluated bidder as Kris Consults Limited at a contract price of UGX 20,989,300 was presented. • For Supply of Computers and Printers to education department, Thatha, Central and Abindu division. The best evaluated bid notice dated 29th May 2023 with the best evaluated bidder as John Bossa JB Enterprises Limited at a contract price of UGX 10,900,000 was presented. • For contruction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Abindu Primary School, the best evaluated bid notice dated 13th April 2023 with the best evaluated bidder as Hassan and Sons Business Limited at a contract price of UGX 20,972,400 was presented. 	2
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	The performance assessment results and implications are published on the Municipality office Notice board by the planner Mr. Komakech Richard on 30th August 2023.	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 feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Local Government conducted radio talk shows to provide feedback on status of activity implementation. From the radio talk show report dated 9th February 2023. A radio talk show was held on radio Maria Nebbi indicated that the LG provided feedback on programmes being run by the district. This included feedback on HIV/AIDS programs being conducted by the district.</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>The information on tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal was placed on the Finance department notice board in 18th August 2023 by the finance officer Mr. Komakech Patrick.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no IGG issues placed before the PAC and council in the previous FY.</p>	1

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>For the year 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X was 613</p> <p>Total passes=603</p> <p>Percentage was $603/613 * 100=98\%$</p> <p>For the year 2020, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X was 798</p> <p>Total passes=759</p> <p>Percentage was $759/798* 100=95\%$</p> <p>(Current-Previous)</p> <p>Percentage change was $98\%-85\% = 3\%$</p> <p>Hence percentage improvement by 3%</p>	2
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>For the year 2022, total number of candidates who sat excluding Division X was 302</p> <p>Total passes = 298</p> <p>Percentage was $298/302 * 100= 99\%$</p> <p>For the year 2020, total candidates excluding Division X who sat was 214</p> <p>Total passes were 195</p> <p>Percentage pass was $195/214 *100 = 91\%$</p> <p>Percentage change was $99\% - 91\% = 8\%$</p> <p>Hence percentage improvement by 8%</p>	3

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>Average score in the education LLG performance had improved between the previous year but one and the previous year. The score in 2022 was 35% and increase to 70% thus registering a 35% increment which was more than 5%. This was from the LG performance assessment results that were uploaded on to the OPAMS and were cleared by the National Task force and presented in the matrix; COMPARING LLG SCORES FOR 2022 & 2023. The comparison was provided in the Analysis - LLG PA 2023 Synthesis Report dated 20th October 2023 as extracted from OPAMS.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department received UGX 116,271,809/= as sector development grant.</p> <p>The funds were used on eligible projects as follows:</p> <p>a) Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyacara at UGX UGX 21,000,000/- as indicated on the contract Payment vouchers.</p> <p>b) Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukiya at UGX UGX 21,000,000/- as indicated on the contract Payment vouchers.</p> <p>c) Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu at UGX UGX 21,000,000/- as indicated on the contract Payment vouchers.</p>	2

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The following certificates were availed to the assessor from the Development Grant projects:</p> <p>a) Payment of construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyacara at UGX. 21,000,000/- was certified by the DEO, DCDO, and District Environment Officer all signed on 12th June 2023. Payments were made on 20th June 2023.</p> <p>b) Payment of construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukiya at UGX 21,000,000/- was certified by the DEO, DCDO, and District Environment Officer all signed on 12th June 2023. Payments were made on 20th June 2023.</p> <p>c) Payment of construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu at UGX 21,000,000/- was certified by the DEO DEO, DCDO, and District Environment Officer all signed on 12th June 2023. Payments were made on 20th June 2023.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The contract price variations for the two works projects under the education department were within +/-20% for the FY 2022/2023. For instance;</p> <p>1. For construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Jukia Primary School, the contract price was at UGX 21,000,000 against the Engineer's estimate of UGX 21,000,000. The variation in contract price was calculated as +/- 0.0%.</p> <p>2. For construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Abindo Primary School, the contract price was UGX 20,972,400 against the Engineer's price of UGX 21,000,000. The variation in contract price was calculated as +/- 0.13%.</p> <p>3. For construction of 5-stance at Nyacara Primary School, the contract price was UGX 20,989,300 against Engineer's estimate of UGX 21,000,000. The variation in contract price was calculated as +/-0.05%</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There were no seed secondary schools planned for in FY 2022/2023 as per LG consolidated procurement plan dated 12th July 2022.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The staff ceiling for Nebbi MLG was 181 per the IPFs from MoFPED. The actual staffs in positions were 178.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	Therefore, $178/181 \times 100 = 98.3\%$	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG had 12 UPE schools and 1 USE schools. According to the consolidated assets register, 13 schools in the LG had basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines especially classrooms, desks and latrines.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	To calibrate the school, $13/13 \times 100 = 100\%$.	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG reported accurately on teachers and where they were deployed, in the schools. The staff lists provided by the DEO were compared with the lists at the visited schools (Nebbi Primary school, Afere Primary School and Namrwodho Primary school). The following were found:

a) At Nebbi Primary school the DEO list and that found at the school were similar in both number and names, that is 24 teachers.

b) At Afere Primary School, the list from the DEO's office had 19 teachers, while those on the ground were the same number and with similar names.

c) Similarly, at Namrwodho Primary school both the DEO's list and that at the school had 19 teachers.

