



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Otuke District

(Vote Code: 586)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	77%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	90%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	68%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	46%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	59%

**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 District implemented one project using DDEG funding and it was still ongoing as per reports.</p> <p>1. Partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII at Ushs 64,114,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 38. Approved Budget on page 9.</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 the Final results of LLGs presented to the assessment team by OPM, Otuke had Not applicable for the assessment of 2022 which implied that there was no assessment in 2023. The absence of results for 2022 meant that there was no base data to determine whether there was an increase in performance between 2022 and 2023 were the LG scored 78% hence the score of zero.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 was implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 and was still ongoing since it was being constructed in phases as per the reports and the budget.</p> <p>1. Partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII at Ushs 64,114,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 38. Approved Budget on page 9.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0.	The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 completed as per the phase that was budgeted for, Ugx 64,114,000 was all received and completed as per the reports.  1. Partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII at Ushs 64,114,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 38. Approved Budget on page 9.	2
3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	One project was implemented and sampled it was +6.64% which was within +/-20% of the acceptable variation.  The project was partial construction of the administration block phase VII.  Project:  Estimated cost: Ugx 341,124,840/=  Contract cost: Ugx 318,474,345/=  Variation: Ugx 22,650,495/=  %age variation ( 22,650,495/341,124,840) x 100% =6.64%	2

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. Adwaru Town Council, Orum Town Council and Otuke Town Council were sampled. For instance the following staff were found in Adwafri Town Council;  1. Odongo Richard - Town Clerk 2. Adyeny Moses- Senior CDO 3. Adoko Ambrose- Assistant Town Clerk 4. Oguli Peter- Ag. Town Treasurer 5. Acela Fred- Town Agent 6. Auma Proscovia- Town Agent 7. Awio Oscar- Town Agent 8. Abuka Geofferey Alex- Town Agent	2
---	--	--	---	---

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.  <b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b>	There was evidence of partial completion reports for DDEG projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 that was dated on 5th August 2023, a report well signed by the district Engineer on 5th August 2023 and the CAO on 5th August 2023.	2
5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;  If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs  score 4 or else 0  <b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b>	The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;  DLG IVA  Adware T/C 88 57 Orum S/C 75 47 Adwari S/C 72 93 Olilim S/C 79 95  The performance of the LLGs was outside the credibility performance range of +/- 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible.	0
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	It was noted by the District Planner that in the previous FY they didn't conduct performance assessment for LLG and no PIP was developed.	0
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	It was noted by the District Planner that in the previous FY the LG didn't conduct performance assessment for LLG and therefor no PIP was developed.	0

## 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 LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 9th of the current FY 2023/24.	2
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	From the attendance reports, there was evidence that the District had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI). For instance in the month of June 2023 the worst performers were Chagara Tom-Senior Accounts Assistant and Ojok Timothy- Driver in the Works department with 28% attendance. The best performer was Etil Tom- District Planner and Ochen Jackson- Principal Human Resource Officer with 100%.	2
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:  HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous  FY: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had 9 HODs and only two appraisals for HODs were presented as below;  1. Kamala Francis- CFO was appraised on 30th August 2023 by Akileng Simon Peter, CAO 2. Ocen Silvester- DCDO was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Akileng Simon Peter, CAO	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. For instance on 11th April 2023 the committee sanctioned Omara Samuel, road overseer; Ayikobua Isaac, Law enforcement officer, Ego Godfrey, Education assistant II; and Aner Sam, Education Assistant II for abscondment. Aner Sam was forwarded to the District Service Commission for termination while Omara Simon and Ayikobua Isaac did not appear before the committee as summoned.	1
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	The HR department did not provide evidence to show that the LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional.	0

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

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

Score 1.

