



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	70%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	60%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	62%
Educational Performance Measures	73%
Health Performance Measures	64%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	74%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	66%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the DDEG fund received was UGX 126,562,000. The District Planner noted that most of the money was used for retention and only one project was implemented under DDEG.</p> <p>1. Completion of Service Pit at Ushs 5,700,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 70.</p> <p>However, the Contractor was not paid due to Procurement delay and the funds were swept back to the central treasury by the end of FY 2023.</p>	<b>4</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>• 1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>• If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>From a copy of result assessment presented by Planner during the assessment indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 160% compared to the last year as per computation below;</p> <p>The average score for current year was 69%.</p> <p>The average score for previous financial year was 25%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p><math>= (0.69 - 0.25 / 0.25) * 100\% = 160\%</math></p> <p>The LLG performance assessment for current year increased by 160% from previous year performance.</p>	<b>3</b>

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 and was all completed and fully utilized.</p> <p>- Completion of Service Pit at Ushs 5,700,000as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 70.</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted for DDEG and implemented one project in the last FY 2022/23. However, the money was not spent due to delay in procurement and the money was swept back to central treasury. The only project implanted was;</p> <p>- Completion of Service Pit at Ushs 5,700,000as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 70.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The project implemented using DDEG funds was completion of the service pit at the District headquarter.</p> <p>Procurement Ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/00019.Completion of service pit at District Headquarters. The estimated cost = 5,000,000/- and actual cost = 5,931,000/-. Variation = +18.62%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Loading ramp at Koomo market Iiri Subcounty. The estimated cost = 30,000,000/- and actual cost = 24,305,825/-. Variation = -18.98%</li> <li>• Construction of Washrooms at Longalom PS. The estimated cost = 15,000,000/- and actual cost = 11,981,025/-. Variation = -20.13%</li> </ul> <p>Construction of Washrooms at Longalom P/S had a variation beyond the +/-20% range.</p>	0

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the three LLGs sampled (Matany Sub County, Napak Town Council and Iriiri Sub County, the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance in Irriri Sub county, Longole Ruth Iringo- Senior Assistant Secretary, Ochen James Bala- Parish Chief, Lochoro Charles-Parish Chief, Maruk Tito-Parish Chief, Ogeutum James-Veterinary Officer, Kato David Ogwang-Health Assistant, Angella Dinah Sagal-Senior Accounts Assistant and Ekwaru Emma- Agriculture Officer were found at station as per the daily attendance registers.</p>	2															
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>There was no evidence of completion reports for DDEG projects implemented that were availed to the assessment team.</p>	0															
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>	<p>The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="756 1196 1043 1458"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">DLG IVA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Iriiri S/C</td> <td>89</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ngoleriet S/C</td> <td>65</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Matany S/C</td> <td>53</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Napak T/C</td> <td>87</td> <td>97</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The performance of only two LLGs (Ngoleriet and Napak TC )was within the credibility performance range of +/- 10 the other two were outside which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.</p>		DLG IVA		Iriiri S/C	89	76	Ngoleriet S/C	65	61	Matany S/C	53	89	Napak T/C	87	97	0
	DLG IVA																		
Iriiri S/C	89	76																	
Ngoleriet S/C	65	61																	
Matany S/C	53	89																	
Napak T/C	87	97																	

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided that the LG developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided that the LG implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY.	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	The HR department did not present a copy of a letter showing that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY.	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	The District/Municipality had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI) as seen from the attendance tracking reports. For instance in the month of March, the best performer was Looru Levy Mather, Driver to Natural Resources department and Loma Ruth, Office Assistant in the Education Department with 100%. The worst performers were Ayepa Charles Ag. Cold Chain Technician with 10% and Otim Patrick Omara District Water Officer with 10%.	<b>2</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Some HODs had been appraised while others were not during the previous FY as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lokongo Paul Peter, District Natural Resource Officer was appraised on 5th July 2023 by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga</li> <li>2. Agan Mary, District Community Development Officer was appraised on 6th July 2023 by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga</li> <li>3. Akol Benard District Planner was appraised on 6th July 2023 by the COA, Jack Byaruhanga</li> <li>4. Paul Achia CFO was appointed on 19th April 2023 and was completing probation</li> <li>5. Lodungokol Simon Peter, DPO was appointed on 19th April 2023 and was completing probation</li> <li>6. Nakoyo Joyce Philippe DEO was appraised on 6th July 2023 by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: For instance the rewards and sanctions committee sat on 10th October 2023 and sanctioned Angella Abraham- Plumber for abscondment from duty, Loli Raphael Senior Accounts Assistant- Lokopo Sub County for poor attendance, and Logwala Paul- Head Teacher Kokorio PS for Mismanagement of WFP food.</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had not established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sagal Callisto, Procurement Officer, was appointed on 20th April 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023</li> <li>2. Yeno Joseph, Tourism Officer was appointed on 19th April 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023</li> <li>3. Achia Paul Richard, Chief Finance Officer, was appointed on 19th April 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023</li> <li>4. Ludungokol Simon Peter DPMO was appointed on 19th April 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023</li> <li>5. Lochola Tina- Office Assistant was appointed on 19th April 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023</li> </ol>	1

9	Pension Payroll management	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two staff retired during the previous FY and they accessed pension payroll as follows;</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ilukol Moses Loput, Head Teacher- Kalokengiel PS retired on 18th December 2022 and accessed the payroll in January 2023</li> <li>2. Ochen Caesarino Woloboko, Head Teacher Kapuat PS, retired on 12th August 2022 and accessed payroll in September 2022</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	Score 1.		

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

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	<p>The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;</p> <p>Lokopo S/C received Ushs 25,254,000</p> <p>Iriiri S/C received Ushs 45,285,000</p> <p>Matany S/C received Ushs 12,967,000</p> <p>Lopeei S/C received Ushs 24,986,000</p> <p>Lorengchora S/C received Ushs 20,312,000</p> <p>Lotome S/C received Ushs 21,781,000</p> <p>Apetolim S/C received Ushs 4,687,000</p> <p>Nabwal S/C received Ushs 4,687,000</p> <p>Poron S/C received Ushs 4,687,000</p> <p>Kangole T/C received Ushs 989,000</p> <p>Lokiteded S/C received Ushs 989,000</p> <p>Matany T/C received Ushs 989,000</p> <p>Ngoleriet S/C received Ushs 22,850,000</p> <p>Lorengchora T/C received Ushs 14,230,000</p> <p>The releases above to LLG were transferred as follows;</p> <p>In quarter 1: Did not receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2: the release was done on 3rd October 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 3: The release was done on 2nd January 2023.</p> <p>In Quarter 4: Did not receive DDEG in Quarter 4</p>	<b>2</b>
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	There was evidence that the LG did not timely warrant direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>Quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022 and warranted on 13th October 2022, warrant was made in 10 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 2nd October 2023 and warranted on 9th October 2023 which was 6 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.</p>	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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:	The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done.However, it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 24 October, 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 24th January, 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	The LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Q 1 - from 29th August, 2022 to 16th September, 2022 and the activity included establishment of performance gaps in LLG, Mentoring LLGs on performance improvement and share performance gaps and agree on strategies on closing the gap.</p> <p>Q 2 report was done from 14th November 2022 to 30th November, 2022.</p> <p>Q 3 mentoring report was done from 13rd February 2023 to 24th February 2023.</p> <p>Q 4 mentoring report was done from 22nd May 2023 to 2nd June 2023.</p>	



11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the Chairperson Jack Byaruhanga.</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one report was discussed on 20th September 2022- TPC- MIN.05/DTPC/NDLG/09/2022:Presentation and review of Q1 supervision and mentoring reports of LLGs for FY 2022/23 by the District Planner.</li> <li>2. Quarter two report was discussed on 17th January 2023- TPC- MIN.07/DTPC/NDLG/Jan/2023:Presentation of Q2 supervision and mentoring reports of LLGs for FY 2022/23 by the District Planner.</li> <li>3. Quarter three report was discussed on 07th March 2023- TPC- MIN.04/DTPC/NDLG/Mar/2023:Presentation and review of Q3 supervision and mentoring reports of LLGs for FY 2022/23 by the District Planner.</li> <li>4. Quarter four report was discussed on 07th June 2023- TPC- MIN.07/DTPC/NDLG/06/2023:Presentation and review of Q4 supervision and mentoring reports of LLGs for FY 2022/23 by the District Planner.</li> </ol>
----	---	---	--

### 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><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The DLG presented a soft copy of the assets register which on review showed that the register was up to date as it captured details of land, transport equipment, machineries, Office equipment and others. Buildings which included schools, health facilities, and administrative Units. Details for each asset as prescribed in the accounting manual 2007 were also captured.</p>
----	---	---	--

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Board of Survey report dated 9th August 2022 recommended the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-That all district assets should be engraved.</li> <li>2-Obsolete assets should be disposed off</li> <li>3- There should be a plan for continuous maintenance of assets.</li> <li>4-That follow-up should be made to recover stolen motorcycle under Resilience project.</li> </ol> <p>The DLG took action and advertised for disposal of obsolete assets in the New Vision on 23rd June 2022. UGX 4,300,000 was paid for the advert on Receipt No. 606635.</p>	<b>1</b>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref CR/156/4/Napa dated 19th December 2022.</p> <p>The committee held all the quarterly meetings as per the minutes of the meetings availed to the Assessment team;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 meeting was held on 12nd August, 2022.</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 meeting was held on 23rd November, 2022</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 meeting was held on 7th March 2023</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 meeting was held on 28th July 2023.</li> </ol> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 was submitted on 7th September 2022.</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 minutes were submitted on 26th October 2023.</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 was submitted on 26th October 2023.</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to Ministry on 26th October 2023.</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No desk appraisals for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY was provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that field appraisals for the DDEG projects were provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HoDs from different departments and discussed in a meeting that was held on 7th June 2023 at the Farmer's Hall under TPC Min 06/DTPC/NDLG/06/2023; Presentation of Project Profiles for FY 2023-24 by District Planner.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were two DDEG projects for current FY that underwent E&amp;S screening.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a stance latrine at Lokiteded.</li> <li>2. Construction of chain link fence at Lokiteded town council.</li> </ol> <p>The above projects were all screened on 25th September 2023.</p> <p>IVA disagrees with the assessor's findings and the score. Some of the projects i.e., drilling and sitting of production well at Apeduni, Apeitolim sub county and renovation of staff house at Iriiri HC II were not DDEG projects. They were UGiFT and PHC funded projects respectively.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Construction of a staff house at the district headquarters was the only project planned to be implemented using DDEG funding in the current FY, in the approved procurement plan dated 3rd August, 2023, submitted to PPDA on 26th October, 2023 and signed by the CAO Okumu Bedijo James.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Contracts Committee minutes for the sitting of 2nd November, 2023 in minute 6/cc/23-24 (b) approved evaluation reports and award recommendations for open bidding of the contract for projects to be implemented using DDEG funds.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence for the establishment of the Project Implementation Team as specified in the sector guidelines.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DDEG project implemented during FY 2022/2023 followed the standard technical drawing as provided by the LG Engineer. This was completion of the service bay at the district headquarters, were the dimensions of 11 x 5m, internal for the room for service bay and 6 x 0.8 m, 1,6m deep for the service pit was confirmed.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>There were no records of supervision in the form of reports 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.</p>	<b>0</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that works were certified and payments made within the specified timeframe. Sample projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of staff house at Loparipari P/S by M/S Lookorok General Stores Ltd</li> </ul> <p>Request for payment made on 22nd February 2023. Works inspected on 22nd February 2023.</p> <p>Works certified and payment initiated on 24th February 2023. Payment made on 3rd March 2023, Voucher No.4202156</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Staff house at Lokodiokodio P/S by M/S Nomak Investments Ltd</li> </ul> <p>Request for payment made on 12th June 2023.</p> <p>Works certified and payment initiated on 27th June 2023. Payment made on 29th June 2023, Voucher No. 6434995</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Lorengechora HC III by M/S Kutonak 2015 Quick Supplies</li> </ul> <p>Request for payment made on 17th May 2023.</p> <p>Works certified and payment initiated on 17th May 2023. Payment made on 13th July 2023, Voucher No. 5884064</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rehabilitation of OPD at Lotome HC III by M/S Glotech Consult-int Ltd.</li> </ul> <p>Request for payment made on 2nd June 2023. Works inspected, certified and payment initiated on 6th June 2023.</p> <p>Payment made on 13th July 2023, Voucher No. 6430904</p> <p>All payments were initiated within 2 months as required.</p>	1
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 a complete procurement file in place for the contract with all records as required by PPDA that was reviewed. It had these documents in place;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed contract dated 17th May, 2023 with Ms. Loruku Investments limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 25th April, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 26th april,2023 in minute 52/cc/22-23 (i),awarding the contract</li> <li>• Letters of acceptance and award, records for bid issue and receipt among documents on file.</li> </ul>	1

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.	The District i) designated Ms. Agan Mary Apuun the District Community Development Officer with an appointment letter issued on 7th October, 2021 to coordinate response to feed-back (grievances/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) comprising of Mr. Koryang Timothy the Ag. Deputy Chief Administrative Officer as the Chairperson, Ms. Agan Mary Apuun the District Community Development Officer as the Secretary and the members included Ms. Lokongo Paulina Peter the District Natural Resources Officer, Mr. Alinga Sisto the District Engineer, Ms. Nakoya Joyce Phillipine the District Education Officer, Dr. James Lemukol the District Health Officer, Mr. Akol Bernard the District Planner, Mr. Angella Joseph the District Production Officer, Mr. Louis Logiel Ag. Chief Finance Officer and Mr. Chuna Chadrack Logiel the Information Officer with an appointment letters issued on 7th October, 2021.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.	There was evidence of a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action and a record of complaints for example, a complaint registered by Gullit Michael on 7th May, 2023 for non-payment of wages for the excavation work of soil and trenches worth UGX. 390,000 and the case was handled by the Labour Officer of which it was resolved that payment be effected on 9th May, 2023.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0	Similarly, the GRC handled a couple of issues arising out of project works for example, where Minutes of the grievances redress committee dated 12th June, 2023 arising from a GRC meeting held at the Farmers' Hall at the District Headquarters under MIN. 03/GRC/12/06/23: Briefs From The Focal Point Person on delayed progress of construction work by Alder Construction Company Limited and absence of the contractor at the time the GRC inspected the project site. And also under MIN. 05/GRC/12/23: Comments from the DEO, DCDO and DNRO on sit down strikes by the casual workers abandoning the site due to laxity of the contractor not having in place schedule for payments.	
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.	A public notice dated 3rd November, 2022 was availed as proof that the District publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the DDP III and AWP & the budget showed that Climate change and environment are integrated in DDP III on page 54, AWP on page 11, and the approved budget on page 50 which included wetland management, tree planting, training farmers in smart agriculture, etc. Community and mindset change, reducing negative cultural practices and attitudes as an intervention on social issues also found on page 60 of LG DDP III, AWP on page 12 and the Approved Budget on page 52.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management  score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced DDEG Guidelines.  A meeting held on 20th December 2022 in the Farmer's Hall under MIN no 06/DTPC/NDLG/09/2022 Dissemination of DDEG guidelines for FY 2022/23 to LLGs by the District Planner.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There was no evidence of incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY despite the fact that the completion of a Service Pit at the District headquarters a DDEG project with a total allocated cost of UGX 126,562,000 could have been screened and a costed ESMP prepared for integration into the BoQs.	0