The attendance books in the three schools visited confirmed the correctness of the DEO's deployment list.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG education department compiled an asset register for 2022/23 FY that accurately reported on infrastructure in all registered schools. For example:

a) Nebbi Primary School was reported in the assets register to have 15 classrooms, 23 latrines, 300 desks and 9 units of staff houses. This information was found to be true on verification by the assessor.

b) At Afere Primary School the DEO's asset register was in harmony with the information on the ground as they both indicated 12 classrooms, 20 latrines latrine, 224 desks and 4 units of staff houses.

c) At Namrwodho Primary School there were 8 classrooms, 8 latrine, 148 desks and 2 units of staff houses. This information was in agreement with what was on the ground.

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 the LG ensured that all the 12 registered primary schools complied with MoES budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports for the calendar year 2022 (signed by the head teacher and chairperson of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30.</p> <p>The assessor sampled 3 of them to check the details of school performance, cash flow, annual budget and asset register, as follows:</p> <p>a) Namthin primary school submitted on 24th January 2022.</p> <p>b) Abindo primary school submitted on 20th December 2022.</p> <p>c) Paminya Ayila primary school submitted on 26th November 2022.</p> <p>Of the sampled schools, they all conformed to the recommended aspects (i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register).</p> <p>Percentage: $\frac{3}{3} * 100 = 100\%$</p>	4
---	--	--	--	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG department supported schools to make SIPs. For instance,</p> <p>1. Nebbi Primary School submitted its SIP on 22nd February 2023.</p> <p>2. Afere Primary School had no evidence when it submitted its SIP.</p> <p>3. Namrwodha Primary School submitted its SIP on 1st February 2023.</p> <p>A field visit to the schools indicated that Nebbi Primary School had a SIP for 2023. Similarly, Namrwodho Primary School had a SIP submitted on 1st February 2023. However, Afere Primary School did not present any documentary evidence of a SIP at the time of the field assessment.</p> <p>Hence percentage of schools sampled was $\frac{2}{3} * 100 = 67\%$.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools for FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <p>12 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 10,922 pupils while USE schools with enrolment of 565.</p> <p>To calculate compliance; $13/13 \times 100 = 100\%$</p> <p>It was submitted on 24th October 2022.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY year at UGX 2,560,897, 000/= as reflected on the approved budget estimates for FY 2023/2024 page 28 of 51.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY 2023-2024. According to staff lists sampled, teachers were deployed as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nebbi Primary School had 16 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Bitum Robert, Aweko Gilda, and Kumakech Vincent. 2. Afere Primary School had 16 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Kumakech Aldo, Oyenboth Juliet and Endema Augusto. 3. Namrwodho Primary School had 18 teachers and a headteacher. Teachers as indicated in the staff list were deployed e.g. Owachgiu Denis, Opoka Denis and Amito Flavia. 	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

At the MC deployment list was displayed the notice board of the department.

Lists of deployment were also displayed in headteachers' offices that were sampled and visited.

a) Nebbi Primary School had 24 teachers and a headteacher.

b) Afere Primary School had 19 teachers and a headteacher.

c) Namrwodho Primary School had 19 teachers and a headteacher.

The details displayed included; name, date of birth, qualifications, and tittle among others.

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 copt to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG had 12 primary schools Head Teachers whom all had been appraised for calendar year for 2022 and the following were sampled:

1. Iwupat David Okech, Head Teacher Namthin Primary school and he was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
2. Oryem Kizito, Head Teacher of Pubidhi Primary School and was appraised on 15th January 2023
3. Oryem John Depeuty Head Teahcer of Nyacara Primary School and was appraised on 25th January 2023.
4. Ocoun Charles Okafor, Head Teacher Angir Primary School and he was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
5. Mwacan Ocungi Winnifred Head Teacher of Namrodho Primary School and she was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
6. Amaniyo Joyce, Head Teacher of Afere Primary School and she was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
7. Bithum Robert, Head Teacher of Nebbi Primary School and he was appraised on 24th January 2023.
8. Kumakech Cengtho Geoffrey, Head Teacher of Nebbi Public Primary School and he was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
9. Berocan Winnie, Head Teacher of Abindu Primary School and was appraised on 23rd January 2023.
10. Kabaliisa Onencangiu Jane, Head Teacher of Paminya Ayila Primary School and she was appraised on 16th January 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

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG had One Secondary School and there was evidence to show that secondary School Head Teacher was appraised by Chairman BoG for the work of previous calendar year.

1. Mbalangu Adolf Head Teacher of Nebbi Secondary School was appraised on 30th February 2023 by Chairman BoG which appraisal was outside the set timelines of 31st December 2023.