The LG recruited 5 Deputy Head Teachers, 1 District Commercial Officer, 1 senior Agriculture Engineer, 4 Senior Assitant Accountant, 56 Education Assistant II, 1 Inspector of Schools, 1 Senior Health Educator, 1 Veterinary Officer, 1 Procurement Officer and 11 Office Attendants in the previous FY on 12th June 2023 and the ones sampled below accessed payroll in the month of July 2023.

Deputy Head Teachers,

1. Oleke Joel
2. Adenga Jasper zadok
3. Ogwang David

District Commercial Officer:

1. Okello Emmanuel

Senior Agriculture Engineer

1. Okoch Dennis

Senior Assistant Accountant

1. Ojom Bosco
2. Apio Stella
3. Ongom Walter

Education Assistant II

1. Apio Nancy
2. Omara Daniel Ogwang
3. Nyaga Mercy

Office Attendants

1. Amuge Evaline
2. Onyang Samuel
3. Atieno Everline

Only three out of 56 Education Assistants accessed the payroll within two months from recruitment hence a score of zero.

Pension Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

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

Score 1.

There was evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY had accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

1. Odongo Quinto, DEO retired on 12th January 2023, accessed the payroll in March 2023
2. Ojok Ferdinand, Senior Education Assistant, retired on 3rd December 2022, accessed the payroll in February 2023
3. Apili Sarah, Senior Education Assistant, retired on 7th July 2022, accessed the payroll in September 2022
4. Aporo George, Deputy Head Teacher, retired on 6th September 2022, accessed the payroll in November 2022
5. Okot Felix, Education Assistant II, retired on 10th December 2022, accessed the payroll in February 2023
6. Joyce Ejom Obong, Assitant Education Officer, retired on 16th July 2022, accessed the payroll in September 2022
7. Obong Ben Kenneth, Head Teacher, retired on 11th October 2022, accessed the payroll in February 2023. This was more than two months.
8. Obua Wilfred, Education Assitant II, retired on 15th December 2022, accessed the payroll in February 2023
9. Akwiri Lilly, Nursing Assistant, retired on 9th October 2022, accessed the payroll in January 2023
10. Obong Felix, Education Assistant II, retired on 30th July 2022, accessed the payroll in September 2022

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

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<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>Olilim S/C received Ushs 21,209,102</p> <p>Orum S/C received Ushs 18,989,545</p> <p>Ogwette S/C received Ushs 26,705,148</p> <p>Ogor S/C received Ushs 25,436,830</p> <p>Alango S/C received Ushs 22,477,420</p> <p>Adwari S/C received Ushs 10,111,316</p> <p>Okwang S/C received Ushs 8,314,532</p> <p>Barjobi S/C received Ushs 4,298,190</p> <p>Barjobi T/C received Ushs 752,602</p> <p>Otuke T/C received Ushs 15,870,086</p> <p>Olilim T/C received Ushs 752,602</p> <p>Adwari T/C received Ushs 752,602</p> <p>Okwongo T/C received Ushs 752,602</p> <p>Okwang T/c received Ushs 752,602</p> <p>The direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY were as follows:</p> <p>In quarter 1: LG did not receive DDEG</p> <p>In quarter 2: Release was on 07th November, 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 3: Release was on 23rd January, 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4: LG didn't receive DDEG.</p>
----	---	---	---

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG did not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: LG 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 02nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 which was 10 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4: LG did not receive DDEG.</p>
----	---	--	--



10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done however it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 1 LG did not receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 7th 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 23rd January, 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4, LG did not receive DDEG funds.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Q 1 - The monitoring report indicated that the activity was conducted on the 5th and 6th of October 2022.</p> <p>Q 2- A monitoring report indicated that the activity was conducted on the 11th and 12th January 2023 by the technical staff to specifically find out the implementation level of aquaculture activities in Otuke District.</p> <p>Q 3 -A monitoring report indicated that the activity was conducted on 15th and 16th March 2023 and the major activity done was to monitor projects that were being implemented in the previous FY.</p> <p>Q 4 Supervision report indicated that the activity was conducted from 7th June 2023 and 8th June 2023 on the progress o the planned investments in the different sub counties.</p>	2