15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There was evidence of projects supervised in a report dated 9th March, 2023 for trees planted to mitigate environmental issues under drilling and sitting of water projects for example, a total of UGX. 100,000 allocated per water point under Bill No. 4 Environmental Mitigation Measures Item 4: Tree planting around water points in the BoQs.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was proof of land ownership for DDEG projects for example, construction of service pit at the headquarter was the DDEG project at the time. It has a freehold tenure title Volume HTQ630 Folio 6; size 3.240.8840ha.; Block (Road) 4 Plot 107 at Lokiteded; Owner Napak District Local Government. Issue date 27th November 2015.	<b>1</b>
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	There was evidence of support supervision and monitoring of projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example;  1. Report on the site inspection of the extension of piped water to Naregae from Longariama dated 12th June, 2023  2. Supervision report for the rehabilitation of OPD at Lotome HCIII dated May, 2023  3. Supervision report for the construction of a 4 unit teachers house at Lokodiokodioi primary school dated January, 2023	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There were inconsistencies in certification processing and completion where both the Environment Officer and CDO were not compliant for example;  1. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 10th May, 2023 for the construction of a latrine with urinals at Lorengecora HCIII signed by both the CDO and Environment Officer  2. Payment certificate No.2 issued on 16th June, 2023 for the extension of piped water system form Longariama to Naregae signed by only the Environemnta Officer  3. Payment certificate No. 2 issued on 25th May, 2023 for the sitting and drilling of production wells signed by the Environment Officer only	<b>0</b>

## Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up-to-date at the point of time of the assessment.	<b>0</b>
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.  Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;  1st quarter report was produced on 31st October, 2022.  2nd quarter report was produced on 31st January 2023.  3rd quarter report was produced on 28th April 2023.  4th quarter report was produced on 31st July 2023.	<b>2</b>
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	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.  Score 1 or else score 0	The LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of the implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows:  In quarter one report was received on 11st November 2022.  In quarter two report was received on 31st January 2023.  In quarter three report was received on 25th May 2023.  In quarter Four report was received on 1st August 2023.	<b>1</b>

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC, and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed reports were submitted through the registry as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The quarter 1 report was received on 11st November 2021</li> <li>2. The quarter 2 report was received on 31st January 2022</li> <li>3. The quarter 3 report was received on 25th May 2023</li> <li>4. The quarter 4 report was received on 1st August 2023</li> </ol> <p>All the four reports were reviewed by PAC as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one was reviewed during the LG PAC meeting held on 28th November 2022</li> <li>2. Quarter two was reviewed during LG PAC meeting held on 22nd February 2023</li> <li>3. Quarter three was reviewed during the LG PAC meeting held on 20th June 2023.</li> <li>4. Quarter four was reviewed during the LG PAC meeting held on 23rd August 2023.</li> </ol> <p>All the minutes were endorsed by the Chairperson of LG PAC and the Secretary of LG PAC.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 180,000,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 35) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 280,960,839 which gave a variance of Ushs 100,960,839 this indicate that District local Government over collected local revenue which shows good performance.</p> <p><math>(280,960,839/180,000,000) \times 100\% = 156\%</math></p> <p>The LG corrected 156% of its planned revenue. This indicates that LG collected more revenue than what they had planned.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 35 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 108,077,220</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 158,003,139</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 158,003,139- Ushs 108,077,220= Ushs 49,925,919</p> <p>= ( 49,925,919/108,077,220) x 100= 46%</p> <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 increased by 46%.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The shareable revenue of Ugx 20,161,321 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <p>Lokopo S/C received Ushs</p> <p>Iriiri S/C received Ushs 6,850,636</p> <p>Matany S/C received Ushs 3,379,610</p> <p>Lopeei S/C received Ushs 292,500</p> <p>Lorengchora S/C received Ushs 954,000</p> <p>Lotome S/C received Ushs 1,436,500</p> <p>Apetolim S/C received Ushs 1,623,370</p> <p>Nabwal S/C received Ushs 408,200</p> <p>Poron S/C received Ushs 2,386,085</p> <p>Kangole T/C received Ushs 422,000</p> <p>Lokiteded S/C received Ushs 60,000</p> <p>Matany T/C received Ushs 400,000</p> <p>Ngoleriet S/C received Ushs 97,500</p> <p>Lorengchora T/C received Ushs 60,000</p> <p>The transfer was evidenced by the letter dated 5th January 2023 signed by the Senior Finance Officer Lokutae Jonathan.</p>	2

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read.</p> <p>"BEST EVALUATED BIDDER</p> <p>PROCUREMENT REFERENCE: NAPA907/WRKS/2022-2023</p> <p>SUBJECT PROCUREMENT: CONSTRUCTION OF STAFF HOUSE AT KOKORIO P/S</p> <p>METHOD OF PROCUREMENT: OPEN DOMESTIC BIDDING</p> <p>BEST EVALUATED BIDDER NAMOROTOT GENERAL ENTERPRISE LTD</p> <p>TOTAL CONTRACT PRICE: UGX 148,913,640/=V.A.T INCLUSIVE</p> <p>DATE OF DISPLAY: 18TH NOVEMBER, 2022</p> <p>DATE OF REMOVAL: 30TH NOVEMBER, 2022"</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG publicized the performance assessment results and the implications for the FY 2021/22 was publicized on District notice board on 16th August 2023 endorsed by the District Planner.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made public available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal dated 22nd August 2022 with ref CR 103/4 on the notice board endorsed by the CAO Jack Byaruhanga.</p>	1

22

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

No IGG issues was reported in the previous Financial Year.

**1**

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was 736</p> <p>Total absentees were 05</p> <p>Total that sat were (736- 5) =731</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&amp;3) = 70+439+144=653</p> <p>Pass rate = ( 653)x 100 =89.3%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">731</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 884</p> <p>Total absentees were =18</p> <p>Total that sat were (884 - 18) =866</p> <p>Total grades (1,2&amp; 3)= 71+468+190=729</p> <p>% pass rate= (729) x 100 =84.18%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">866</p> <p>% Change = 84.18 - 89.3 = -5.12%</p>	<b>0</b>

1

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

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered was =  
157

Total absentees were =00

Total that sat were = 157

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 9+57+66 =132

Pass rate =  $132 \times 100 = 84\%$

157

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was =  
233

Total absentees were =0

Total that sat were (233 - 0) =233

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 10+61+93 =164

% pass rate=  $164 \times 100 = 70.38\%$

233

% change =  $70.38 - 84 = -13.62\%$

0

2

N23\_Service Delivery  
Performance: Increase  
in the average score in  
the education LLG  
performance  
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

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

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

The average score of education LLG  
performance increased by 57% compared  
to the last year as per the computation  
below;

The average score for the current year  
was 69%.

The average score for the previous  
financial year was 44%

Percentage change = Current percentage  
less previous percentage over old  
percentage.

$= (0.69 - 0.44 / 0.44) * 100\% = 57\%$

The Education LLG performance  
assessment for the current year increased  
by 57% from the previous year's  
performance.

2



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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

DLG did receive a Sector Development  
Grant of Ushs 702,707,000 for FY  
2022/2023 and were all used on eligible  
projects as follows;

1. Renovation of Staff House and Litchen in Kautakou Primary School at Ushs 12,100,000.
2. Construction of a 2-classroom block with an Office in Apeotolim Primary School at Ushs 84,672,000.
3. Rehabilitation of six classrooms in Kodike Primary School at Ushs 64,556,000.
4. Construction of a Staff House in Loparipar Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000.
5. Rehabilitation of Staff House in Nakicheelet Primary School at Ushs 40,000,000.
6. Construction of Staff House in Kokorio Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000.
7. Construction of Staff House in Lokodiokodio Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The verified vouchers indicated the District Education Officer, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer, and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;

1. Voucher no 6434995 dated 29th June 2023 for Ushs 33,594,942; Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00003, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Lokodiokodioi was certified by DHO on 19th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 20th June 2023, district Engineer on 19th June 2023 and DCDO on 20th June 2023.
2. Voucher no 4772487 dated 18th April 2023 for Ushs 82,858,737, Certificate No 1, dated 28th March 2023, Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Kokorio was certified by DHO on 3rd April 2023, District Environment Officer on 28th March 2023, district Engineer on 28th March 2023. However, the District Community Development Officer didn't sign on the payment certificate.
3. Voucher no 4202156 dated 2nd March 2023 for Ushs 47,984,000, Certificate No 1, dated 22nd February 2023, Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Loparipar was certified by DHO on 22nd February 2023, District Environment Officer on 24th February 2023, district Engineer on 20th February 2023 and District Community Development Officer on 22nd February 2022.

As per Voucher item 2 DCDO didn't certify the work. However, the payment was made.

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

All three projects sampled complied and were within +/-4.92% of +/-20% the acceptable variation. These were;

Project 1: Construction of staff house at Loparipar Primary School

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/SDG/00004

Project 2: Rehabilitation of 6 classroom block at Kodike Primary School

Project 3: Construction of staff house at Lokodiokodio Primary school

Project 1:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 149,114,032/=

Contract Cost: Ugx /=156,450,000/=

Variation: Ugx 7,000,000/=

%age (7,000,000/149,114,032) x 100% =-4.69%

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 64,556,049/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 61,878,050/=

Variation: Ugx 2,677,999/=

%age variation (2,677,999/64,556,0490 X 100% = 4.14%

Project 3:

Estimated Cost: Ugx 149,116,615/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 156,450,000/=

Variation : Ugx -7,333,385/=

%age (-7,333,385/149,116,615) x 100%=-4.92%

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY

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

From Quarter 4 report prepared by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga, on 25th July,2023, on page 53 there is no clear information about the percentage of work done on the Irrir Seed Secondary school. With the limited information the percent work done viz vis the planned can not be determined.

0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the staff list and payroll, the LG had deployed a total of 341 (95%) Primary school teachers out of the budgeted 357 teachers</p>	<b>2</b>
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG consolidated assets register for Napak LG 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 30 registered primary schools was in place consisting of the following ; 331 classrooms, 510 latrine stances , 6,014 desks, 89 teachers houses and no laboratories' prepared by the DLG education office</p> <p>This implies that all schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format .</p> $30 \times 100$ $30$ $= 100\%$	<b>3</b>

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DLG teacher's deployment list from the DEO'S office dated 18th July 2023 matched with that one found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:</p> <p>At longalom primary school taken as rural the list had 21 teachers listed on the list posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Ms. Napeyok Betty Volla as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the DEO.</p> <p>Matany Primary School taken as semi urban School the list indicated 8 teachers with Abura Richard Ogole as head teacher also matched well with the DEO's list..</p> <p>Lorengecora primary school taken as urban the list had 14 teachers and the head teacher being Ms. Aliat Molly Loline Logut. The list also matched well with that of DEO.</p> <p>This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was at <math>3/3*100= 100\%</math>.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG had a school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 30 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>Lorengecora primary school taken as urban had 10 classrooms, 151 desks, 24 stances of latrines and 10 teachers houses .</p> <p>,Matany primary school taken as semi-urban had 13 classrooms, 19 latrine stances, 148 desks &amp; 9 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Longalom primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 14 classrooms, 130 desks, 20 latrine stances &amp; 12 teachers houses.</p> <p>All the verified assets infrastructures and equipments were also indicated in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

lorengecora primary school(urban)

Primary school had budgeted for the whole calendar year 2023 dated 17th January, 2023 with clear cash flow statements for term I,II & III 2023 and signed by the SMC chairperson Mr. Michael Apurio and an asset register that had 10 classrooms, 151 desks, 24 stances of latrines and 10 teachers houses was attached.

Matany primary school taken as semi urban primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC dated 17th January, 2023 clearly indicating the annual budget and cash flow for the previous FY that had been drawn on 2nd November 2022 following the publicized circular by the DEO's office dated 8th August, 2022 of the capitation grant for quarter one FY2022/2023, they had been signed by the SMC chairperson Mr. Atirok Ezra

Longalum primary school equally had the necessary annual budget for the previous FY clearly showing the budgeted figures for term III 2022, term I 2023, term II 2023 all had been signed by the chairperson SMC Rev: Zachary Amok Isaac

$3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence adduced to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.

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

From the sampled and visited Schools; Lorengecora P/S, Matany P/S and Longalum primary school the Headteachers possessed respective SIPs and implementation was evident as shown below;

Lorengecora primary school feedback from inspection by Achia Abednego on 16th June, 2023 the following SIPs were agreed upon:

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

To address the issue of learners absentees.

The DLG to recruit more teacher so as to complement those present due to the big population.

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

Matany primary school the LG education office supported in the following SIP areas;

Increasing the number of desks Availing teachers with more residential house.\

Ensuring that all learners are registered with EMIS

Longalum primary school SIPS in place involved the following:

Conducting back to school campaigns within the community through providing incentives such as temporary shelter to accommodate more learners, providing safe drinking water at school, involving in sports, teachers supervision in the teaching process, a brass band for the school that uplifts the learners talents and also raises money for the school through hiring its services else where in the district.

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

6

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- If 100% score: 4:
- Between 90 - 99% score 2
- Below 90% score 0

The LG had collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the 30 primary registered schools from the previous FY. Further still there was a reminder on the LG notice board for all schools to update the captured EMIS information before 30th November, 2023. The notice was dated 10th September, 2023

The %age of schools was;

$30 \times 100$

30

$= 100\%$

18,965 learners had been registered by 15th October, 2023. Confirmed by the DEO

4

## Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY at Ugx 3,234,055,000/=.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the staff list and payroll, the LG had deployed a total of 341 (95%) Primary school teachers out of the budgeted 357 teachers. The DLG deployed 341 primary school teachers for the 30 UPE schools which aligns with the education sector guidelines.</p> <p>According to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment, for instance:</p> <p>Lorengecora Primary School taken as Urban had 14 teachers.</p> <p>Matany Primary School taken as semi urban had 08 teachers.</p> <p>Longalum Primary School taken as rural had 21 teachers.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG staff list for 2023 dated 8th July, 2023, which included 341 primary school teachers, was found posted on the LG Education notice board.</p> <p>Additionally, the Head teachers at the visited schools had also displayed their respective staff lists for the calendar year 2023 in their offices that matched that the LG notice board. For instance;</p> <p>Lorengecora primary school had list displayed as of 6th February, 2023.</p> <p>Matany primary school had list displayed as of 8th February, 2023.</p> <p>Longalum primary school had a list dated 17th February, 2023.</p>	1



Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

All primary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO, for instance;

1. Awor Betty Omara, Head Teacher Loodoi PS was appraised on 26th December 2022 by the SAS Anyango Anna Grace
2. Oyel Bob John Jones, Head Teacher Lopeei PS was appraised on 21st December 2022 by the SAS Muya Philip
3. Muge Rose, Head Teacher Cholichol PS was appraised on 12th December 2022 by the SAS Lemukol Anthony
4. Kidon Mathias, Head Teacher Kalotom PS was appraised on 14th December 2022 by the TC Lochoro Daniel
5. Napeyok Betty Vella, Head Teacher Longalom PS was appraised on 13th December 2022 by the SAS Lochoro Miriam
6. Abura Richard Ogole, Head Teacher Matany PS was appraised on 6th December 2022 by the SAS Anyango Anna Grace
7. Adyei Josephine Omara, Head Teacher Nakiceleet PS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by the SAS Lochoro Miriam
8. Lolem Samson, Head Teacher Kaurikiakine PS was appraised on 23rd December 2022 by the SAS Longole Ruth Iningo
9. Aporu Rose Lilly, Head Teacher Lokupoi PS was appraised on 12th December 2022 by the SAS Anyango Anna Grace
10. Apoet Faustus, Head Teacher Morulinga PS was appraised on 31st December 2022 by the SAS Anyango Anna Grace