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 score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG appraised all staff in Education department by MEO as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Onyai Alfred , Inspector of Schools was appraised on 3rd July 2023 (appraisal outside the stipulated time of 30th June 2023). 2. Okumu Denis Nyango, Assistant Sports Officer was appraised on 3rd July 2023 (appraisal outside the stipulated time of 30th June 2023). 	0
---	--	--	--	----------

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG education department prepared a training plan for previous FY 2022/2023 dated 1st July 2022.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) MIS for PDG b) Sports Officer for PGD c) 2 Head teachers for Bachelor Education d) 13 Teachers for Bachelor of education to help them attain requirements as per National Teacher Policy. 	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. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG confirmed in writing these details. For previous FY 2022/2023 Nebbi MLG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation. The letter was written on 24th October 2022 and received on 5th December 2022.</p> <p>It indicated that 12 UPE schools with a total enrolment of 10,922 pupils and 1 USE schools with enrolment of 565.</p> <p>To calculate compliance; $13/13 \times 100 = 100\%$.</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>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions during the previous FY 2022-2023 of UGX 8,100,000/= .</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did timely warrant for school's capitation within 5 days from the dates of releases from MoFPED and warrant reports provided by the Municipality indicated that;</p> <p>In Quarter one; Cash limits were uploaded on 12th August 2022 and warranting by LG was conducted on 15th August 2022.</p> <p>In Quarter two; Cash limits were uploaded on 17th October 2022 and warranting by LG was conducted on 18th October 2022.</p> <p>In Quarter three; Cash limits were uploaded on 17th January 2023 and warranting by LG was conducted on 18th January 2023.</p> <p>In Quarter four; Cash limits were uploaded on 20th April 2023 and warranting by LG was conducted on 24th April 2023.</p>	2
<p>All the above provided dates were within 5 working days and the L was compliant..</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the CAO received funds and communicated to the DEO within three working days of release form MoFPED..</p> <p>This coincided with the three sampled schools. For instance in Q1 (Term 3), the DEO communicated to headteachers by immediately displaying on the MLG notice board, Write letters, (e.g. Letter dated 28th July 2023, and sometimes calls them for a meeting.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>The department prepared an inspection plan and meetings for terms 1, 2 and 3 of 2022 as follows:</p> <p>a) Term 1 dated 15th February 2023 with highlights of Review of Term 3 Inspection 2022, Discussion of inspection tools and proposed dates for Inspection.</p> <p>b) Term 2 dated 17th April 2023 highlighting the following areas e.g. Review of previous Inspection (Term 1, 2023) Discussion on the Inspection tool and proposed dates of Inspection.</p> <p>c) Term 3 dated 12th September 2022: The meeting reviewed Term 2 Inspections. The highlights included scheming level at 79% and Lesson plan at 60%. Teachers latrine at Nebbi Primary school had developed a huge crack etc.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>UPE schools were inspected and monitored as follows:</p> <p>In the term I, 2023 inspection and monitoring report dated 17th April 2023 indicated that 12 UPE schools, with no private primary schools inspected. Hence $12/12 \times 100 = 100\%$.</p> <p>In the term II, 2023 inspection report dated 11th September 2023 (please note that inspection occurred interm 2, however, the report was made after and 11th September is during Term II Holidays) indicated that 12 UPE schools, with no private primary schools inspected. Hence $12/12 \times 100 = 100\%$.</p> <p>In the term III, 2022 inspection report dated 10th December 2022 indicated that 12 UPE schools and 1 USE were inspected. Hence $13/13 \times 100 = 100\%$</p> <p>Therefore the average percentage of compliance was $(100+100+100)/3 = 100\%$.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that inspection reports had been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions and that those actions had subsequently been followed up during the previous FY. For instance there were:</p> <p>Departmental meetings held on:</p> <p>10th August 2022 Item Agenda 8: Inspection Report;</p> <p>23rd June 2023 Item Agenda 9: Discussion of Inspection reports.</p> <p>28th August 2023: Item Agenda 3: Communication of Inspector of School during the Head Teachers meeting.</p> <p>N.B: There were no evidence of other minutes/reports.</p> <p>However, information from the sample schools and visitors' books did not affirm the same especially by the staff from DEO's office.</p> <p>At the schools visited inspection reports left behind by inspectors were seen. For example at</p> <p>Afere Primary School inspection reports by different inspectors were for term 1 & 2.</p> <p>Namrwadho and Nebbi Primary schools inspection reports and follow up by different inspectors at the school were missing.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that DIS and DEO presented findings from inspection and monitoring results of respective schools to DES</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the social services committee meeting that was held on:</p> <p>a) 22nd November 2022, Agenda item 6: Q1 performance report 2022/2023. MNC/TSWC/14/2/2022/23.</p> <p>The meeting was attended by 9 people.</p> <p>b) 23rd May 2023 Agenda Item 6: Review of Departmental Performance 2022/2023; MNC/TSWC/11/10/2022/23.</p> <p>c) 17th August 2023, Agenda Item 6: Discussing Departmental Progressive Reports.</p> <p>MNC/TSWC/14/2/2022/23.