11	Routine oversight and monitoring  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	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:  Score 2 or else score 0	The LG availed TPC minutes which showed that supervision and monitoring 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 Akileng Simon Peter.  The minutes were as follows;  1. Quarter one report was discussed on 25th October 2022 - TPC- MIN.04/3/2022 Presentation of Q1 Monitoring report FY 2022/23.  2. Quarter two report was discussed on 23rd February 2023- MIN.07 Presentation of Q2 Monitoring report.  3. Quarter three report was discussed on 21st March, 2023- TPC- MIN.08/03/2023: Presentation of Q3 Monitoring report.  4. Quarter four report was discussed on 14th June 2023- TPC- MIN.07/06/2023: Presentation of monitoring report for quarter four.
----	--	--	--

### Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	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:  Score 2 or else score 0  <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>	The IFMS soft copy of the assets register presented at the time of assessment was incomplete and the CFO explained that it was being updated.  1. The register had information on schools, health facilities, Sub Counties missing among others.	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had in place a board of survey report for the FY 2021-2022, produced and dully signed on 12th October 2022. The report carried recommendations to management which included disposal of assets which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing the recommendations from the previous Board of Survey report.</li> <li>• Motor cycles among which were No.LG0173-26, LG 0167-27, UG47223M and UG4465M</li> <li>• Motor vehicles which included among others UAG344T, UG02182 and LG0171-26.</li> <li>• Laptop computers, printers and 1 desktop computer.</li> </ul> <p>The DLG advertised for the disposal of the obsolete assets in the Daily Monitor of 26th July 2022 and disposed the advertised assets.</p> <p>Some of the receipts for the disposed assets were receipt No.4966 for disposal of motor cycle NoLG0009-096 at UGX 650,000 and receipt No.4967 for disposal of motor cycle No. LG00030-96 at UGX 600,000.</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/202/2 dated 1st July, 2020.</p> <p>The committee held only one meeting and that was in quarter four.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 Minute were not on file.</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 minute were not on file.</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 minute were not on file.</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 minute dated 27th April 2023.</li> </ol> <p>All minutes were not submitted to the ministry.</p>	<b>0</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>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. For the DDEG project was desk appraised on 16th March 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP, and availability of funds in the Approved budget.</p> <p>- Partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII (roofing of the main Administration block) at Ushs 64,114,000, and the project was recommended for field appraisal.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects The project field appraisal was conducted on 15th September 2022 for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <p>1. Partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII (roofing of the main Administration Block), and the project was recommended for funding and implementation.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed in a meeting that was held on 3rd September 2023 under TPC Min 06/DTPC/2023 Presentation of Project Profiles/ Master list FY 2023/2024.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening where required for projects for the current FY and neither were checklists used, in spite of the fact that they were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were some of the projects that should have been screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pipe water connection to theater at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 130,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>2. Construction of a theater at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 500,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>3. Construction of General ward at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 300,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure project for the current FY, planned to be implemented using the DDEG was incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan, signed on 5th July, 2023 by the D/CAO, Ingoi James. The planned infrastructure was renovation of a staff house at Okwong HCIII at Ugx 87M, was item no 39 on page 4 in the plan.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure project to be implemented in the current FY, using DDEG was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done when the Contracts Committee sat on 25th October, 2023 where the evaluation report was approved and contract award for the renovation of the staff house at Okwang HCIII, was done in minute CC05/05/10/2023.</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 evidence that the LG did not properly establish the project implementation team (PIT) as per guidelines, in a letter dated 5th January, 2023 by the CAO which named the following persons on the team;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otim Alex- Contract manager</li> <li>• Alany Jimmy Max- Project manager</li> <li>• Onyanga Patrick-Senior environment officer</li> <li>• Ocen Sylvester -District community development officer</li> <li>• Adeny Moses- Labour officer</li> </ul> <p>However, the clerk of works was left out from the team.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the infrastructure project implemented using DDEG, followed the standard technical design provided by the LG Engineer, as was observed at the district administration block, where the roof was made of steel trusses of 50 x 50 x 5mm, with Z-purlins of 100 x 50 x 5mm, with IT-4 iron sheets fixed using tap screws.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was a report dated 23rd May, 2023 by the DE to show that the relevant technical officers carried out supervision for the administration block project before payments.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	There was a payment request raised by Bygon Enterprises, of Ugx 318,474,345/= the contractor on 22nd May, 2023, it was certified on 23rd May, 2023 by the DE and paid on 15th June, 2023, Ugx 195,997,747/=, under voucher no. 5876776, which was within the time frame of less than two months.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had a complete procurement file in place for the contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The file reviewed was;  Project: Partial construction of administration block phase VII  Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00001, it had these documents  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 6th March, 2023 with Bygon Enterprises Limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 6th December, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022</li> <li>• Solicitor General letter dated 1st march, 2023 signed by Mathias Mickey Mwanje</li> <li>• PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipts of bids, supervision reports, payment records among documents therein.</li> </ul>	1