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 3 Secondary schools, however only one appraisal for Secondary School Headteachers was provided during the assessment as below;

1. Okalebo John Peter, Head Teacher St Andrews Secondary School Lotome by Chairperson BOG Simon Peter Loduk

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>All staff in the LG Education department had been appraised against their performance plans as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ademaan Benjamin Angole, Senior Education officer was appraised on 5th June 2023 by Talamoi Florence-Principal Education Officer</li> <li>2. Akol Milly Maggie, Sports Officer was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Talamoi Florence-Principal Education Officer</li> <li>3. Kotol William- Education Officer Guidance and Counselling was appraised on 29th June 2023 by Talamoi Florence-Principal Education Officer</li> <li>4. Talamoi Florence, Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June by DEO Nakoya Philippe</li> <li>5. Lokapel Joseph D. District Inspector of Schools was appraised on the 26th June 2023 by by DEO Nakoya Philippe</li> </ol>	2
---	--	--	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level as prepared by DEO Nakoya Joyce P. on 11th April 2022 and submitted to the CAO on 11th August 2022. Some of the trainings planned and conducted included Financial Management Skills was conducted on 6th June 2023 and Copetence Based Assessment conducted on 15th August 2022.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.  If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment noted from DEO, that the LG was compliant as the CAO wrote to the permanent secretary on 11th October, 2023 on the updated enrolment and confirming the location of the Moroto technical institute.</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. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Napak LG made allocations of UGX 13,341,565 for FY 2022/2023 and 15,088,000 for FY2023/2024 to cater for inspections per term as required by the school implementation guidelines so as to ensure efficiency.</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 If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 2th August, 2022 after 30 days.</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 13rd October, 2022 after 10 days.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12nd January, 2023 after 10 days.</li> <li>• 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 28th April, 2023 after 17 days.</li> </ul>	0
	<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>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 25th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 20th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 24th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds were released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 9th May 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	0
	<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"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>For FY 2022/2023, the Education Department had prepared an inspection Plan dated 17th March 2022. It was prepared by the DIS and Was approved by the DEO. The plan prioritized inspecting the Government Schools (30 Primary and 2 Secondary). Below are the dates on which the pre-inspection plans were carried out;</p> <p>Term III 2022 meeting was on 13th October 2022 and planned to cover all 30 schools between 17th October to 29th October 2022</p> <p>Term I 2023 meeting was held on 10th February 2023 planned to inspect 30 schools between 13th February to 7th March, 2023</p> <p>Term II 2023 meeting was held on 17th July 2023 and planned to cover 30 schools between 18th July 2023 to 30th July 2023</p> <p>Term III 2023 meeting was never conducted though school records indicate that inspections had been carried out.</p> <p>. <math>3/3 \times 100 = 100\%</math></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"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the previous Financial Year revealed that 100% of Government Schools were inspected for term II I 2022, term I, II &amp; III 2023 but feedback reports were not seen at Lorengecora and Longalum primary school.</p> <p>The term III 2022 report was dated 18th November 2022.</p> <p>Term I report was dated 5th March 2023 and was submitted to DES on 24th April 2023</p> <p>Term II report dated 30th July 2023</p> <p><math>30 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>30</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>The assessment team noted that inspection reports were discussed especially at the DLG level as indicated in a report dated 2nd November, 2022 basically for term 3 of 2022 and 17th May, 2023 for term 1 findings.</p> <p>Later a meeting with head teachers was convened on 14th October, 2023 at the DLG farmer's hall for all the head teachers to discuss their findings minute no MIN 5/14/10/2023</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the Head teachers of all the schools visited, that the District Inspector of Schools (D.I.S) presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to them at a meeting convened on 14th October,2023 inside farmers hall at the DLG offices prepared by the Department of Education .among the schools was ; Lorengecora primary school, Longalum primary school &amp; Matany primary schools</p> <p>below is the evidence to DES submission of reports by the DIS</p> <p>The term 3 2022 report was dated 18thNovember 2022. It was handed to DES on 19th January, 2023.</p> <p>Term one report was dated 5thMarch,2023 and was submitted to DES on 24th April,2023</p> <p>Term 2 report dated 30thJuly,2023 was submitted to DES on 24th August 2023</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 7th October 2022 at the District Head Quarters Farmer's Hall where at least 20 members were present. Under Min no MIN 14/22/23.Submission of standing Committee Report. It was observed that, the delay to approve the Board of Governors for Lorengecora Seed Secondary School was bogging down the operation of the school. The committee resolved that follow up should be made with the Ministry of Education and sports for approval of Board of Governors.</p> <p>A meeting held on 30th May 2023 at the District Head Quarters Farmer's Hall where at least 24 members were present. Under Min no MIN 40.22/23.Submission of Committee Reports.Under Education department some if issues that were discussed;</p> <p>Proposed construct classroom block at Nabwal Primary School, construction of Teacher's house at Lamoratoit Primary School should be re- allocated to fencing of Kautakou Primary School.</p> <p>All the above were geared towards improved education service delivery.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract, and retain children in school called the "Go back to school" campaign from both DLG education offices as education officer Flornce Talamoi aired the above cause on ATEKER FM on 16th October 2023.</p> <p>The DEO Ms. Joy Nakoya presented evidence while addressing communities of Namugit, Lopana at Lokopo sub-county and emphasized GBS on 6th April 2023.</p>	2

**Investment Management**

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed accurate reporting on the assets of 30 primary schools.

The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:

Lorengecora primary school taken as urban had 10 classrooms, 151 desks, 24 stances of latrines and 10 teachers houses .

,Matany primary school taken as semi-urban had 13 classrooms, 19 latrine stances, 148 desks & 9 teacher's houses.

Longalom primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 14 classrooms, 130 desks, 20 latrine stances & 12 teachers houses..

During the assessment, it was noted that the infrastructure in the three visited schools did align with the information recorded in the District Local Government's register.

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 18th October 2022 for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs for eligible projects under education and all projects were derived from DDP III page 32 and 53 as follows;

- Renovation of Staff House and Litchen in Kautakou Primary School at Ushs 12,100,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal

1. Construction of a 2 classroom block with with a Office in Apeotolim Primary School at Ushs 84,672,000.
2. - Rehabilitation of a Six classroom in Kodike Primary School at Ushs 64,556,000.
3. - Construction of a Staff House in Loparipar Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000.
4. - Rehabilitation of Staff House in Nakicheelet Primary School at Ushs 40,000,000.
5. - Construction of Staff House in Kokorio Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000.
6. - Construction of Staff House in Lokodiokodio Primary School at Ushs 149,115,000

The Desk Appraisal report was endorsed by the Ag, Planner.



12

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0

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

Field appraisal Renovation of Staff House and Litchen in Kautakou Primary School . Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023.

Field appraisal Construction of a 2 classroom block with with a Office in Apeotolim. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023

Field appraisal Rehabilitation of a Six classroom in Kodike Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023.

Field appraisal Construction of a Staff House in Loparipar Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023.

Field appraisal Rehabilitation of Staff House in Nakicheelet Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023.

Field appraisal Construction of Staff House in Kokorio Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th March 2023.

All field appraisal forms were Signed by District Planner, DCDO, DNRO and District Environment Officer.

1

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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, score: 1, else score: 0

The LG education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The education items were Construction of Seed Secondary School (Phase II) at Irrir and Lopei. The plan was approved on 3rd October, 2023 by the, CAO, Okumu Bedijo James.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Contracts Committee sat on 16th November, 2022 and 28th November, 2022 - which approved the evaluation report and award of contract and negotiation in Minute 22/cc/22-23, 28cc/22-23 respectively. The contract awarded were</li> <li>1. Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Lokodiokodio primary school.</li> <li>2. Construction of a 4-unit staff house at Loparipari primary school.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG did not properly establish the project implementation team (PIT), for school construction projects constructed within last FY as per guidelines in a letter dated 19th December, 2023, written by the CAO, where only, Nakoya Joyce Phillipine - DEO-, was named Project/Contract Manager. The letter left out the Project manager, CDO, environment officer, clerk of works and labour officer. Thus, the PIT was not established as per guidelines.	<b>0</b>
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>	Works at Irii Seed Secondary school implemented during the last FY followed standard technical designs during implementation. This was verified during the field visit to Irii Seed Schooling November 2023 and confirmed the above position after inspection. Structures that were erected included ICT block, science laboratory, administration block and classroom block. All of them were at the ring beam level.	<b>1</b>
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>	<p>There was evidence that the Clerk of Works for Construction of Irii Seed Secondary School (Mr. Risa Boniface) prepared reports and submitted them to the District Engineer. Sample reports were dated as shown below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly supervision report dated 30th January 2023</li> <li>• Monthly supervision report dated 28th February 2023</li> <li>• Monthly supervision report dated 30th 2023.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

Reports dated 14th February, 2023, 21st February, 2023, 14th March, 2023 and 13th June, 2023 signed by the CAO as chairperson of the meeting and the minute secretary showed that monthly supervision at critical stages by a joint team had been done by all the technical officers

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were not within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p>	1
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Voucher no 6434995 dated 29th June 2023 for Ushs 33,594,942; Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00003, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Lokodiokodioi was certified by DEO on 19th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 20th June 2023, district Engineer on 19th June 2023 and DCDO on 20th June 2023, payment was initiated on 12th June 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within the time flame.</li> <li>2. Voucher no 4772487 dated 18th April 2023 for Ushs 82,858,737, Certificate No 1, dated 28th March 2023, Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Kokorio was certified by DEO on 3rd April 2023, District Environment Officer on 28th March 2023, district Engineer on 28th March 2023, payment was initiated on 3rd April 2023 and payments were made on 18th April 2023 which was within the time flame.</li> <li>3. Voucher no 4202156 dated 2nd March 2023 for Ushs 47,984,000, Certificate No 1, dated 22nd February 2023, Contract No.Napa.604/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00004, Project; Construction of a 4 Teacher's House at Loparipar was certified by DEO on 22nd February 2023, District Environment Officer on 24th February 2023, district Engineer on 20th February 2023 and District Community Development Officer on 22nd February 2022, payment was initiated on 22nd February 2023 and payments were made on 2nd March 2023 which was within the time flame.</li> </ol>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education department did not timely submit a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, as this was done on the 19th of May, 2023.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution  
*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

Procurement files reviewed were;

Project 1: Construction of staff house at Loparipar primary school.

Procurement ref: NAPA/wrks/2022-2023/SDG/00004, had these documents.

- Signed works contract dated 16th November, 2023 with Ms. Lookorok General stores
- Contracts Committee decision which sat on 16th November, 2022, awarded the contract in Min 22cc//2022-2023(h)
- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, among document on file.

Project 2: Rehabilitation of a 6- classroom block at Kodike primary school

Project Ref: NAPA/wrks/2022-2023/SDG/00002, with these documents.

- Signed works contract on 16th December, 2022 With Ms. Amoko Technologies limited
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 16th November, 2022, approving the award of contract in minute 22cc/2022-2023 (k)
- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file.

Project 3: Construction of staff house at Lokodiokodio primary school

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/SDG/00003, with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 16th November, 2022 with Ms. Nomak Investments limited
- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 28th November, 2022, were the contract was awarded in Minute 28/cc/2022-2023(c).
- PP1 form, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government had handled grievances in line with the grievance redress framework in spite of the availability of the minutes of the district redress and grievances handling committee orientation meeting held on and 29th September, 2022 and 28th December, 2022 at both the Education Boardroom and on 24th April, 2023 at the water boardroom and on 12th June, 2023 at the Farmers' Hall</p>	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 of the Local Government Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines financial year 2022-2023 that clearly spells out the allocations of environmental issues for education sector however, there was no evidence availed to show its dissemination to the respective schools of Lorengecora primary, Matany primary and Longalom primary schools</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>Costed ESMPS incorporated in the BoQs were seen for the following education projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Construction of staff house at Lokodiokodioi P/S. ESMP cost in BoQ was seen and cited in section D &amp; E as Environment Management 600,000/=; Section F as Gender mainstreaming 300,000/= totaling to UGX 900,000/=</li><li>2. Construction of staff house at Loparipar P/S. ESMP cost in BoQ was seen and cited in section D &amp; E as Environment Management 150,000/=; Section F as Gender mainstreaming 100,000/= totaling to UGX 250,000/=</li><li>3. Construction of staff house at Kokorio P/S. ESMP cost in BoQ was seen and cited in section D&amp;E as Environment Management 200,000/=; Section F as Gender mainstreaming 150,000/= totaling to UGX 450,000/=</li></ol>	2

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0	<p>The following documents were provided as evidence for land ownership for some education projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For construction of staff house at Loparipar P/S. Freehold title, VolumeMOR 12 Folio 24; Plot 165, Block 4 at Loparipar. Owner: Lopeei sub county (Loparipar P/S); SIZE 5.5320ha.</li> <li>2. For Rehabilitation of staff house at Kautakou and construction of staff house at Lokodiokodioi P/S minutes for the land board sitting dated 10th March 2023 held at water boardroom cited a list of pending land titles of which these two schools were part (Minute 4/NDLB/3/10-004/2022/23. The assignment was given to private surveyor who has delayed to deliver. Minutes were prepared and signed by Ngiro James and approved by chairperson Kuskus Michael Lopey on on 13th June 2023.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score:0	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supervision report for the construction of a 4 teachers house at kokorio primary school dated March, 2023</li> <li>2. Supervision report for the construction of a 4 unit teachers house at Lokodiokodioi primary school dated January, 2023</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

Project contract payment certifications were inconsistently processed and certified by the Environment Officer and CDO throughout the projects' implementation cycles for example, certificates 1 and 3 were signed by both but 2 was only signed by the Environment Officer. The requirement in project implementation is that both Environment Officer and CDO should always be seen certifying all certificates and not choose when they feel like on particular investments.

1. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 27th January, 2023 for the construction of a 4-unit teachers' house at Lokodiokodio primary school signed by both the Environment Officer and the CDO

2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 28th March, 2023 for the construction of a 4-unit teachers' house at Kokorio primary school signed by only the Environment Officer

3. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 22nd February, 2023 for the construction of a 4-unit teachers' house at Loparpar primary school signed by both the Environment Officer and the CDO



**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Napak District had registered a small percentage increase of less than 20%, in utilization of Health Care services when you compare its performance for FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23.</p> <p>From the annual HMIS reports 107 of the 3 Health facilities, Lokopo HCIII, Lotome HCIII and Lorengechora HCIII the deliveries for FY 2021/22 were: 256, 216 and 513 respectively.</p> <p>The total Deliveries for the 3 Health Facilities for FY 2021/22 was 985.</p> <p>The Deliveries for the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 was 254,225,568 respectively.</p> <p>The Total deliveries for the FY 2022/23 was 1047.</p> <p>This represented a percentage increase of 6.3%</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 76% as per the OPAMS.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>RBF program was suspended and integrated with PHC fund as per the Letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th Dec,2022.</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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.	DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 106,689,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of OPD at Lotome HC III at Ushs 60,000,000.</li> <li>2. Construction of A chain Link Fence in Iriri (Naturumrum Health Centre II at Ushs 84,000,000.</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance latrine in Lorengecora HC III at Ushs 25,000,000.</li> </ol>	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer, and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Voucher no 6430777 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 19,384,318 Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.907/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00014, Project; Construction of Chainlink Fence at Naturumrum HCII was certified by DHO on 5th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 5th June 2023, district Engineer on 5th June 2023 and DCDO on 5th June 2023.</li> <li>2. Voucher no 5884064 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 19,384,318 Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.907/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00027, Project; Construction of a 5 Stance VIP Latrine at Lorengecora Town council was certified by DHO on 17th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 17th May 2023, district Engineer on 17th May 2023. However, DCDO didn't certify the work.</li> </ol>	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	As per Voucher no 2, DCDO didn't certify the work. However, the payment was made.			