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Education department carried mobilization</p> <p>of attracting learners and retaining them at Town council level. There was one radio talk shows was held on Rainbow Media Corporation limited. A cash payment of 550,000/-receipt serial 316 in consideration of 1 hour radio talk show was made dated 24th June 2023.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had assets register setting out facilities and equipment in schools for the previous year 2022.</p> <p>This register was up to date as the information it carried corresponded with the information picked from the schools. For example the register indicated that:</p> <p>At Nebbi Primary School there were 15 classrooms, 20 latrine, 300 desks and 9 units of staff houses.</p> <p>Afere Primary School was reported in the assets register to have 12 classrooms, 20 latrines, 224 desks and 4 units of staff houses. This information was found to be true on verification by the assessor.</p> <p>At Namrwadho Primary School the DEO's asset register was in harmony with the information on the ground as they both indicated 8 classrooms, 10 latrine, 148 desks and 2 units of staff houses</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>The LG conducted education investments desk appraisals to ascertain if they were derived from the LGDP and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. The appraised investments included construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Jukia P/S central division, construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyacara P/S Abindu division and construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Abindu P/S Abindu division. According to the the desk appraisal report dated 28th November 2022 prepared by the planner Mr. Komakech Richard, it was found that all the investments were eligible for funding and derived from the LGDP and the projects were recommended for construction.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG conducted education investments field appraisals to ascertain if they were derived from the LGDP and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. The appraised investments included construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Jukia P/S central division, construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyacara P/S Abindu division and construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Abindu P/S Abindu division. According the field appraisal report dated 29th November 2022 prepared by the planner Mr. Komakech Richard, it was found that the investments were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and fit the customized designs and there recommended for continuity of development.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no planned Seed Secondary School project in the procurement plan for FY 2023/2024 dated 17th October 2023. However, there were other infrastructures projects that were incorporated into the procurement plan for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Jukia Primary School, Abindu Primary School and Nyacara Primary School. 	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 the school infrastructure project was approved by the contracts committee and clearance by the Solicitor General was not necessary because they were below threshold. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyacara Primary School , was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/5-04-23 and awarded to Kris Consults Limited at a contract price of UGX 20,989,300. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th April 2023. 2. For construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Abindu Primary School, was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/5-04-23 and awarded to Hassan and Sons Business Limited at contract price of UGX 20,972,,000. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th April 2023. 3. For construction of a 5-stance VIP Latrine at Jukia Primary School, was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/5-04-23 and awarded to Bosan Investments Limited at a contract price of UGX 21,000,000. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th April 2023. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>A letter dated 9th May 2022 in which the Town Clerk appointed the following as members of Project Implementation Team for the projects sampled for instance Construction of a VIP Latrine at Jukia, Abindo and Nyakara Primary Schools. However, the Labour Officer was not part of the team composition yet it is a requirement in the guidelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MEO(Contracts manager) - Openyitho Innocent 2. Municipal Engineer - Olore Kasamba Joseph 3. Environment Officer - Odongo Emilio 4. Senior Assistant Enginnering Officer / Clerk of works - Kibwota Benjamin 5. PCDO - Gipatho Roseline 5. MOOH- Angel Othuba 6. SHRO / Labour officer - Okello Felix 7. SPO - Adukwun Consolate 	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>	In FY 2022/2023, there were no planned seed secondary school. However, there were other infrasture projects for instance; Construction of 5- stance VIP Latrines construction in Jukia Primary School, Abindu Primary School and Nyacara Primary School. From the site visit, it was found that the VIP was of 5 stances plus a shelter. Each stance was 1.2m internal width, there was a ramp at the entrance and a curtain wall of 1.7m height. The roof was of timber trusses with 28mm gauge iron sheets. This was as per the specifications.	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>	In the construction works conducted in the Primary Schools of Jukia, Abindu and Nyacara, monthly meetings were done as per progress report date 28th April 2023.	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>	On 28th April 2023 at the school of Jukia Primary School a joint technical supervision was carried out by the Municipal Engineer, Environment Officer and MCDO. The same technical staff supervised the schools of Abindu and Nyacara on the same day.	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