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District i) designated Mr. Otim Alex the Principal Assistant Secretary with an appointment letter issued on 1st July, 2022 to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprised of Dr. Oremo Robert Ojede the District Health Officer, Mr. Ogwang William the Chairperson School Management Committee (SMC), Acan Pii primary school, Mr. Adyeny Moses the Ag. Senior Labour Officer, Mr. Ochera Patrick the Education Officer, Guidance and Counselling, Mr. Obua Charles the chairperson Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC), Orum HCIV, and Mrs. Akello Florence Otono the Chairperson Parents teachers' Association (PTA), Nick Vandervoghr primary school.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG specified a system for handling grievances, which included a centralized complaints log and a Grievances Redress Committee (GRC). Complaints from the workers at Okum seed secondary school for unpaid wages and another that arose from the micro-scale irrigation project that the community complained about for having been relocated away from the originally planned site to the Town Council were handled in Grievances Redress committee (GRC) meeting held at the District council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records availed at the time of assessment on publicized grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the DDP III and AWP &amp; budget showed that Climate change and the environment are integrated in DDP III on page 88-89, AWP on page 13 and the approved budget on page 94 which included wetland management, tree planting, training farmers in smart agriculture, etc.</p> <p>Community and mindset change, reducing negative cultural practices and attitudes as an intervention on Social issues is also found on page 109 of LG DDP III, AWP on page 14, and Approved Budget on page 98.</p>	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 that was held on 21st March 2023 under MIN no. 06/03/2023; Presentation of IPFS and DDEG Guidelines for FY 2023/24 by the District Planner.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There were no DDEG projects budgeted for in the previous FY and therefore no costed ESMPs were prepared because the project had already been approved in the previous FY but one and the process of screening and ESMP preparation were already done and captured in the previous FY LG assessments. The phased DDEG project that had been carried out in the previous but one FY was still being implemented in the previous FY was the partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII at Ushs 64,114,000.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change that were budgeted for in the previous FY.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There were no DDEG projects budgeted for in the previous FY and therefore no relevance for proof of land ownership since the project had already been approved in the previous FY but one and the assessment for land ownership was captured in the FY 2021 LG assessments.	1



15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the projects below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring reports for the construction of a twin house, kitchen and 2 stance latrine at Acan Pii and Okee primary schools dated 23th March, and 202326th June, 2023</li> <li>2. Monitoring reports dated 22nd May, 2023 and 28th June, 2023 for the Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school, Abilyero, Abua, Ajuka, Acungapenyi, Adyerakunya, Amukugungu villages.</li> <li>3. Monitoring report dated 13th June, 2023 and 28th June, 2023for the Omoro road low cost seal construction.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that E&amp;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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors 'invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Certificate No. 2022/23/001 issued on 24th May, 2023 for the construction of a twin staff house, 2-stance latrine and kitchen at Okee primary school was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> <li>2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 15th June, 2023 for the construction of a low cost seal Omoro 0.8 km road was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> <li>3. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 23rd May, 2023 for the partial construction of the Administrative Block Phase VII was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>