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Two of the sampled projects were within +/- 18.38% of +/- 20% acceptable variation, the other was +20.26% and did not comply.

The projects were;

Project 1: Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Lorengechora HCIII

Procurement Ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/00027

Project 2: Renovation of OPD at Lotome HCIII

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/00032

Project 3: Construction of chain link fence at Naturumrum HCII

Procurement ref: NAPA/wrks/2022-2023/00014

Project 1:

Estimated cost: Ugx 25,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 24,404,545/=

Variation Ugx 4,595,455/=

%age variation ( 4,595,455/25,000,000) x 100% = 18.38%

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 47,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 37,479,820/=

Variation: Ugx 9,520,180/=

%age variation ( 9,520,180/47,000,000) x 100%=20.26%

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 89,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 93,246,300/=

Variation: Ugx -4,246,300/=

%age variation (-4,246,300/89,000,000) x 100%= - 4.77%

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was no health facility upgrade implemented in the district in the FY 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	The staffing level of health workers was at 88%.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. From the approved staff structure, the LG required 213 health workers,</li> <li>2. From the staff list the actual number of deployed health workers were 189.</li> <li>3. <math>189/213 = 88\%</math></li> </ol>	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was no upgrade of HCII to HCIII planned for FY 2022/2023	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<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>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for the 3 sampled health facilities; Lokopo HCIII, Lotome HCIII and Lorengechora HCIII was accurate as indicated below.</p> <p><b>Lokopo HCIII</b> had 11 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p><b>Lotome HCIII</b> had 14 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the facility staff list at noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p><b>Lorengechora HCIII</b> had 13 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p>	2
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>There was a letter from MOH to District Chairperson dated 25th January,2023 confirming upgrade of Iriri Health Centre III to HC IV in the FY 2022/23.</p> <p>There was a Latrine constructed in Lorengechora HCIII, Renovation of OPD at Lotome HCIII and a chain link fence constructed at Naturumrum HC II. All were functional.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG presented the Health facility annual work plan and budget for the FY 2022/2023 for the three sampled facilities;</p> <p>Lotome HC III submitted on the 12th August 2022.</p> <p>Lorengechora HC III submitted on the 1st July 2022</p> <p>Lokopo HC III did not submit a plan work for the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>All the three Health Facility annual work plan and budget for the sampled health were submitted beyond the 31st March of the previous FY 2022/2023.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the 3 sampled Health facilities: Lokopo HCIII, Lotome HCIII, and Lorengechora HCIII prepared and submitted their Budget performance reports for FY 2022/23 as per the Budget and Grant guidelines. Their submission dates are as follows:</p> <p>Lotome HCIII submitted its Annual Budget Performance Report on 7th July 2022.</p> <p>Lorengechora HCIII submitted on 10th July 2022.</p> <p>Lokopo HCIII submitted on 10th July, 2022.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the sampled Health facilities: Lokopo HCIII, Lotome HCIII and Lorengechora HCIII prepared and submitted their Facility improvement Plans for FY 2023/24, and their plans incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports as indicated below:</p> <p>Lotome HCIII submitted its Facility improvement Plan on 9th Oct 2023. Its performance issues included increasing OPD utilization from 10934 to 12405. This was an action point of the performance review meeting of 22nd Aug 2023</p> <p>There was also an issue of Raising ANC attendance. This was recommended in the 4th Performance review meeting of 22nd Aug, 2023.</p> <p>The Plan also included the issue of ensuring Transparency.</p> <p>And accountability. This was raised as recommendation of the DHT support supervision report which recommended that Health facilities should display their funds as received and used .</p> <p>Lorengechora submitted on 3rd July 2023</p> <p>Lokopo also prepared and submitted its Facility improvement plan on 19th July ,2023.</p> <p>Its plan included performance issues like conducting mobile clinics per month .This was one of the recommendations of the 4 th Quarter 2022/23 performance review meeting which recommended that all facilities should plan and implement Outreaches in order to improve service utelization</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the sampled Health Facilities: Lotome HCIII, Lokopo HCIII, and Lorengechora HCIII submitted their monthly HMIS re 105 and quarterly HMIS 106 Reports for the FY 2022/23. However, some Health Facilities did not submit their HMIS 106 Repots timely.

Their submission dates are indicated below:

### **Submission dates for HMIS 105**

#### **July 2022**

Lotome HCIII 3rd Aug, 2022

Lokop HCIII 7th Aug 2022

Lorengechora HCIII 7th Aug 2022

#### **August 2022**

Lotome HCIII 5th Sept 2022

Lokopo HCIII 7th Sept ,2022

Lorengechora HCIII 7th Sept,2022

#### **Sept,2022**

Lotome HCIII 3rd Oct2022

Lokop HCIII 7th Oct ,2022

Lorengechora HCIII 7th Oct,2022

#### **Oct,2022**

Lotome HCIII 4th Nov,2022

Lokop HCIII 7th Nov,2022

Lorengechora HCIII 2nd Nov,2022

#### **Nov2022**

Lotome HCIII 2nd Dec 2022

Lokop HCIII 6th Dec,2022

Lorengechora HCIII 7th Dec 2022

#### **Dec 2022**

Lotome HCIII 5th Jan,2023

Lokop HCIII 6th Jan,2023

Lorengechora HCIII 3rd Jan,2023

#### **Jan 2023**

Lotome HCIII 4th Feb,2023

Lokop HCIII 7th Feb,2023

Lorengechora HCIII 6th Feb 2023

#### **Feb,2023**

Lotome HCIII 3rd March,2023

Lokop HCIII 6th March 2023

Lorengchora HCIII 6th March 2023

**March ,2023**

Lotome HCIII 3rd April 2023

Lokop HCIII 5th April,2023

Lorengchora HCIII 4th April,2023

**April 2023**

Lotome HCIII 2nd May,2023

Lokop HCIII 6th May,2023

Lorengchora HCIII 3rd May, 2023

**May, 2023**

Lotome HCIII 5th June, 2023

Lokop HCIII 7th may, 2023

Lorengchora HCIII 4th May, 2023

**June,2023,**

Lotome HCIII 5th July,2023

Lokop HCIII 7th July,2023

Lorengchora HCIII 4th July ,2023

**Submission dates HMIS 106 reports**

**1st Quarter HMIS 106**

Lotome HCIII 3rd Oct 2022

Lokop HCIII 6th Oct,2022

Lorengchora HCIII 7th Oct,2022

**2nd Quarter HMIS 106**

Lotome HCIII 9th Jan 2023

Lokop HCIII ----(No Report seen)

Lorengchora HCIII 6th Jan,2023

**3rd Quarter HMIS 106**

Lotome HCIII 8th April ,2023

Lokop HCIII 5th April, 2023

Lorengchora HCIII 7th April,2023

**4th Quater 106**

Lotome HCIII 4th July,2023

Lokop HCIII 7th July, 2023

Lorengchora HCIII 4th July,2023



6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated in PHC as per the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th Dec 2022.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated in PHC as per the letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th Dec 2022.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. He noted the new system doesn't send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Napak Health Department developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p> <p>The document could not be traced anywhere in the DHO's office</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no reports to establish whether Napak District developed and implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Napak LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 3,162,837,000 (Approved budget estimates for Napak LG 2023/24 page 26 of 58 vote 907). This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 where the provided wage rate was Ugx 3,162,836,851 as indicated on page 98 vote 907. Therefore, Napak LG budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

- 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

**Lokopo HCIII** had 11 out of 19 required health workers for HCIII, giving over 57.9% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed Staff list at Lokopo HCIII noticeboard)

**Lotome HCIII** had 14 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 73.7% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Lotome HCIII noticeboard)

**Lorengchora HCIII** had 13 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 68.4% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Lorengchora HCIII noticeboard)

Therefore, all the 3 sampled health facilities didn't have at least 75% of staff required hence Napak LG did not deployed health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

**Lokopo HCIII:** 6 out of 11 health workers deployed to Lokopo HCIII were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Apolot Harriet Faith; Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 16th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Owino Simon; Clinical Officer was present on duty on 16th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Achiengi Hellen Olal; Nursing Assistant was present on duty on 16th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 20 days in the month of October 2023.

*(Lokopo HCIII staff attendance book 16th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

**Lotome HCIII:** 12 out of 14 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment

included;

1. Adupa John Robert Senior Nursing Officer was present on duty on 16th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023

2. Akongo Jacinta Health Information Assistant was present on duty on 16th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023

3. Achuka Mary Faith Nursing Assistant was present on duty on 16th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 17 days in the month of October 2023

*(Lotome HCIII staff attendance book 16th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

**Lorengechora HCIII:** 11 out of 13 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Kapel Michael Health Assistant was present on duty on 17th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 11 days in the month of October 2023

2. Lopade Eric Laboratory Technician was present on duty on 17th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 22 days in the month of October 2023

3. Abura Fausta Enrolled midwife was present on duty on 17th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 19 days in the month of October 2023

*(Lorengechora HCIII staff attendance book 17th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).*

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Napak DLG publicized health worker deployment. Lists of health workers were found displayed on the noticeboards at the three facilities (Lokopo HCIII, Lotome HCIII and Lorengechora HCIII) visited.

The displayed list of staff at Lokopo HCIII noticeboard had a total of 11 staff whereas the one displayed at Lotome HCIII had a total of 14 staff. Lorengechora HCIII had 13 staff (Lokopo HCIII Lotome HCIII and Lorengechora HCIII noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 and were stamped.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

The LG 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 as below;

1. Aguro Rose Enrolled Nurse- Incharge Ngoreit HC II, was appraised on 28th June 2023 by SAS, Abura Jeremiah
2. Longole Mary, Nursing Officer- Iriiri Health Center III, was appraised on 19th June 2023 by SAS, Longole Ruth Iningo
3. Abol Jonathan, Enrolled Nurse- Nakicumet HC II, was appraised on 19th June 2023 by SAS Anyango Anna Grace
4. Adupa John Robert, Snr Nuirsing Officer- Lotome HC III, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Lomilo Charles
5. Owor Alice Oyella, Enrolled Midwife- Lokopo HC III, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Locoro Miriam Longol
6. Ongom Patrick, Enrolled nurse- Namendera HC II, was appraised on 22nd June 2023 by SAS Longole Ruth Iningo
7. Lomonyang Rose, Nursing Officer- Kangole HC III, was appraised on 3rd June 2023 by TC, Locoro Daniel
8. Agan Betty, Nursing Officer - Morulinga HC II, was appraised on 23rd June 2023 by SAS Ayango Anna Grace
9. Ilukol Christine, Nursing Officer- Apeitolim HC II, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Kinei Joseph
10. Apollo John Bosco Herbert, Enrolled Nurse, Naturumurum HC II was appraised on the 15th of June 2023 by Health Inspector Loput Isiah
11. Aketch Martha, Enrolled midwife- Nabwai HC II was appraised on 28th June 2023 by SAS Acuka Simon Peter N.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY as follows;

1. Lochoro Hellen Joyce, Enrolled Midwife- Naturumulum HC II was appraised on 22nd June 2023 by Health Inspector Loputa Isiah
2. Agwang Proscovia, Laboratory Assistant Lotome health Center III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Incharge Adupa John Robert
3. Moru Alice, Enrolled Midwife- Nabwang HC II was appraised on 28th June 2023 by SAS Acuka Simon Peter N.
4. Kato David Ogwang, Health Assistant-Iriiri HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Longole Ruth Iningo
5. Ojara Isaac, Health Information Assistant- Lapeitolim HC II was appraised on the 30th of June by Incharge Ilukol Christine
6. Loteng Veronica- Enrolled midwife Lopeie HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Incharge Mukeswe Alysious Masige
7. Akol Daniel Enrolled Nurse- Kangole HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Incharge Lomonyang Rose
8. Nachugae Rose, Enrolled Midwife Morelinga HC II was appraised on 23rd June 2023 by Incharge Agan Betty
9. Aema Joseph A. Medical Laboratory Technician- Lotome HC III was appraised on 30th June by Incharge Adupa John Robert
10. Lopade Erick, medical Laboratory Technician Lorengchora HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Incharge Lomukwang Alice Omona

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

Corrective actions were taken based on the appraisal reports for health workers and these included Training on Quality Management Systems, Leadership and Management Training, Data Analysis and interpretation, and TB Analysis.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level. The trainings that had been conducted included including TB laboratory and leprosy training, training on adolescence sexual reproductive health, child health days plus/immunization, and EPI dashboard.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG documented training activities in the training/CPD database. For instance there were registers for the following trainings;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adolescence Sexual reproductive health took place on 7th October 2022</li> <li>2. Child health days plus/Immunization took place on 22nd November 2022</li> </ol>	1

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the CAO wrote to MOH confirming facilities receiving PHC. This letter was dated 11th July 2023 indicating health facilities to receive PHC in the FY 2023/24. There were 17 health facilities benefitting from PHC</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the Q4 performance report showed that on page 62 supervision &amp; monitoring was allocated UGX 56,319,000 and on (page 17), PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 633,549,000.</p> <p>As per the computation  <math>56,319,000/633,549,000 \times 100 = 8\%</math>.</p>	0



9

N23\_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

- 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 2th August, 2022 after 30 days.
- 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 13rd October, 2022 after 10 days.
- 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12nd January, 2023 after 10 days.
- 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 28th April, 2023 after 17 days.

0

9

N23\_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities was not within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter;

Quarter 1 funds was released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 25th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 20th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 24th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 9th May 2023 which was more than 5 days.