The education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to

contractors made within specified time frames within the contract. Nebbi Municipal council implemented three key projects which were;

1. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Jukia P/S central division contracted by Hassan and sons Limited at a contract value of UGX20,972,400. The contractor raised a payment requisition on 8th June 2023, Inspection and certification of works were all done 28th June 2023 and payment was done on 30th June 2023 just 2 days after certification of works. A payment of the certified amount worth UGX18,753,000 was paid under EFT number 6429327 as per the payment voucher provided.

2. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyacara P/S Abindu division contracted by Kris Consults Limited at a contract value of UGX20,989,300 The contractor raised a payment requisition on 8th June 2023, Inspection and certification of works were all done 28th June 2023 and payment was done on 30th June 2023 just 2 days after certification of works. A payment of the certified amount worth UGX18,743,445 was paid under EFT number 6432639 as per the payment voucher provided.

3. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Abindu P/S Abindu division contracted by Bosan Limited at a contract value of UGX21,000,000. The contractor raised a payment requisition on 8th June 2023, Inspection and certification of works were all done 28th June 2023 and payment was done on 30th June 2023 just 2 days after certification of works. A payment of the certified amount worth UGX18,728,353 was paid under EFT number 6431061 as per the payment voucher provided.

For all the investments above, the LG government complied the contractual obligation of paying the contractors within a period of 2 months after the issue of payment request and after completion of certification of works.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG education department submitted its procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 on 28th April 2022 which was within the timelines specified in the guideline.

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 no seed secondary school planned for in the FY 2022/2023. However, for the other school infrastructure projects planned for in FY 2022/2023, there was evidence of completeness of procurement file with all records as indicated below;

- For construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Nyacara Primary School, procurement reference no: NMC/726/Wrks/22-23/00003, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 13th April 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/4-04-23 and awarded to Kris Consults Limited at a contract price of UGX 20,989,700. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th April 2023.
- For construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School procurement reference no NMC/726/Wrks/22-23/00004, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 13th April 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/5-04-23 and awarded to Hassan and Sons Business Limited at contract price of UGX 20,972,400. The contract between the parties was signed on 27th April 2023.
- For construction of 5-stance VIP Latrine at Jukia Primary School, procurement reference no NMC/726/Wrks/22-23/00002, the procurement file had an evaluation report dated 13th April 2023. The evaluation was approved by the contracts committee on 5th April 2023 under minute no Min04-059/5-04-23 and awarded to Bosan Investments Limited at a contract price of UGX 21,000,000. The contract between the two parties was on 27th April 2023.

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

No grievance was recorded under Education

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 evidence that LG disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land.</p> <p>The guidelines were disseminated in a headteachers' meeting held from 28th August 2023. This evidenced by a Agenda Item 4: Policy brief by MEO.</p> <p>He disseminated information on having SMC should remain function, Schools intending to operate boarding section should get clearance from MEO, Issue of overcharging learning is negatively impacting attendance.</p> <p>Participants included headteachers, PTA chairpersons, and SMCs.</p> <p>Circular from MEO to all schools subject Environmental mitigation measures to learning institutions dated 2nd August 2023 and a follow circular on 2nd April 2023.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukia Primary school, Juba Village, Jukia Hill Parish, Central Division, Nebbi Municipality ESMP was incorporated in the BoQs in a contract document dated 20th March, 2023</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School in Acer Village, Abindu Parish, Abindu Town council, Nebbi Municipality ESMP was incorporated in the BoQs in a contract document dated 21st March, 2023</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary school in Akesi Village, Nyacara Parish, Abindu Subcounty, Nebbi Municipality ESMP was incorporated in the BoQs in a contract document dated 21st March, 2023</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>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School in Acer Village, Abindu Parish, Abindu Town council, Nebbi Municipality ESMP under "the registered trustees of the Church of Uganda" the application for freehold was made on 16th July, 2009</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary school in Akesi Village, Nyacara Parish, Abindu Subcounty, Nebbi Municipality document showing transfer of ownership from Nebbi Town Council to Nyakara Primary School as of 18th May, 2004</p>	1

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	Monitoring of construction of VIP latrines in Abindu, Nyacara and Jukia primary schools that was conducted on 8th June, 2023 and another one on 2nd May, 2023 all by the principal community development officer Environmental compliance inspection report for construction for 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukia Primary School that took place on 28th June, 2023 Environmental compliance inspection report for construction for 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary School that took place on 28th June, 2023	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Jukia Primary school, Juba Village, Jukia Hill Parish, Central Division, Nebbi Municipality E & S interim payment certificate on 12th June, 2023 Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School in Acer Village, Abindu Parish, Abindu Town council, Nebbi Municipality E & S interim payment certificate dated 12th June, 2023 Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary school in Akesi Village, Nyacara Parish, Abindu Subcounty, Nebbi Municipality E&S interim payment certificate dated 12th June, 2023 All the payment certificates missed E&E certification forms endorsed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to payments.	0

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was no evidence of deliveries conducted at Nebbi Municipality health facilities in FY 2021/22 and FY 2022/23. The Municipality had no functional health facilities in the Financial years of interest.</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>Average score in the health LLG performance had improved between the previous year but one and the previous year. The score in 2022 was 85% and increased to 100% thus registering a 15% increment which was more than 70%. This was from the LG performance assessment results that were uploaded on to the OPAMS and were cleared by the National Task force and presented in the matrix; COMPARING LLG SCORES FOR 2022 & 2023. The comparison was provided in the Analysis - LLG PA 2023 Synthesis Report dated 20th October 2023 as extracted from 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 III's and IV's previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>The indicator was dropped from LGPA 2023. This was agreed on during the OPM training held from 23rd - 24th October at Imperial Royale Hotel. RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23.</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>There were no any health investments in the previous financial year. The LG didn't have funding for health investments and therefore no works were conducted under the health sector.</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>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no any health investments in the previous financial year. The LG didn't have funding for health investments and therefore no works were conducted under the health sector.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</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>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2023, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>The costed staff structure did not provide for health staff at Nebbi Municipal Council. Neither was there Health facilities nor recruitment of staff during the FY of assessment.</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2023, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	----------