**Financial management**

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to-date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to Assessment Team as detailed below;</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A/c name: OTUKE DLG GENERAL FUND</p> <p>A/c No: 01983501002791</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th November 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 4,971,418</p> <p>A/c name: OTUKE DLG UWEP</p> <p>A/c No: 04215730012</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th November 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 18,617,888</p> <p>A/c name: OTUKE DLG YLP</p> <p>A/c No: 04555560025</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th November 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 5,371,649</p> <p>A/c name: OTUKE DLG REVENUE COLLECTION</p> <p>A/c No: 009840168000001</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th November 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 0</p>	
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 10th November, 2022.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 24th November, 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 22nd May, 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 14th August, 2023.</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows:</p> <p>Quarter one report was received on 17th November, 2022.</p> <p>Quarter two report was received on 28th February, 2023.</p> <p>Quarter three report was received on 24th May, 2023.</p> <p>Quarter Four report was received on 22th August, 2023.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The reports were submitted to LG PAC as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quarter 1 on 17th November 2022</li> <li>- Quarter 2 on 28th February 2023</li> <li>- Quarter 3 on 24th May 2023</li> <li>- Quarter 4 on 22nd August 2023</li> </ul> <p>Quarter one report was reviewed by PAC in a meeting that was held on 26th April 2023 at the District Council Hall under minute no 4/26/04/2023: Handling of Internal Audit Queries for Quarter one FY 2022/2023</p> <p>Quarter two report was reviewed by PAC in a meeting that was held on 27th April 2023 at the District Council Hall under minute no 3(b)/27/04/2023: Handling of Internal Audit Queries for Quarter two FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Quarter Three report was reviewed by PAC in a meeting that was held on 25th July 2023 at the District Council Hall under minute no 5/25/07/2023: Handling of Internal Audit Queries for Quarter three FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Quarter Four report was reviewed by PAC in a meeting that was held on 29th August, 2023 at the District Council Hall under minute no 3(b)/29/08/2023: Handling of Internal Audit Queries for Quarter four FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 273,710,400 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 36) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 166,546,383 which gave a variance of Ushs (107,164,017) this indicate that District local Government collected less revenue compared to what they had budgeted for.</p> $(107,164,017/273,710,400) \times 100\% = 39\%$ <p>The LG managed to correct 61% of its budgeted revenue in the Previous FY.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 36 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 148,484,902</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 166,546,383</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 166,546,382- Ushs 148,484,902= Ushs 18,061,481</p> $= 18,061,481/148,484,902) \times 100= 12\%$ <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 increased by 12% compared to the last year collection.</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 29,084,625 (65%) was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <p>Ogwette S/C received Ushs 5,985,395</p> <p>Ogor S/C received Ushs 9,392,170</p> <p>Alango S/C received Ushs 5,045,750</p> <p>Adwari S/C received Ushs 5,773,040</p> <p>Okwang received Ushs 780,520</p> <p>Orum received Ushs 455,000</p> <p>Olilim S/C received Ushs 152,750</p> <p>Barjobi received Ushs 1,500,000</p>	2