0

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Napak District Health Department implemented actions of the Quarterly Performance Review meetings, for example, the 3rd Quarter Performance Review meeting which took place on 17 May 2023, recommended provision of updated Malaria Channel graphs/ chart in Health facilities. This was implemented and is indicated in the 4th Quarter performance review report /minutes of 22nd August 2023.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners and other departments. For example;</p> <p>The quarter 1 Performance review meeting that took place on 23rd November,2022 included HC in-charges like:</p> <p>Ongom Patrick I/C Namendera HCIII</p> <p>Lemukol Amos SCO I/C Lorengechora HCIII,</p> <p>Abol Jonethan EN I/c Nakichumet HC II.</p> <p>It also included members from other Departments for example</p> <p>Oryema Jack Water Officer</p> <p>Muye Alex Principal Human Resource officer.</p> <p>Representatives from Development Partners that attended included :</p> <p>Ngorok Anna from CUAMM</p> <p>Dr .Okiror Babra from TASO</p> <p>Econyu Joel from VSO</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG lacks a public HCIV and general hospital. However, it has one PNFP general hospital called St. Kizito Matany and they did not carry out any support supervision to the PNFP hospital, they only attend board meetings on quarterly basis.</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>Evidence that DHT ensured that Health Sub-Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY 2022/23</p> <p>Bukora Health Sub district carried out support supervision to several Lower Health facilities</p> <p>Examples of incidences of the support supervisions done by Bukora HSD ae indicated below:</p> <p>The Report of August 2022 HSD support supervision ,which was submitted to DHO's office on25th Sept,2022 indicated that Bukora HSD carried out Support supervision on 17 Health facilities in the District in that Month of August 2022.</p> <p>Some of the issues indicated in the report was that in some Health facilities like Amedek HCII the Essential drugs were out .</p> <p>And there was no Health education plan</p> <p>Another HSD support supervision was done 26th -27th Sept 2022 covered 17 Health facilities.</p>	1

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 evidence that Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits.</p> <p>The support supervision on Naturumrum of 27th August 2022, identified low immunization coverages at the Health Facility, and recommended that a micro plan be made by in charge on How to provide Immunization outreaches.</p> <p>The Support supervision on Nabwal HCII noted lack of acknowledgement of funds given to the Facility under PHC and recommended that health facility should display on the Notice board the funds received and funds used quarterly. (feedback report 7th Sept 2022)</p> <p>A follow up support supervision that took place on Lotome HCIII on 20th Nov,2022, reported a correction of the problem of essential medicine stock out that had been reported in the previous HSD support supervision of 27 th August 2022.</p> <p>This was rectified by redistribution of medicine from over stoked Health facilities.</p>	1
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 evidence to show that, was evidence District provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY2022/23 examples of the incidences of the district Support supervision on medicine management are indicated below:</p> <p>On 18th May,2023 medicine management monitoring and mentorship was done in Lotome HCIII. There were no stock cards that were not updated. Lomel Michel the District medicine Supervisor mentored health staff on how to fill the stock cards accurately. (Report by Lomel Michel submitted to DHO on 14th July 2023.</p> <p>Another MMS was done on Lokopo HCIII on 28 June 2023, it identified overstocking of INH 300mg and stock out of Stat pak. Recommended redistribution of overstocked medicine.</p>	1

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	A review of the performance report showed that DHO was UGX 56,319,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 17,458,890 was spent on Health promotion page 31 of approved budget.  Expressed as a % = $32,999,760 / 56,319,000 \times 100 = 31\%$ .	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence DHT carried out Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY 2022/23  There was a report on Quarter 1 WASH activities which included Community Dialogue meetings done in Lopee village, House to House inspection which took place in different areas of the district by Health inspector, bore hole inspection, Community sensitization done in 5 Villages among others.  (Report by Kato David Ogwang submitted to DHO on 4t April 2023)	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of follow up on Disease prevention and Health promotion.  No follow up reports on Health promotion and Disease prevention was got in DHO 's office.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Napak assets register. There was register had medical equipment's for example diagnostic equipment, the weighing scale the Friedges, beds, etc for different Health centres, their numbers and condition.</p> <p>The Register also had Items for the DHO's office indicating among other things the Vehicles like Toyota UG 4650M attached to DHO's office.</p> <p>Another Toyota Hilux 7112 M, motorcycles,Computers among other</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived DDP III page 53 and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of OPD at Lotome HC III.</li> <li>2. Construction of A chain Link Fence in Iriri (Naturumrum Health Centre II</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance latrine in Lorengecora HC III</li> </ol> <p>All the projects were appraised on 18th October 2022 by the Senior Planner, Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.</p>	1

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

1. Field appraisal for construction of OPD at Lotome HC III. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 1st October 2023 signed by DHO, District Planner, and SCDO.
2. Field appraisal for construction of A chain Link Fence in Iriri (Naturumrum Health Centre II. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 1st October 2023 signed by DHO, District Planner, and SCDO.
3. Field appraisal for construction of a 5-stance latrine in Lorengecora HC III. Impacts and mitigation measures were identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 1st October 2023 signed by DHO, District Planner, and SCDO.

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0

Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction for the projects listed below however, monitoring using the checklists was not carried out.

1. Renovation of staff house at Iriiri HC II prepared on 25th September, 2023
2. Fencing of Naturumurum health centre II 11th May, 2023
3. Construction of OPD at Lotome HC III 26th July, 2023

Below are the respective prepared ESMPs;

1. Construction of chain-link fence at Lokiteded HC III at total project cost of UGX 136,790,795 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 6,839,500 prepared on 25th September, 2023
2. Rehabilitation of staff house at Iriiri HC III at total project cost of UGX 50,000,000 with environmental and social mitigation measures at costed of UGX 2,500,000 prepared on 25th September, 2023
3. Rehabilitation of OPD at Lotome HCIII at total project cost of UGX. 13,688,000 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 684,400 prepared on 26th April, 2023
4. Fencing of Naturumurum HCII at total project of UGX. 60,000,000 with environmental and social mitigation measures costed at UGX 3,000,000 prepared on 18th November, 2023.

0

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0

The LG health department did not timely submit by April, 30th for the current FY all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan. Their request was submitted on 21st June,2023, and the procurement plan was approved on 3rd August, 2023 by the CAO, Okumu Bedijo James.



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>The LG health department submitted procurement request form PP1 to the PDU by 1st Quarter of current FY on 4th August, 2023. The request was for construction of chain link fence at the headquarter at ugx 136,790,795/= and renovation of staff house at Irrir HCIII at Ugx 50,000,000/=.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee minutes dated 28th November, 2022, in minute 28cc/22-23 (a), approved the award of the contracts this was for construction of chain link at Naturumrum HCII</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG did not properly establish the project implementation team for all health projects as per guidelines. in a letter dated 19th December, 2022, signed by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga, only named Teko Timothy Ag. DHO, as Contract Manager and left out the other members of the team such as CDO, project manager, Labour officer, environment officer and clerk of works.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no planned upgrade of a HC II to HC III or construction of new HC III in FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Reports dated May, 2023 by supervisor of works, 10th May, 2023 by engineering assistant and that of 25th May, 2023 by the District Engineer were seen as evidence that supervision of the health infrastructure was done in the last FY.</p>	<b>1</b>
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 were no monthly site meeting held since there was no health facility upgrade in the district in the year under review.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was a report dated 25th May, 2023 by the CDO, DE and DNRO to show that technical supervision of all health infrastructure had been done by the relevant officers.</p>	<b>1</b>

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers. For example;

1. Voucher no 6430777 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 19,384,318 Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.907/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00014, Project; Construction of Chainlink Fence at Naturumurum HCII was certified by DHO on 5th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 5th June 2023, district Engineer on 5th June 2023 and DCDO on 5th June 2023, payment was initiated on 5th June 2023 and payments were done on 19th June 2023 which was more than 20 working day.
2. Voucher no 5884064 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 19,384,318 Certificate No 3, dated 19th June 2023; Contract No.Napa.907/WRKS/2022-23/SDG/00027, Project; Construction of a 5 Stance VIP Latrine at Lorengecora Town council was certified by DHO on 17th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 17th May 2023, district Engineer on 17th May 2023. However, DCDO didn't certify the work, payment was initiated 17th May 2023 and payments were made on 15th June 2023 which was more than 10 working days.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The procurement files reviewed were.

Project 1. Construction of chain link fence at Naturumrum HCII

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/22-23/00014, it had these documents.

- Signed works contract dated 16th December, 2022 with Ms. Galax General suppliers and Construction limited
- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes which sat on 28th November, 2022, awarded the contract in minute 28cc/22-23.
- PP1 form, call for bids, record of bid issue and receipt, among record on file

Project: 2

Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Lorengechwa HCIII

Procurement Ref: NAPA/wrks/2022-2023/00027, with the following documents

- Signed works contract dated 8th February, 2023 with Ms. Kulonak 2015 Quick Suppliers
- Evaluation report dated 16th December, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 20th December, 2023, in which the contract was awarded in minute 33/cc/22-23 (k)
- PP1 form, call for bid, record of issue and receipts, among the other records on the file.

Project: 3

Renovation of OPD at Lotome HCII

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-23/00032, had these documents on file;

- Signed works contract dated 8th February, 2023 with Ms. Glotech Consults International limited
- Evaluation report dated 16th December, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 20th December, 2023 in which the contract was awarded in minute 33/cc/22-23 (m)

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no health related grievances recorded.</p>	<b>2</b>
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 district claimed to having disseminated the “guidelines for WASH in health facilities Uganda, 2022. However, the WASH activity reports given did not clearly capture the concern of Health Care waste management (i.e., for reports dated 4th January and 2nd July 2023 prepared by Kalo David -Health Assistant).</p>	<b>0</b>

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>Documentary evidence showed that the budget requirements for PHC NWR Grant, 30% of the health office budget is required for LGs to allocate it to health promotion, education and prevention activities among which waste management is considered. However, the provided 2022/2023 third quarter budget for Amedek HC II, Nebwal sub-county captured activity as hygiene and sanitation. This did not present the component of health care waste management as a stand-alone activity.</p> <p>Under functional system of medical waste, one of the health facility was not adequately taking care of what is generated.</p> <p>In Lotome HCIII, although there were some ideal ways of waste segregation using colour coded bins, and having segregation guiding charts on walls, there was a placenta pit that was out of use and rather disposing medical waste in a pit latrine. Challenge was that placenta pit was located in a high water table area.</p> <p>Under waste management service providers, an MoU was seen on file “for collection, transportation and safe disposal of waste.</p> <p>Evidence of sampled receipts for GLS waste collection on file include;</p> <p>Invoice number 5825 had 1790kgs of waste collected for a period of October 2023 dated from Iriir HCIII and Matany hospital;</p> <p>Invoice number 4296 had 1123kgs of waste collected for a period of May – June 2023 from Iriir HCIII and Matany hospital.</p>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 health sector conducted training on waste management. Evidence was the report dated 4th January 2023 written by Kalo David Ogwang -Health Assistant.</p>

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	A costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY for example, the rehabilitation of an Out Patient Department (OPD) at Lotome HCIII with a total project cost at UGX. 13,688,000 and environment and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 684,400 prepared on 26th April, 2023	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	Health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership for example Lokiteded HC III where the construction of chainlink fence was carried out is located on land with certificate of title issued on 31st May, 2016 with instrument No. 00021187 on Block(Road) 4, Plot 134	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example;  1. Supervision report for the construction of chainlink fence at Naturumurum HCII dated May, 2023  2. Supervision report for the rehabilitation of OPD at Lotome HCIII dated May, 2023	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Certification forms were not consistently 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 for example;

1. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 10th May, 2023 for the construction of a latrine with urinals at Lorengecora HCIII signed by only the Environment Officer

2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 3rd May, 2023 for the rehabilitation of OPD at Lotome HCII signed by both the CDO and Environment Officer

3. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 23rd May, 2023 for the construction of a chain-link at Naturumurum HCII signed by both the CDO and Environment Officer



**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the sector (MoWE) MIS data for the current FY2023/24, the % of rural water sources that are functional within Napak District is 61%.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the sector (MoWE) MIS data for the current FY2023/24, the % of WSS facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Napak District is 57%.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current year under review was 48% as per the OPAMS.</p>	<b>0</b>

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

According to the DWO MIS for FY2021/22 which formed the basis for budgetary allocation, the district's average safe water coverage was 86%. The following sub-counties had their percentage of safe water coverage below the district average figure; Iriiri S/C 64%, Lokopo S/C 79%, Lopeei S/C 84%, Lotome 95%, Ngoleriet 95% and Lorengecora 95%.

According to the FY2022/23 Budget and the approved AWP for FY2022/23 approved by the MoWE on 26th July 2022, the following projects were planned and implemented;

- Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 04No. deep boreholes in various sub-counties under the water sector grant as follows; Lotome S/C, Ngoleriet S/C, Lopeei S/C and Nabwal S/C at a cost of ugx 91,929,600.

- Construction of a 40,000m<sup>3</sup> storage tank at ugx 67,690,700 at Lokiteded T/C (formerly Matany S/C).

- Sitting and drilling of 02No. of motorized production wells in Apeitolim S/C (formerly part of Lokopo S/C) at ugx 87,792,000

- Extension of piped water system from Longariama to narega in Ngoleriet S/C at ugx 62,078,905

- The construction of Lolet piped water system in Lorengecora S/C at ugx 291,590,970

- Rehabilitation of 02 boreholes(Iriiri &Matanyi S/C) and repair of 2 mini solar plants(Iriiri &Lokopo S/C).

Hence, The % of projects in Sub Counties with safe water coverage below the District average in the previous year; =  $8/13 \times 100\% = 61.5\%$ . this is below 80%.

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling of 2 production wells in Achukudu RGC in Apeitolim Lower Local Government:

Engineer's estimate = UGX 86,000,000

Contract Sum = UGX 87,792,000

Various = UGX -1,720,000

Percentage variance = -  
 $1,720,000/86,000,000 \times 100\% = -2\%$

2). Drilling of 4 boreholes installed with hand pumps in various sub-counties.

Engineers estimate = UGX 97,720,240

Contract price = UGX 91,929,600

Variation = UGX 5,790,640

Percentage variation =  
 $5,790,640/97,720,240 \times 100\% = 5.9\%$

3). Extension of piped water supply system from Longariam village to Naregae village in Ngoleriet sub-county.

Engineers estimate = UGX 12,459,632

Contract price = UGX 12,459,632

Variation = UGX 0

Percentage variation =  
 $0/12,459,632 \times 100\% = 0\%$

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

According to the AWP FY2022/23, Napak district planned to implement the following projects.

- Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 04No. deep boreholes in various sub-counties under the water sector grant as follows; Lotome S/C, Ngoleriet S/C, Lopeei S/C and Nabwal S/C at a cost of ugx 91,929,600.

- Construction of a 40,000m<sup>3</sup> storage tank at ugx 67,690,700 at Lokiteded T/C (formerly Matany S/C).

- Sitting and drilling of 02No. of motorized production wells in Apeitolim S/C (formerly part of Lokopo S/C) at ugx 87,792,000

- Extension of piped water system from longariam to narega in Ngoleriet S/C at ugx 62,078,905

- The construction of Lolet piped water system in Lorengecora S/C at ugx 291,590,970

- Rehabilitation of 02 boreholes (and repair of 2 mini solar plants (Iriiri & Lokopo).

According to the 4th Quarter Progress Report received at the MoWE on 19th October 2023, the above projects were implemented as follows.

- Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 02 No. deep boreholes were completed and dry boreholes were realized in the other two hence not working.

- Construction of a 40,000m<sup>3</sup> storage tank at ugx 67,690,700 at Lokiteded T/C (formerly Matany S/C) was completed

- Sitting and drilling of 02 No. of motorized production wells in Apeitolim S/C (formerly part of Lokopo S/C) was completed

- Extension of piped water system from longariama to narega in Ngoleriet S/C was completed

- The construction of Lolet piped water system in Lorengecora S/C was completed

- Rehabilitation of 08 boreholes. This was more than the planned activities. No change order was presented for review during the verification exercise because the funds were realized from the incomplete 02 dry wells balances.