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Though the Municipal council recruited health workers in 2022/23, they were not deployed since the Council had no functional health facilities.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	----------

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 the MMOH, the assessment team was not availed with information on health facilities constructed or upgraded in FY 2022/23. In the Annual performance report for FY 2022/23 in the PBS, there was no evidence that information on upgraded or constructed health was reported. .</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 availed on submissions of Health facility Annual Work plans and Budgets since the Municipal council did not have functional health facilities in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	----------

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</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>	<p>There was no evidence availed on health facility Annual Budget Performance Reports from health facilities since the Municipal council did not have functional health facilities in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed by MMOH on submissions and implementation of health facility performance improvement plans for FY 2023/24 since the Municipality had no functional health facilities</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 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>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>	<p>There was no evidence of submissions of monthly and quarterly HMIS reports availed to the assessment team as the Municipality had no functional health facilities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 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>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>The indicator was dropped from LGPA 2023. This was agreed upon during the OPM training conducted from 23th -24th October at Imperial Royale Hotel . RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The indicator was dropped from LGPA 2023. This was agreed upon during the OPM training conducted from 23th -24th October at Imperial Royale Hotel . RBF was reportedly not implemented in FY 2022/23</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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 LG didn't not timely compile and submit all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. The monthly budget performance reports were submitted on different dates as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quarter one Budget performance report was submitted on 6th January 2023 which was far beyond the first month of the following quarter. 2. The quarter two Budget performance report was submitted on 15th March 2023 the first month of the following quarter. 3. The quarter three Budget performance report was submitted on 11th May 2023 the first month of the following quarter. 4. The quarter four Budget performance report was submitted on 8th August 2023 the first month of the following quarter. <p>Therefore, the LG didn't not timely compile and submit all quarterly (4) Budget Performance 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 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>No evidence was availed to the assessment team on development of an approved Performance Improvement Plan since the Municipality had no functional health facilities</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence of implementation of Performance Improvement Plan was not availed since there was no Plan developed as there were no functional health facilities in the Municipality.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nebbi Municipal Council Budgeted for wage for 39 recruited health workers in the FY 2023/24. Uganda shs 1,063,742,000 was budgeted for as Wage. This was documented on page 23 of 51 of the Municipal Council Approved Budget for FY 2023/24.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team that the Council deployed the recruited health workers. The health workers could not be deployed since there were no functional health facilities in the Municipality. The Ag. MMOH reported that the recruited health workers were deployed to Nebbi District Health facilities, However there was no evidence availed to confirm this.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team to show that the health workers were working in health facilities in the District were they were reported to have been deployed.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was availed to show that the Municipal Council had publicized health workers' deployment and disseminated it in the FY 2023/24.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Nebbi Municipal Council did not conduct annual performance appraisal of Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted to HRO during the previous FY as there was no functional health facility in the municipality.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipality did not avail evidence of performance appraisal conducted by the Health In charges in the previous FY since there was no functional health facility.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of corrective action based on the appraisal reports.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to the assessment team on training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in the FY 2022/23.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	No evidence was availed on documentation of training activities in the training database in the FY 2022/23.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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	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	The assessment team was not availed ,at the time of assessment, the copy of the letter the Town Clerk wrote to the Ministry of Health confirming the list of health facilities receiving PHC NWR grants in the FY 2023/24.	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>According to the health sector budget that was on page 23 of the approved budget estimates for 2022/2023. There was no allocation of monitoring service delivery and management of the health services.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 LG didn't have any health facility thus no warranting required.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't have any health facility thus no warranting and communication made.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't have any health facility thus publicizing of releases was not applicable.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't have any health facility thus publicizing of releases was not applicable</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG didn't have any health facility thus publicizing of releases was not applicable</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 no evidence of supervision of HCIV. The Municipal Council did not have a HCIV in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>No evidence was availed to the assessment team that the MHT ensued that the Municipal Health sub district conducted supervision of lower health facilities in the FY 2022/23 since there were no functional health facilities.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of supportive supervision conducted in the health facilities since no health facilities were functional in the Municipality.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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 availed to the assessment team that the Municipal Council provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies since there were no functional health facilities.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the health sector budget that was on page 23 of the approved budget estimates for 2022/2023. There was no allocation for health promotion and prevention activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

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	From the MMOH, the assessment team obtained the following reports on health promotion disease prevention and social mobilization activities implemented in the FY 2022/23;	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		1 Report on Radio Talk Show focusing on HIV/AIDS held on 9th February 2023 on Radio Maria FM. The report was not dated but signed by Piwun Angel Othuba Health Inspector/ Ag MMOH.	
			2 Report on health promotion, disease prevention activities carried out in Quarter four of FY 2022/23 dated 23rd June 2023 and signed by Piwun Angel Othuba, Health Inspector/Ag.MMOH. The report listed the following activities that were implemented:	
			- Sensitization of food handlers in Nebbi Municipality conducted on 12th June 2023 by Piwun Angel Othuba, Health Inspector/Ag. MMOH	
			- Inspection of St.Martins Deforres School conducted on 22nd June 2023 by Piwun Angel Othuba. Health Inspector/ Ag.MMOH.	
			There was evidence that health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities were carried out in Nebbi Municipal Council in FY 2022/23.	