Henceforth the district executed more projects than the targets in AWP <100%.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 85% and FY 2022/2023 was 88% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage increase was <math>88\% - 85\% = 3\%</math></p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>Per the sector (MoWE) MIS data, the % of WSS facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Napak District was 57% for FY2022/23 and FY2021/22 was 98%. Hence, a decrease of -41% was recorded in in functionality of water user committees.</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>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 DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY as per the sampled facilities below;</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1). Drilling of deep borehole in Nakipomia village in Ngoleriet sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 94313 and completed on 26th June, 2023.</li> <li>2). Drilling of deep borehole in Nacuuka Community School in Lotome sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 94312 and completed on 14th June, 2023.</li> <li>3). Construction of a 40,000 litre storage tank in DHO village in Lokiteded Town Council completed on 30th March, 2023.</li> </ol>	
			<p>These projects were completed as per the plan,</p>	
			<p>Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and functional, boreholes were strategically located within the proximity of the communities with no deep pit latrine within the prescribed 30m radius, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs.</p>	
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports, however reporting template did not capture quarterly information on the functionality WSCs and WSS facilities at the sub counties.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Q-1 report dated 4th November 2022 the reported page 11,</p> <p>Q-2 reported dated 30th January did not have the information reported by the assessor.</p> <p>Q-3 was prepared on 10th April 2023 and submitted to the MoWE on 2nd November 2023</p> <p>Q-4 report was prepared on 4th August 2023 and delivered to the ministry on 19th October 2023.</p>	

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year; there were a total of 18 new water facilities including the ones from development partners. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 13th October, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form 4 which had summaries of the status of all the water facilities per sub-county.</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY 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>A copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment. The following LLGs were the lowest performing as per the assessment report; Kangole T/C with 0, Lokiteded T/C with 0, Matany T/C with 0, and Matany S/C also with 0, and the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 48%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the above-mentioned LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p>	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO had budgeted for the following Water and sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician, a total of Ugx 78,000,000/-, per the PBS Staff List FY 2023/2024.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>there was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer budgeted for the following;</p> <p>1) Natural Resources Officer starting salary UGX 2,700,000 per month</p> <p>2) Environment Officer was not budgeted and Forestry Officer were each budgeted for at Ugx 26,400,000</p>	2

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Omara Patrick Otim, DWO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by CAO Byaruhanga Jack</li> <li>2. Lokut David, Assistant Engineering Officer - Water was appraised on 30th June by DWO Omara Patrick Otim</li> </ol>	<b>3</b>
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 DWO had identified the capacity needs of the water office staff, this was seen in a report forwarded to the HR by the DWO, dated 30th June, 2023.</p>	<b>3</b>

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



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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

At the time of planning for FY2022/23, safe water coverage of the Napak district was estimated at 83% as of FY2022/23.

The Annual Work Plan for FY 2023/24 was received and approved by the MoWE on 26th July 2023, the following sub-counties had their safe water coverages below the district average.

- Iriiri S/C with 64 %, received 03BHs, 01 Production well (at Lomaratoit P/S and design of extension of piped water system
- Lorengecora S/C with 2BHs + piped water system and retentions moneys
- Apeiltolim S/C with 79% received 03 boreholes;
- Nabwal S/C 01 BH
- Ngoleriet S/C 01BH + retention funds
- Napak T/C 01 Borehole.

Therefore, the total budget allocation to sub-counties with low water coverage is = 283,000,000 + 35,000,000 + 18,000,000 + 63,987,417 = 399,987,417 /=-

However, the total budget for development was 617,680,505/= hence, 65% % allocation to Low performing LLGs has been prioritized.

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

In this file there was a letter dated 12th July 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Lorengecora, Iriiri, Apeitolim, Lokopo, Nabwal, Napak and Ngoleriet; a copy of the same letter was seen on the DWO notice board.

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

The DWO had also made a presentation during a technical staff meeting held on 28th August, 2023, and also during the District Advocacy held on 31st August, 2023 at the district water office board room.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports and a monitoring plan which was dated 26th August 2022, together with quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 22nd October, 2022, it was noted that 454 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 14th December, 2022, a total of 486 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 24th March, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 498.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 27th June, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 401.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was =  $454 + 486 + 498 + 401 = 1,839/4 = 460$ .

Napak DLG had a total of 564 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was  $460/564 * 100\% = 82\%$

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

A meeting held on 28th September, 2022 this was during the first quarter. The key issues discussed during this meeting were found in minute number Min.6.0/ DWSCC/Q1-2022-23 where the DWO emphasised on the field findings from the quarterly monitoring that was conducted and borehole maintenance and community hygiene and sanitation were the major field findings that were discussed and the members agreed on getting involved in finding a lasting solution.

During the second quarter the meeting was held on 15th December, 2022 and

the key issues discussed during the meeting were found in minute Min.4.0 /DWSCC/Q2-2022-23 among the key issues discussed was the sanitation activity implementation by one of the Development Partners i.e. WHH where the representative of the organization stated that they had visited 72 villages out of the 72 that were planned and for hand washing campaigns they had done it in 36 villages out of the 46 that were planned. In Lorengecora S/C.

For the third quarter the meeting was held on 5th April, 2023 and the major issues of discussion were found in minute Min.5.0/DWSCC/Q3-2022-23. One of the main issue of discussion was the WASH status of the District and the status of implementation of the projects by development partners, the DWO gave his presentation on the sanitation coverage by sub-county where he pointed out that the following sub-counties were still lagging behind as far as sanitation improvement was concerned; Lorengecora, Ngoleriet, and Lotomei.

Whereas in quarter 4 the meeting was held on 29th June, 2023, and key issues discussed under minute Min.7.0/DWSCC/Q4-2022-23. The specific issue discussed here was the project implementation status of WHH one of the development partners, they presented their achievements as follows; completed drilling of 13 boreholes in the various sub-counties and rehabilitated 37 boreholes in different sub-counties in the district. The DWO applauded WHH for their tremendous support.

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2

The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 83% as per the letter dated 12th July, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties Iriiri, Nabwal, Lokopo, Apeitolim, and Napak T/C whose safe water coverages were 64%, 65%, 79%, 78%, and 54% respectively. The letter detailed the projects allocated to these LLGs together with their budgeted amounts.

2

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Napak DLG water sector was UGX 82,514,463. The DWO allocated UGX 36,464,741 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was <math>36,464,741/82,514,463 \times 100\% = 44\%</math>.</p> <p>The DWO therefore followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	<b>3</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&amp;M. The DWO presented a training report dated 20th April, 2023. The training period spanned from 5th to 7th March, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&amp;M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills hygiene and sanitation among others.</p> <p>The trainers were Ms Aliau Paul ADWO in charge mobilization and Muya Benard the Health Assistant.</p>	<b>3</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were included in the register as they were detailed in form 1 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 13st October, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. In the form 1 there were 18 new boreholes this included the ones done by the development partners</p>	<b>4</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

The evidence showed the LG's DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted a desk appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget. It was established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage). The desk appraisals were conducted and discussed on 13th March 2023. The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 56 and Approved Budget pages, 47.

Projects appraised were;

1. Extension of Water to Lomarotoit Primary School.
2. Drilling of bore holes in Iriiri sub county.
3. Drilling of Production wells
4. Fencing of water Tanks and Solar System at Loken and Napak Seed Schools.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

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

1). Application from Akobokobot village in Apeitolim S/C, the application was dated 25th October, 2017, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 25st August, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LC I Mr. Elau John Moses and the following community members: Akareut Dinah Lucy, Acakara Margret, and Opolot Robert.

2). Application from Lobulepeded village in Iriiri S/C, the application was dated 20th August, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI Longora Paul with the following community members Moru Philip, Adiaka Sabina and Akol Anna. The application was cleared by the DWO for implementation in 2023/2024 financial year on 24th August, 2023.

3) Application from Nagule-Angolol village in Ngoleriet S/C, this application was dated 27th January, 2022, endorsed by the LCI Akulo Loru with the following community members: Aliat Alice, Nangiro Agnes and Naumo Paulina. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 25th August, 2023 by the District Water Officer.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

LG conducted field appraisals and checked for technical feasibility environmental social acceptability, and customized designs for WSS projects for FY 2023/2024. LG DWO, District Planner, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted field appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget and established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The LG District Water Officer conducted a field appraisals for water projects on 12th April 2023.

The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 56 and Approved Budget pages, 47.

Projects appraised were;

1. Extension of Water to Lomarotoit Primary School.
2. Drilling of bore holes in Iriiri sub county.
3. Drilling of Production wells
4. Fencing of water Tanks and Solar System at Loken and Napak Seed Schools.



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>Napak observed screening and costed ESMPs incorporated in the BoQs for previous FY were seen on file. Sampled projects were the four boreholes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E &amp; S CC screening for drilling of Borehole at Ngoleriet sub-county.</li> <li>2. E &amp; S CC screening for drilling of Borehole at Lotome sub-county.</li> <li>3. E &amp; S CC screening for drilling of Borehole at Lokicher, Lopeei sub-county.</li> <li>4. E &amp; S CC screening for drilling of Borehole at Nebwal sub-county.</li> </ol> <p>The above drilling for boreholes were all screened on the 7th March 2023. Forms were signed by DNRO and DCDO.</p> <p>Costed ESMP for the four boreholes above were incorporated into the BoQ. Total cost was UGX 6,852,500/=</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 water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan signed by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga, on 30th August,2022. The investments were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling of 2 production wells in AChukudu and Apeitolim trading Centres</li> <li>• Deep borehole drilling and installation of 4 boreholes at selected sites in Napak district</li> <li>• Repair of Mini solar piped system in Pilas and Lokali primary school.</li> </ul>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction this was done in their sitting on 16th November, 2022 in minute 22cc/22-23 (a,c,f,i). There was also a letter dated 4th January, 2023 signed by Magomu David Andrew for solicitor general clearing the contract for Ebowa Investments limited.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The District water Officer did not properly establish the project implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines as per letter dated 19th December, 2022, signed by the CAO, Jack Byaruhanga were, Otim Patrick Omara- DWO and Lokut David - ADWO, were named as Contract Manager. Other team members such as the project supervisor, Labour officer and Environment officer were not named.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer, for example, the storage tank construction at the DHO Cell in Lokiteded T/C was a 40,000 liter stainless steel tank mounted on steel hollow section columns with the following dimensions 64x40x5.8kg/m and they were six in number and they were braced with angle bars with dimensions of 50x50x4mm. The steel column bases were fix firm on a base plate 8mm thick which was securely anchored on a concrete column base 400x400mm dimensions as prescribed on the designs that were obtained from the DWO.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There were reports dated 11th May, 2023, 10th May, 2023 and 16th May, 2023 for the different projects seen during assessment as an indication that monthly technical supervision was carried in the previous FY.</p>	2

12

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

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

There was evidence that the DWO did verify works and payments were initiated and paid the contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts for example;

1. Voucher no.6425103 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 79,900,000 with certificate no. 1 dated 5th June 2023; contract no. 604/WRKS/2022-23/DINU/00020; Construction of Lolet water Supply by Ebowa Investments Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 19th June 2023, payment was initiated on 30th May 2023 and made on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.
2. Voucher no.6423675 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 31,771,314 with certificate no. 2 dated 25th May 2023; contract no.Napa 907/WRKS/2022-23/UGIFT/00015Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 4 Deep boreholes by East Africa Borehole Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 25th June 2023, payment was initiated on 15th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.
3. Voucher no.6439679 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 11, 36,650 with certificate no. 2 dated 25th May 2023; contract no.Napa 907/WRKS/2022-23/0003: Extension of Piped Water System from Longariama to Naregae by Ojoga and Sons Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 19th June 2023, payment was initiated on 19th June 2023 and paid on 28th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

12

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

The procurement files for water infrastructure investments reviewed were;

Project: 1

Sitting, drilling and installation of boreholes in selected sites

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/00012. The documents therein were;

- Signed works contract dated 16th December, 2022 with East Africa boreholes limited
- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 16th November, 2022 were the contract was award in Minute 22cc/22-23 (c)

- PP1, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records among the records on file.

Project: 2

Two production wells in Achukudu

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/22-23/UGFIT/00001, had these documents on the file;

- Signed works contract dated 16th December, 2022 with East Africa boreholes limited

- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 16th November, 2022 where the contract was award in Minute 22cc/22-23 (i)

- PP1 forms, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record

Project: 3

Construction of piped water system at Lokeru in Lorengechora parish

Procurement ref: NAPA907/wrks/2022-2023/DINU/00020, had these documents on file;

- Signed contract dated 6th January, 2023 with Ebowa Investments limited

- Evaluation report dated 10th November, 2022

- Contracts Committe minutes which sat on 16th November, 2022 and approved the contract in minute 22cc/22-23(f)

- Solicitor General letter dated 4th January, 2023 clearing the contract for Ebowa Investments limited.

## **Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>The DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee handled water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework for example, a complaint from the community of Nakipomia village, Ngoleriet sub-county that was recorded in a letter dated 23rd January, 2022 and addressed to the District Water Officer for a new borehole since one borehole that was serving a big number of households of 178 was not efficient in terms of service provision. This complaint was handled in a meeting held on 2nd June, 2022 at the Nakipomia village under Min 5.6/02/2022-Matters arising and Min 6.6/02/2022: Reactions</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p>	<p>There was evidence of a guideline on Strategy for Catchment Based Integrated Water Resources Management in Uganda (2020-2030) dated 2020 and also a guideline for Protection and Preservation of Lokere water catchment for Social Change in Karamoja, Uganda that were availed at the time assessment however, no formal document was presented on their dissemination.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY that were prepared and implemented for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Filled E&amp;S screening forms for the drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Lotome sub county prepared on 7th March, 2023</li> <li>2. Filled E&amp;S screening forms for the drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Nabwal sub county prepared on 7th March, 2023</li> </ol> <p>As well as the water plans that were prepared and implemented as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Lotome, ngoleriet, Nabwal and Lopeei sub counties prepared on 7th March, 2023</li> </ol> <p>And these were equally incorporated into the activity implementation annual work-plan of June 2022 to July 2023</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <p>1). Land agreement signed on 29th January, 2022 between Lokorio lokodalima and the community of Nakipomia village of Ngoleriet S/C. This agreement was signed by Ojao Gabriel the LCI and Angella Joshua together with Aurien Charles on behalf of the community.</p> <p>2). Land agreement signed on 29th August, 2021 between Eseru Peter and the community of Acukudu village of Apeitolim S/C, and was signed by Engemu J.M. the LCI and Oceda John William together with bAtekit Angela on behalf of the community.</p> <p>3). Land agreement signed on 22nd March, 2023 between Lotomei Eliya and the community of Nacuuka village of Lotomei S/C, it was also signed by Lorikot John the LCI and Achia Phoebe on behalf of the community.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;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 Environment and Social Compliance Certification(E &amp; S) were availed as seen below;</p> <p>1. Environment and Social Compliance Certification (E &amp; S) for the drilling and sighting of 4 bore holes in Naaika in Lotome sub county at Completion signed by District Natural Resource Officer on 27th June 2023 and the District Community Development Officer on the 26th June 2023</p> <p>2. Environment and Social Compliance Certification (E &amp; S) for the drilling and sighting of 4 bore holes in Nakipomia in Ngoleriet sub county at Completion signed by District Natural Resource Officer on 27th June 2023 and the District Community Development Officer on the 26th June 2023.</p>	2

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the CDO and Environment Officers carried out monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for example;

1. Quality assurance report for the construction of a piped water system at Lolet in Lorengecora sub county dated 10th May, 2023

2. Report on the site inspection of the extension of piped water to Naregae from Longariama dated 12th June, 2023

3. Quality assurance report on the construction and installation of production wells at Achukudu, Apeitolim sub county 11th May, 2023.

4. Quality assurance report on construction and installation of water tank reservoir at the district headquarters dated 8th February, 2023.

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG presented data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>A report by DAO dated 7th June 2023 provided a Summary of irrigated land for the past two financial years.</p> <p>MOUs were presented for the three (3) UgFIT Demo sites that were established covering a total of 4.55 acres in the FY 2022/2023. i.e</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Host farmer site in Lotome Sub-County (1.0 acres) signed on 23rd August 2022.</li> <li>2. Host farmer site in Ngoleriet Sub-County (1.05 acres) on signed on 23rd August 2022.</li> <li>3. Napak Seed Secondary School in Napak T/C (2.5 acres).</li> </ol>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Napak LG had twenty (20) acres of irrigated land in FY 2021/2022. That is to say.</p> <p>Micro trial irrigation at household level = 12</p> <p>Development partners= 8 acres</p> <p>LG had installed two seven and a half acres (4.55acres) Ugift Demo sites as the total irrigated land in the FY 2022/2023</p> <p>Increase in acreage.</p> <p>= <math>(24.55-20)/24.55 (100)</math></p> <p>= 18.5%</p>	2



2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 77% as per the OPAMS.</p>	4
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  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>There was evidence that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant had been used on eligible activities. That is to say; the annual budget performance report prepared by the SAE and dated 30th June 2023 indicated that Shs:137,585,000 was spent on complimentary services and Shs:55,540,224 was spent on capital development which were eligible activities.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that was provided and the CFO noted that the LG is still under the implementation stage micro scale irrigation.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates and the cost of agricultural inputs was calculated as follows.</p> <p>SAE costed figure = UGX 58,965,000</p> <p>Contractor's costed figure = UGX 55,540,224</p> <p>Variation = <math>(58,965,000 - 55,540,224) / 58,965,000 \times 100</math></p> <p style="text-align: right;">= -5.808150598%</p> <p>Hence the contract variation is within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates.</p>	1

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The completion of the Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation was between 80% and 99% since the sites were still and monitoring and testing.</p> <p>A signed supplier contract (Part 4 section 9 contract form), ref: Napa 907/SUPLS/22-23/00016 dated 17th May 2023, with Oba and Sons Enterprise LTD and Napak DLG.</p> <p>A system generated payment voucher totaling to Ugx 55,540,224 that was approved by the CAO on 29th June 2023 was presented.</p> <p>Goods received notes (GRN) were not available.</p> <p>Completion certificates were not available.</p> <p>UGIFT demonstration site posts were not installed on the two sites that were visited.</p>	<b>1</b>
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the approved staff structure, the LG required 60 extension workers. At the time of assessment the LG had appointed and deployed 14 extension workers.</p> <p>14/60 = 23%.</p>	<b>0</b>

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs met standards as defined by MAAIF. The two visited site acreages were in line with MAAF standards i.e. Host farmer site in Lotome Sub-County (1.0 acres) and the host farmer site in Ngoleriet Sub-County (1.05 acres).</p> <p>All the three irrigation systems were demonstrated. I.e. These installed systems were sprinkler, drip system, and drag hose technology.</p> <p><b>Low flow micro sprinkler technology.</b></p> <p>For each site, the system was installed on 1/2 an acre, storage tank of 5000L, tank stand structure made from Steel, head of 7M and 4.0M for Lotome and Ngoleriet sub county respectively, GI pipe of Dia, 40mm for supply and wash outlet. Each site had 12 sprinkler rise pipes, QRC service saddle, QRC end caps and the floating rain gun, 3 Drainage manholes, and a solar-powered borehole (4 solar panels of 500W).</p> <p><b>Drip irrigation demo.</b></p> <p>Main Delivery line Dia = 50mm HDPE pipe</p> <p>Drip lines Dia = 16mm black tubing</p> <p>Drip line Wall thickness = 1.0mm</p> <p>Emitter spacing = 30cm</p> <p><b>Drag hose</b> irrigation installed had a hose pipe of Dia = 0.75in, length of 50M, adjustable garden Nozzles and 2 hydrant assemblies.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Upon site visits on the 2 demos, it was found that all the 4 systems (drip, sprinkler, drag hose, and rain gun) were tested and found functioning, however, the sprinklers couldn't shoot to the design radius of 8-10 meters due to the low pressure on one of the sites.</p>	2

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was proof that the accuracy of information regarding the placement of extension workers was verified. Three LLGs were randomly selected and confirmed the placements of the following:</p> <p>Ohide Eva, serving as an Animal Husbandry Officer in Matany Subcounty.</p> <p>Awas Timothy, holding the position of Agricultural Officer (AO) in Lorengechola Sub-county.</p> <p>Ekwaru Emma, functioning as an Agricultural Officer (AO) in Iriiri Sub-county.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, all the information in the guideline sent by MAAIF for demos were accurately installed and functional. The site visitor's books were all in place and being used.</p>	2

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

There was evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services, and farmer EOI.

For example, the quarterly progress reports compiled by AO and endorsed by the CAO. I.e., Q1(30th September 2023), Q2 (30th December 2023), Q3 (31st March 2023), and Q4 (30th June 2023).

In Q4, environmental and social safeguard screening were conducted, and three demonstration sites were established, along with eight farm visits as part of the procurement process.

In Q3, there were 14 awareness-raising/field day meetings with a total attendance of 282 women, 115 men, and 23 youth.

In Q2, awareness-raising activities were carried out at the district level, targeting the District Executive Committee (DEC), Resident District Commissioner (RDC), and District Internal Security Officer (DISO). A total of 29 males and 11 females attended.

The Q1 report indicated that by the end of the quarter, one Senior Agricultural Engineer (SAE) and two Agricultural Officers (AO) had successfully completed all six training modules. Additionally, five AOs were in progress, having completed 20-60% of the modules.

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date LLG information entry into MIS.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>For instance, MIS report dated May 28, 2023, indicated that there were 195 candidates who expressed interest (EOI), out of which 88 were successful, and 107 candidates were unsuccessful. The MIS database revealed that the percentage of unsuccessful candidates was 54.87%, primarily attributed to the scarcity of water sources, rendering candidate's ineligible.</p>	
			<p>The LG presented evidence of the hard copies of the EOI application and the up-to-date MIS database on the EOI. This was found tallying at 195 candidates.</p>	
			<p>AO logged into his Irri Track application, and the assessor verified data on the farm visits as shown as an output in the MIS database.</p>	
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the preparation of quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>Q3 (31st March 2023) progressive report submitted by SAE and signed by the CAO was presented with graph data and statistics generated from the MIS dashboard. For example, Page 10 showed a bar graph on preparation of farm visit clustered per Sub- County, Page 8 showed a bar graph showed successful EOI by age group.</p>	
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had developed and approved performance Improvement. Napak is a phase II district.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had Implemented Performance Improvement Plans for lowest performing LLGs.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. From the wage estimates for the FY 2023/4 the budget was Ugx 654,931,000/=	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	The LG had deployed extension workers, as evidenced by the staff list and attendance reports. The deployed extension workers included the following:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obure Gideon, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Lorengecora Sub County</li> <li>2. Nangiro Abrahams, Agricultural Officer in Matany Sub County</li> <li>3. Ogeatum James, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Iriiri Sub County</li> <li>4. Kulume Mary Gorreti, District Veterinary Officer</li> <li>5. Angella Joseph, Senior Agriculture Officer</li> <li>6. Ochan Godfrey, Agriculture Officer</li> <li>7. Ohide Eva Caesar Alexander, Animal Husbandry Officer</li> <li>8. Achilla Catherine, Assistant Agriculture Officer</li> <li>9. Naligoi Emmy, Veterinary Officer</li> <li>10. Akiror Betty Ekou, Agriculture Officer in Iriiri Sub County</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7

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

Maximum score 6

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

There was evidence from the staff lists displayed at the LLGs and the daily attendance registers that extension workers were working in LLGs where they are deployed

1. Ogeutum James- Veterinary Officer and Ekwaru Emma- Agriculture Officer were deployed at Iriri Sub county
2. Nangiro Abrahams, Agricultural Officer were deployed at Matany Sub County
3. Ekwaru Emma- Agricultural Officer and Ohide Eva, Animal Husbandry Officer were deployed at Ngoleriet Sub county

2

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

There was evidence from the staff lists displayed at the LLGs and the daily attendance registers that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed

1. Ogeutum James- Veterinary Officer and Ekwaru Emma- Agriculture Officer were deployed at Iriri Sub county
2. Nangiro Abrahams, Agricultural Officer were deployed at Matany Sub County
3. Ekwaru Emma- Agricultural Officer and Ohide Eva, Animal Husbandry Officer were deployed at Ngoleriet Sub county

2



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 LG conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY as below:

1. Obure Gideon Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Lorengecora Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Lemukol Anthony
2. Nangiro Abrahams, Agricultural Officer- Matany Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Anyango Anna Grace
3. Ogeatum James Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Iriiri Sub County was appraised on 16th June 2023 by SAS Longole Ruth Iningo
4. Kulume Mary Gorreti District Veterinary Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by DPMO Lodungokol Simon Peter
5. Angella Joseph, Senior Agriculture Officer was appraised on 29th June 2023 by DPMO Lodungokol Simon Peter
6. Ochan Godfrey, Agriculture Officer was appraised on 29th June 2023 by DPMO Lodungokol Simon Peter
7. Ohide Eva Caesar Alexander, Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Kulume Mary Gorreti District Veterinary Officer
8. Achilla Catherine, Assistant Agriculture Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Muya Phillip
9. Naligoi Emmy, Veterinary Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS Anyango Anna Grace
10. Akiror Betty Ekou, Agriculture Officer- Iriiri Sub County was appraised on 13th June 2023 by SAS Longole Ruth Iningo

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator took corrective actions including; artificial insemination, disease surveillance, post graduate diploma in project planning and management, dry season feeding of animals and a masters in agricultural science.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The training report provided evidence of a session on Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture held on 20th April 2022. In attendance were several individuals, including Nangiro Abrahams, the District Agricultural Officer; Ochan Godfrey, an Agricultural Officer; Akoror Betty, another Agricultural Officer; Obore Gidion, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer; Okinyom John Peter, an Agricultural Officer; and Arita Moses, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer.</p> <p>Some extension workers completed the six modules of the MSI program as a requirement. these included; Nangiro Abrahams- District Agricultural Officer, Anuso -SAE, Betty- Agricultural Officer</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The trainings were documented and file for all the training activities for both the farmers and the extension staffs, there evidence was provided on quarterly reports, Q3, reported on 31st March 2023, Q4 reported on 30th June 2023 which shows information generated from MIS/ Irritrack systems and other reports like report dated 7th March 2023, 20th February 2023 all these reports provide evidence on database record of trainings documented and reflected.</p>	1

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

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>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</p>	<p>The LG had appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services</p> <p>The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 196,550,093 of which UGX 147,412,570 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 49,137,523 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
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>LG was in phase 2,100% micro-scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.7,370,628</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.19,655,009</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations were Uhs.14,741,257</p> <p>15% of farmer visits were Ushs 7,370,628</p> <p>According to Page 7 of Sector Grant guidelines.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
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>There was no evidence of cofunding planned as per the current budget</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG was still in the implementation stage one.</p>	<b>0</b>
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented that the Local Government (LG) had disseminated information on the use of farmer co-funding. For example:</p> <p>An awareness creation report (farmer EOI) for Lower Local Council leaders, sub-counties, and town councils expressing interest in the irrigation program, dated 11th April 2023.</p> <p>A monitoring and technical backstopping report dated 10th May 2023.</p> <p>An awareness-raising report for political leaders, Sub-Technical Planning Committee (STPC), General Internal Security Officers (GISOs), and town councils, dated 23rd May 2023.</p> <p>Another awareness-raising report for Lower Local Government (LLG) political leaders, Heads of Departments (HODs), parish chiefs, and district stakeholders, dated 11th April 2023.</p> <p>An activity report for the Ugift field day (Farm visit to the newly installed demonstrations by eligible farmers) dated 31st May 2023.</p>	<b>2</b>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DPO monitored the installation of the demo sites as this is evidence on the report produced on 19th June 2023 signed by the DPO. More evidence is provided in the summary report of quarter four on monitoring dated 19th June 2023.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Quarterly supervision and monitoring dated 8th July 2023 by SAE, was presented as evidence and also the quarter four report, reported on the training of the demonstration host farmers on the use and maintenance of the system.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The indicator was not applicable since the LG was still in its first year of implementation.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The demo site had been installed and the production department is using it to conduct farmers training and exposures as a farmer field schools. This was documented in report dated 16th August 2023 signed by the SAE.</p>	2

11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 There was evidence that the LG conducting activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines for example:  
Maximum score 4

An awareness creation report (farmer EOI) for Lower Local Council leaders, sub-counties, and town councils expressing interest in the irrigation program, dated 11th April 2023.

An activity report for the Ugift field day (Farm visit to the newly installed demonstrations by eligible farmers) dated 31st May 2023.

11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0 Evidence was presented about training of staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels, for example:  
Maximum score 4

An awareness-raising report for political leaders, Sub-Technical Planning Committee (STPC), General Internal Security Officers (GISOs), and town councils, dated 23rd May 2023.

Another awareness-raising report for Lower Local Government (LLG) political leaders, Heads of Departments (HODs), parish chiefs, and district stakeholders, dated 11th April 2023.

## Investment Management

12 Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0 There was no evidence that LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY under UGIFT demonstration.  
Maximum score 8

2

2

0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file and verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the district has carried out farm visits to farmers per the report dated 31st May 2023 by the SAO. However, no evidence of agreement to proceed for quotations.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a lack of evidence indicating that the SAE/Secretariat publicized the approved eligible farmers by posting the information on the District and LLG noticeboards. Nevertheless, a report listing eligible farmers by the SAE, dated June 30, 2023, was available on file.</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 micro-scale irrigation systems were not incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan dated 3rd August, 2023 signed by the CAO, Okumu Bedijo James.</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 LG did not request for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) but they did get quotations from a list of pre-qualified suppliers for the district, that was dated 30th September, 2022 and signed by the chairperson of the Contracts Committee.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	The LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria that required a contract to be signed with the lowest bidder, when the contract was awarded to OBA and Sons Enterprises limited who was the lowest bidder from the two companies that bided	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There were minutes for the Contracts Committee dated 8th May, 2023, where the evaluation and award of the contract was done in minute 23/05/cc/22-23(23)	1
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	There was evidence showing that LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the previous FY as shown below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 No. firms bid for the supply and installation of Microscale irrigation technologies to selected sites in Napak.</li> <li>• Two firms (Oba and Sons and Great Seekers (U) Ltd) were found responsive after preliminary evaluation and were recommended for financial comparison.</li> <li>• Oba and Sons had the lowest bid amounting to 55,540,224 and was awarded the contract. The evaluation report was approved on 25/4/2023.</li> <li>• The contract agreement was signed on 17/5/2023 (procurement Ref. No. NAPA 907/SUPL/2022-23/00016)</li> </ul>	2
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	Napak LG is a phase two local government hence they only installed the demo site which was designed and approved by MAAIF only sent to the district for implementation	2



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>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</p>	<p>There was evidence presented on the LG conducting regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers. E.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 Monitoring and technical backstopping dated 20th February 2023</li> <li>2. Q4 Supervision and monitoring report dated 30th June 2023</li> <li>3. Monitoring and supervisory report for newly irrigated sites by DPO dated 19th June 2023.</li> </ol> <p>During the assessment, the site books were confirmed to be present, however, they were new and the LG had been using the ordinary visitors' book.</p>	<b>2</b>
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>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during testing of the functionality of the installed equipment- was presented. These included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Monitoring and supervisory report for newly irrigated sites by DPO dated 19th June 2023</li> <li>☐ Supervision and monitoring report by SAE dated 30th June 2023.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
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>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during the handover of the equipment to the Approved Farmer.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the handover had not been done yet (less than 6 months after installation).</p>	<b>0</b>
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>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</p>	<p>No evidence was provided since the LG was still in stage one of implementation.</p>	<b>0</b>