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence availed to the assessment team on follow up actions by the MHT on health promotion, disease prevention issues. No evidence was availed on meeting minutes of the MHT.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed by the MMOH to show that the health department in the Municipal council had an updated Asset register that sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. The Municipal Council did not have functional health facilities.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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>There were no health investments in the previous FY thus no appraisal conducted.</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>There were no health investments in the previous FY thus no appraisal conducted.</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 LG didn't have any health facility</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2023/2024 dated 17th October 2023, there are no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2023/2024, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</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 is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no works in the health department thus verification of works was not applicable.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is no health infrastructure located within Nebbi MLG. Therefore, in the LG procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th July 2022, there were no planned health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	----------

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</p>	0
----	---	---	---	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</p>	0
----	--	--	---	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</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>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</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>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>The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</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 Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process

**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 Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

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>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
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 Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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 (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	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>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0

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

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

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

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

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

Human Resource Management and Development

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

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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
Maximum score 10				
Maximum score 10				
Maximum score 10				

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	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.)	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
	Maximum score 8	<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		
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	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	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
	Maximum score 8			
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	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
	Maximum score 8			
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	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
	Maximum score 8			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Urban LG was not eligible for the implementation of the MSI investments and therefore excluded from the Performance Assessment.	0

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Kibirige William as Principal Treasurer vide letter dated 14th January 2022 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/347/2022, CR/156/7	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG did not have substantively appointed Planner. However Komakech Richard who is the Planner was assigned duties of Senior Planner vide letter dated 21st July 2021, CR/161.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG did not have substantively appointed Principal Engineer. However Olore Kasamba Joseph was assigned duties of Municipal Engineer vide letter dated 5th July 2023 by the Town Clerk.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	There was neither a substantively appointed Senior Environment Officer nor was there a secondment from line Ministry.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG did not substantively appoint Senior Veterinary Officer. Mr Ongeitho Emmanuel Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer had been assigned the duties of Senior Veterinary Officer vide letter dated 26th September 2022, CR/156/1.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Amia Grace as Principal Community Development Officer vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under DSC/NBB/ 158/2023, NMC/CR/156/8/4.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG did not substantively appoint Principal Commercial Officer. However Wakwayo Felix Commercial Officer had been assigned the duties of the PCO vide letter dated 5th July 2023 as Vote controller 2022/2023 FY.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Adokwun Consolate as Senior Procurement Officer vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/201/2023, CR/160/2.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Nyipir Arnold Grafin as Procurement Officer, vide letter dated 30th June 2023 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/213/2023, CR/160/3.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Okello Felix as HRO vide letter dated 1st June 2023 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/200/2023, NMC/CR/160/2.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Odongo Wathum Emilio as Environment Officer, vide letter dated 22nd May 2019 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/038/2019/1, CR/156/5.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council had a substantively appointed Physical Planner Mungu Alfred. He was appointed on 22nd May 2019 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/038/2019/3	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Omach Deo Olore as Senior Accountant vide letter dated 10th May 2018, under DSC minute DSC/NBB/170/10/2018(i), 17/4/2018.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Odaga Noel as Senior Internal Auditor vide letter dated 10th December 2020 under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/04/2020(147), NMC/CR/156/5/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The MLG by law was using the DSC that had a substantively HRO secretary Service commission. Anyerango Consolate as appointed on 19th February, 2018 as was directed by Min. DSC/149/2028.	2

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The Municipality had 3 Divisions and all the three divisions had no substantively appointed Senior Assistant Town Clerks :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Okura Stephen Assistant Town Clerk had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk at Central Division, vide letter dated 1st July 2022, NMC/CR/161/3. 2. Onyai Vergin MaryIn Assistant Town Clerk had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk Thatha Division, vide letter dated 1st July 2022. 3. Jawambe Edward Town Agent had been assigned duties of Senior Assistant Town Clerk Abindu Division vide letter dated 8th August 2023, NMC/CR/161/3. 	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had 3 Divisions and appointed CDOs in all of the Divisions.</p> <p>There was evidence that the LG substantively appointed all the Community Development Officers as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mandhawun Harriet appointed CDO vide letter dated 13th June 2018, under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/086/2018/4, CR/156/5/3. Deployed at Thatha Division. 2. Gipatho Roseline appointed CDO vide letter dated 1st June 2018, under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/086/2018/3, CR/156/5/3. Deployed at Central Division. 3. Thomaya Samuel appointed CDO vide letter dated 2nd March 2022 under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/344/2022, NMC/CR/156/8. Deployed at Abindu Division. 	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had 3 Divisions and had substantively appointed Treasurer in all the Divisions as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Onutha Raphael appointed Treasurer vide letter dated 26th June 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/096/2018/9, CR/156/5/3. Deployed at Abindu Division. 2. Gitara Sammy appointed Treasurer vide letter dated 2nd December 2021 under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/300/2021, NMC/CR/161/2. Deployed at Thatha Division. 3. Okello Abibu appointed Treasurer vide letter dated 2nd December 2021 under DSC minute No. DSC/NBB/299/2021, NMC/CR/161/2. 	5

Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	From page 15 Draft Final Accounts 2022-2023, the budgeted amount of the Natural Resources Department was Ugx 212,442,832. The Central Government released Ugx 164,101,192. The Municipal Council released amount Ugx 164,101,192 to the Natural Resources department which was 100% release.	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0		
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	From page 15 Draft Final Accounts 2022-2023, the budgeted amount of the Community Based Services Department was Ugx 89,995,146. The Central Government however released amount Ugx 68,490,842 which the LG sent to the department of Community Based Services. This meant that 100% was released to the user department..	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 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.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	Construction of Thatha office block phase VI in Onjuku upper, Thatha Parish, Thatha Subcounty screeing was done on 15th February, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer Construction of Abindu office block Phase I in Olyeko Village, Nyacara Ward, Abindu Division, Nebbi Municipality on 22nd March, 2023 and endorsed by both Ag CDO and Environment Officer Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV E &S screening was done on 13th April, 2023 endorsed by both the Ag PCDO and EO	4
	Maximum score is 12			
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), score 4 or 0	The CDO did not avail any ESMPs for the projects citing that the Environment officer had left a month back for another job and the acting one was not around during the time of assessment to provide the documents. The assessment however never accessed an official record from the Accounting officer.	0
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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>Only one costed ESMP was provided for the DDEG projects</p> <p>Construction of Municipal Head office block phase IV ESMP for revegetation costed at Ugx 900,000 and total project cost of 52,999,700shs as of 18th August, 2022 endorsed by both Municipal Environment Officer and Principal CDO</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>The LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY by end of February. This was evidenced through a letter document number NMC/CR/250/1 addressed to the PS/ST written on 23rd November 2022 titled "Response to consolidated annual report of internal auditor general and auditor general findings for financial year ended 30th June 2022" submitted by the Town Clerk Mr. William Makune Abwooli. The information was received with the official stamp of the MoFPED on 15th December 2022 which was before February.</p>	10
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Municipal Council submitted through PBS the Annual Performance Contract for the FY 2023/2024 to MoFPED on 8th August, 2023</p>	4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The PBS generated report indicated the Local Government had submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on 8th August 2023 which was timely since it was before the August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The PBS generated quarterly budget performance reports indicated the Local Government had submitted all the four quarterly Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quarter one Budget performance report was submitted on 6th January 2023. 2. The quarter two Budget performance report was submitted on 15th March 2023. 3. The quarter three Budget performance report was submitted on 11th May 2023 4. The quarter four Budget performance report was submitted on 8th August 2023. <p>Therefore, all the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the Previous FY by August 31st of the current FY which was a timely submission.</p>	4

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Openytha Innocent as Municipal Education Officer vide letter dated 2nd March 2022, under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/34/2022, NMC/CR/156/8/4.	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG approved staff structure provided for one (1) Inspector of Schools. 1. The LG substantively appointed Onyai Alfred as Inspector of Schools vide letter dated 13th May 2019, under DSC minute: DSC/NBB/030/2019/7, 23rd to 30th refers.	40
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukia Primary school, Juba Village, Jukia Hill Parish, Central Division, Nebbi Municipality E& S screening forms dated 20th April, 2023 Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School in Acer Village, Abindu Parish, Abindu Town council, Nebbi Municipality E& S screening forms dated 11th April, 2023 Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary school in Akesi Village, Nyacara Parish, Abindu Subcounty, Nebbi Municipality E& S screening forms dated 18th April, 2023	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

2

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

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

Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Jukia Primary school, Juba Village, Jukia Hill Parish, Central Division, Nebbi ESMP costed at 1,000,000shs and total project cost of 20,000,000shs as of 18th August, 2022 endorsed by both Municipal Environment Officer and Principal CDO

The Maximum score is 30

Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Abindu Primary School in Acer Village, Abindu Parish, Abindu Town council, Nebbi Municipality ESMP costed at 1,000,000shs and total project cost of 20,000,000shs as of 18th August, 2022 endorsed by both Municipal Environment Officer and Principal CDO

Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyakara Primary school in Akesi Village, Nyacara Parish, Abindu Subcounty, Nebbi Municipality ESMP costed at 1,000,000shs and total project cost of 20,000,000shs as of 18th August, 2022 endorsed by both Municipal Environment Officer and Principal CDO

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

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

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The Municipal Council had neither health facilities nor Principle Medical Officer by the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The Municipal Council had neither health facilities nor Principal Health Inspector by the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	The Municipal Council had neither health facilities nor Health Educator by the time of assessment.	0

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process	0
---	---	--	--	---

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

The Municipality didn't have any project under health by the time of assessment. The accounting officer reported that, requisitions have been submitted to MOH to have a health project within the Municipality but it is a slow process

0

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

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

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	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.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	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.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
---	---	--	---	---

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water Department was ineligible for the Local Government Performance Assessment because it was managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation.	0