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>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</p>	<p>The LG had a complete procurement file for the contract with all records as required by the PPDA law.</p> <p>The reviewed file was for Supply and installation of Micro irrigation Technologies in three sites.</p> <p>Procurement ref: NAPA907/supls/2022-2023/00016 had the following documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 17th May, 2023 with OBA and Sons limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 25th April, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 26th April, 2023 were the contract was awarded in minute52/cc/22/23 (a)</li> </ul>	2
----	---	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no proof displayed on the notice board indicating that the Local Government had prominently showcased information about the nature of grievances and the available avenues to address them in various public areas.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail records of grievances that were handled within the micro scale irrigation sector.</p>	0

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail records of grievances that were handled within the micro scale irrigation sector.</p>	<b>0</b>
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail records of grievances that were handled within the micro scale irrigation sector.</p>	<b>0</b>
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail records of grievances that were handled within the micro scale irrigation sector.</p>	<b>0</b>

**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	There was evidence of the micro-scale irrigation program improving farmers' livelihood guide for farmers dated April 2023 parts 1 and 2 plus a UgIFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program Improving farmers' livelihood Technical Guidelines version 3, April 2023.  Environment and Social Health Safety Management Plan 2022/2023 prepared by DNRO and verified by CDO dated 18th November 2023  A report on field Monitoring and technical backstopping prepared by SAE dated 20th February 2023 was also presented.  MOUs for the three UgFIT Demo sites were signed by the host farmers/institutions and Napak DLG on 23rd August 2022.	2
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 LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following projects in the micro-scale irrigation sector;  1. Micro scale irrigation for Lotome sub county prepared on 18th November, 2023  2. Micro scale irrigation for Napak seed school prepared on 18th November, 2022  3. Micro scale irrigation for Lokalumok-Ngolenet sub county prepared on 18th November, 2022  However, costed ESMPs were not prepared and implemented and neither incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Micro scale irrigation projects were not monitored for irrigation impacts since costed ESMPs were not prepared and implemented that are the guiding plan for the generation of the mitigation measures.	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	E&S certification forms were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the Environment Officer certified prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	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	E&S certification forms were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the CDO certified prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	0

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Achia Paul Richard as a Chief Finance Officer on 19th April 2023 under Minute no.9.2/NDSC/2023.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Akol Benard as a District Planner on 8th February 2023 under Minute no.29.7/NDSC/2022.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Engineer/Principal Engineer nor was there a seconded staff from MoPS.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Lokongo Paulina Peter as a District Natural Resources Officer on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no.46/NDSC/2021.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Lodungokol Simon Peter as a District Production Officer on 19th April 2023 under Minute no.9.1/NDSC/2023.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Agan Mary Apuun as a District Community Development Officer on 1st June April 2012 under Minute no.110/DSC/2012.	<b>3</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Choan Joe Joseph as a Principal Commercial Officer on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no.50/NDSC/2021.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Keem Quinto Moses as a Senior Procurement Officer on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no.48/NDSC/2021.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Sagal Callisto as a Procurement Officer on 19th April 2023 under Minute no.10,1/NDSC/2023.	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 had substantively appointed Muya Alex Opoyo as a Principal Human Resource Officer on 1st June 2012 under Minute no.75/DSC/2012.	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 had substantively appointed Ngiro James as a Senior Environment Officer on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.13/NDSC/2023.	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 LG had substantively appointed Akol Lokeris Stella as a Senior Land Management Officer on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 53/NDSC/2017.	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 had substantively appointed Logel Louis as a Senior Accountant on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 47/NDSC/2017.	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had substantively appointed Ongom Francis Xavier as a Principal Internal Auditor on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 48/NDSC/2017.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had substantively appointed Adei Simon Peter as a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) on 1st June 2012 under Minute no.84/DSC/2012.</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed the following Senior Assistant Secretaries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abura Jeremiah - Ngoleriet Sub County was appointed on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.7/NDSC/2023</li> <li>2. Longole Ruth Iningo - Iriiri Sub County was appointed on 27th May 2019 under Minute no. 140.2/NDSC/2019</li> <li>3. Kinei Joseph - Apeitolim Sub County was appointed on 21st June 2002 under Minute no. 17/DSC/2002</li> <li>4. Lochoro Miriam Longol-Lokopo Sub County was appointed on 27th May 2019 under Minute no. 140.3/NDSC/2019</li> <li>5. Muya Philip- Lopeei Sub County was appointed on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.8/NDSC/2023</li> <li>6. Anyango Anna Grace- Matany Sub County was appointed on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.6/NDSC/2023</li> <li>7. Lotuke Godfrey - Poron Sub County was appointed on 23rd May 2022 under Minute no. 64/11/NDSC/2021</li> <li>8. Amuri Emmanuel - Leregecora Sub County was appointed on 19th May 2020 under Minute no. 178.2/NDSC/2019</li> <li>9. Lomilo Charlres - Lotome Sub County was appointed on 4th January</li> </ol>	0



- 2018 under Minute no.  
49/NDSC/2017
10. Achuka Simon Peter N. - Nabwal Sub County was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 29.10/NDSC/2022
  11. Lemukol anthony- Lokiteded Town Council was appointed on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.4/NDSC/2023
  12. Lowanyang Lilly Maruk- Matany Town Council was appointed on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.4/NDSC/2023
  13. Teko John Bosco - Napak Town Council was appointed on 27th May 2019 under Minute no. 149/NDSC/2019

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed the following Community Development Officer / Senior CDOs;

1. Adyaka Paul- Napak Town Council was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 29.9/NDSC/2022
2. Otyang Ruth Apuun- Lokiteded Town Council was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 29.8/NDS/2022
3. Nadiye Scholastica- Kangole Town Council was appointed on 27th May 2019 under Minute no. 150/NDSC/2019
4. Achia Agatha- Matany Town Council was appointed on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 78/NDSC/2017
5. Atogo Peter- Mutany Sub Country was appointed on 27th May 2019 under Minute no. 162.4/NDSC/2019
6. Abura Lochap Jolly Grace- Lokopo Sub Country was appointed on 21st June 2019 under Minute no. 161.1/NDSC/2019
7. Logiel Agnes- Lotome Sub County was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 29.4/NDSC/2022
8. Kodet Piero Milo- Leregecora Sub County was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 29.3/NDSC/2022
9. Awilli Ritah- Iriiri Sub County was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no. 53/NDSC/2021
10. Aliau Paul- Nabwai Sub County was appointed on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 33.2/NDSC/2022
11. Ilukol James- Ngoleriet Sub County was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no. 53/NDSC/2021

2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed the following Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant;	0
	Maximum score is 15		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sagal Dinah Angella- Iriiri Subcounty was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under minute No.52/NDSC/2021</li> <li>2. Loli Raphael- Lokopo Subcounty was appointed on 7th April 2008 under minute No.04/NDSC/2008</li> <li>3. Kotol Regina- Matany Sub County was appointed on 7th October 2005 under minute No.50/NDSC/2005</li> <li>4. Loumo John Bosco- Napak Town Council was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under minute No.52/NDSC/2021</li> <li>5. Namoe Clementina - Kangole Town Council was appointed on 8th February 2023 under minute No. 34.6/NDSC/2022</li> <li>6. Lokolimoe Jennifer- Lotome Sub County was appointed on 27th May 2019 under minute No. 153.1/NDSC/2019</li> <li>7. Angolere Jimmy- Poron Sub County was appointed on 8th February 2023 under minute No. 34.4/NDSC/2022</li> <li>8. Kobwesigye Vastine- Matany Town Council was appointed on 10th January 2017 under minute No. 140/DSC/2012</li> <li>9. Among Beatrice- Lokitered Town Council was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under minute No.51/NDSC/2021</li> <li>10. Akol Stella Ngorok- Ngoleriet Sub County was appointed on 30th June 2010 under Minute no. 31/NDSC/2010</li> <li>11. Achieng Florence- Napak Town Council was on 4th January 2018 under minute No. 72.2/NDSC/2017</li> <li>12. Longoli Andrew- Apetolim Sub County was appointed on 22nd April 2021 under minute No.52/NDSC/2021</li> </ol>	

13. Achen Lydia- Lopei Sub County was appointed on 30th June 2021 under minute No.61/NDSC/2021

### 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.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 61% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;  The Budgeted amount was UGX 1,293,629,730  Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 799,521,423 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 15).  (UGX 799,521,423 /1,293,629,730)*100=61%.	0
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 94% for community based service as per the computation below;  The budgeted amount was UGX 197,686,050  Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 185,797,255 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 15).  (UGX 185,797,255 /UGX 197,686,050)*100=94%  The giving a variance of UGX 11,888,795. Therefore, released was; 94%.	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.  Maximum score is 12	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the completion of Service Pit at the District headquarters in spite of the fact that a DDEG total cost of UGX 126,562,000 had been allocated.	0

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and costed ESMPs were not carried out for the DDEG since screening to ascertain whether ESIA would be required had not been done.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 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.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	The LG did not prepare costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) since screening was not done.	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

**Financial management and reporting**

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	The LG obtained an Unqualified audit opinion from the OAG for the FY ended 30th June 2023.	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		
6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	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),	LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 07th December 2022. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.		

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 12nd July 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 25th July 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 24rd December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 2nd February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 21st April 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 30th July 2023</p> <p>From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Nakoya Joyce Philippine as District Education Officer on 1st June 2012 under Minute no. 93/DSC/2012.	<b>30</b>
<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 approved structure for LG provided for 2 Inspector of Schools.  1. The LG had substantively appointed Talamoi Florence as Senior Inspector of Schools on 13th May 2022 under Minute no. 12/NDSC/2022. 2. The LG had substantively appointed Lokapel Joseph Dehetts as Inspector of Schools on 8th February 2023 under Minute no. 34.20/NDSC/2022.	<b>40</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was done and the respective ESMPs costed and prepared for all Education projects for the previous FY as listed below;  1. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Apeitolim primary school prepared on 11th May, 2023  2. Rehabilitation of staff house at Nakicelet primary school prepared on 18th November, 2022  3. Construction of a staff house at Lllorlorio primary school prepared on 18th November, 2022  4. Renovation of 6 class rooms at Kodike primary school prepared on 18th November, 2022  5. Rehabilitation of staff house at Kautakou primary school prepared on 26th April, 2023  6. Construction of staff house at Loparipar primary school prepared on 18th November, 2022  7. Construction of staff house at Lokodiokalo primary school prepared on 18th November, 2022  8. Micro scale irrigation for Napak seed	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

school prepared on 18th November, 2022

Below are the prepared and costed ESMPs

1. Construction of a staff house at Lokokondo primary school with a total project cost of UGX 50,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at 7,600,000 prepared on 18th November, 2022
2. Construction of Iriiri seed secondary school with a total project cost at UGX 969,879,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 48,483,950 prepared on 18th November, 2023
3. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Apeitolim primary school with a total project cost at UGX 30,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 2,500,000 prepared on 18th November, 2023
4. Construction of staff house at Kokono primary school with a total project cost at UGX 68,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 3,400,000 prepared on 18th November, 2023
5. Rehabilitation of 6 classroom block at Kodike primary school with a total project cost at UGX 50,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 2,500,000 prepared on 18th November, 2023
6. Rehabilitation of staff house at Kautakou primary school with a total project cost at UGX 60,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 3,000,000 prepared on 26th April, 2023

2

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

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

The projects that were implemented in the education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.

15

The Maximum score is 30



**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Health Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The LG had substantively appointed Narus Regina as an Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing on 1st June 2012 under Minute no. 114/DSC/2012.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Teko Timothy as an Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no. 39/NDSC/2021.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Ngiro James as a Senior Environment Officer on 19th April 2023 under Minute no. 9.13/NDSC/2023.	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Health Educator nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The LG had substantively appointed Akol Anna Lydia as a Biostatistician on 4th January 2018 under Minute no. 50/NDSC/2017.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Cold Chain Technician nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## **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) | If the LG carried out:<br>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | Napak district LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for health projects as below;<br><br>1. E&S CC Screening for the construction of OPD at Lotome HCIII on the 26th April 2023 signed by DNRO and Labour officer for CDO.<br><br>2. Fencing of Naturumurum HCII Iriiri sub-county on the 11th May 2023 signed by DNRO and CDO.  | <b>15</b> |
|   | Maximum score is 30   |  |   |           |
| 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) | b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.   | The projects that were implemented in the health sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs. | <b>15</b> |
|   | Maximum score is 30   |  |   |           |

**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p>	<p>The LG had substantively appointed Anuso Gorreti as Senior Agriculture Engineer on 12th February 2021 under Minute no. 4.3/NDSC/2021.</p>	<b>70</b>
<i>score 70 or else 0.</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p>score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>All MSI projects underwent Environmental, social and Climate Change screening. Projects considered included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MSI for Lotome sub-county.</li> <li>2. MSI for Napak Seed School, Lorengecora 'B' PARISH, Lorikitae village.</li> <li>3. MSI for Lokalumok village Nagulean Golol parish, Ngoleriet sub-county.</li> </ol> <p>All the above MSI projects were screened on the 18th November 2022. Signed by DCDO and DNRO.</p> <p>This indicator also required, prepared costed ESMPs however, the district did not share any costed ESMP thus, no evidence at the time of verification.</p> <p>ESMPs are met to guide the project implementer on how to mitigate the minimal environmental impacts identified in the screening report.</p>	<b>0</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Omara Patrick Otim as Water Officer on 28th June 2000 under Minute no. 68/DSC/2000.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant Water Officer for mobilization nor was there a seconded staff from MOWE.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Lokut David as Assistant Engineering Officer Water on 13th May 2022 under Minute no. 14/NDSC/2022	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The LG had substantively appointed Lokongo Paulina Peter as a District Natural Resources Officer on 22nd April 2021 under Minute no.46/NDSC/2021.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed an Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOWE.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had neither substantively appointed a Forestry Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOWE.	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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 LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY as listed below;  1. Drilling and sitting of production well at Apeduni, Apeitolim sub county prepared on 11th November, 2023  2. Drilling and sitting of production well at Achukudu prepared on 11th May, 2023  3. Drilling and sitting of 4	<b>10</b>

boreholes at Ngoleriet sub county prepared on 7th march, 2023

4. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Lotome sub county prepared on 7th March, 2023

5. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Lollicher 7th March, 2023

6. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Nabwal sub county prepared on 7th MArch, 2023

7. Supply and installation of water tank at the district headquarters 26th April, 2023

Below are the costed ESMPs that were prepared

1. Drilling and sitting of production boreholes at Acukudu with a total project cost at UGX 87,782,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 4,389,600 prepared on 26th April, 2023

2. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Lotome, ngoleriet, Nabwal and Lopeei sub counties prepared on 7th March, 2023

3. Drilling and sitting of 4 boreholes at Nabwal with a total project cost at UGX. 119,750,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX 1,496,750 prepared on 22nd December, 2022

4. Installation of water tank with a total project cost at UGX. 35,000,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX. 1,750,000 prepared on 26th April, 2023

5. Sitting and drilling of a borehole at Kulukakin with a total project cost at UGX. 119,750,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed cost at UGX. 1,496,750 prepared on 7th March, 2023

6. Sitting and drilling of 4 boreholes at Nachuka with a total project cost at UGX. 119,750,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at UGX. 1,496,750 prepared on 7th

March, 2023

7. Sitting and drilling of 4 borehole at Nagulengekol with a total project cost at UGX. 119,750,000 and social and environmental mitigation measures costed at cost of UGX. 1,496,750 prepared on 7th March, 2023

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.

The projects that were implemented in the water sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.

10

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

There was no abstraction permit seen at time of assessment for the construction of 40,000ltr reservoir in Lokiteded TC which is a piped water system.

0