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: OTUK915/WRKS/2022-2023/00004</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: Construction of Twin staff house at Okee Primary school</p> <p>Method of Procurement: Open domestic bidding</p> <p>Best Evaluated Bidder: M/s Lordline General Enterprises Limited</p> <p>Price: Ugx 14,986,236/= VAT Inclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 8th December, 2022</p> <p>Date of removal: 21st December, 2023</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A copy of LG performance assessment results dated 20th September 2023, acknowledged by the district Planner and well publicized on the district notice board.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted baraza from 3rd to 6th January 2023 with the public on back to school campaign in Ogwette and Olilim sub counties.</p> <p>Some of the key objectives of the campaign were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To mobilize all stakeholders with emphasis for parent to kae their children to school and help to retain them in schools.</li> <li>- Adopt performance improvement plan for better primary leaving examinations results.</li> <li>- To generate feedback from citizens on the challenges of service delivery in all responses and review plans to respond to the emerging service delivery demands.</li> </ul> <p>Over 400 participants were engaged in the campaign exercise and the atmosphere was made conducive to everyone to express his or her own opinion</p>	1

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district showed evidence of tax rates and appeal procedures was publicized.</p> <p>A copy of tax rates and appeal procedures that was on notice board was presented at the time of assessment. The taxes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local hotel tax</li> <li>• Trading licenses.</li> <li>• Daily market dues</li> <li>• Land fees</li> </ul> <p>The account for revenue collection at DFCU bank, Account No.01983501002791.</p> <p>The LG also directed that all complaints /appeals to be addressed to CAO or SAS for respective Sub Counties, indicating clear grounds for the appeal within 30 days,</p>	<b>1</b>
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was noted by the Clerk to the Council that no IGG issue was reported in the previous FY.</p>	<b>1</b>

**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 1730</p> <p>Total absentees were 43</p> <p>Total that sat were (1730 - 43) = 1687</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&amp;3) = 25 +568 + 429 =1,022</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>(\frac{1022}{1687}) \times 100 = 60.58\%</math></p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was 1987</p> <p>Total absentees were =59</p> <p>Total that sat were (1987 - 59) = 1928</p> <p>Total grades (1,2&amp; 3)= 47 +664 + 392 = 1103</p> <p>% pass rate= <math>(\frac{1103}{1928}) \times 100 = 57.2\%</math></p> <p>% Change = <math>57.2 - 60.58 = - 3.38\%</math></p>	<b>0</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>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</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 = 563</p> <p>Total absentees were =04</p> <p>Total that sat were = 559</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&amp;3) = 35 +163+193 = 391</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>391 \times 100 = 69.94\%</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;">559</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was = 496</p> <p>Total absentees were =04</p> <p>Total that sat were (496 - 04) = 492</p> <p>Total grades (1,2&amp; 3)= 28+126+157 = 311</p> <p>% pass rate= <math>311 \times 100 = 63.2\%</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;">492</p> <p>% change = <math>63.2 - 69.94 = - 6.74\%</math></p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>From the Final results of LLGs presented to the assessment team by OPM, Otuke had Not applicable for the assessment of 2022 which implied that there was no assessment in 2023 for the Education sector. The absence of results for 2022 meant that there was no base data to determine whether there was an increase in performance between 2022 and 2023 were the LG scored 81% hence the score of zero</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---



3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>DLG did receive a Sector Development Grant of Ushs 1,214,954,000 for FY 2022/2023. was used towards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Construction of twin staff house at Achan Pii Primary School at Ugx 145,000,000.</li> <li>2. - Construction of a twin staff house at Ogwette Primary School at Ugx 145,000,000.</li> <li>3. Construction of Okumu seed secondary school at Ugx 905,710,000.</li> </ol>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Voucher no 6429343 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 28,375,686; Certificate No 2, dated 13th June 2023; Contract No.2 OTUK 915/WRKS/22-23/00003, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Acanpii Primary School was certified by DEO on 14th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 14th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 14th June 2023, payment was initiated on 8th June 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within the time frame.</li> <li>2. - Voucher no 4281546 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 44,010,701; Certificate No 2, dated 13th June 2023; Contract No.2 OTUK 915/WRKS/22-23/00004, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Okee Primary School was certified by DEO on 12nd April 2023, District Environment Officer on 12nd April 2023, district Engineer on 12nd April 2023 and DCDO on 12nd April 2023, payment was initiated on 11st April 2023 and payments were made on the same day which was within the time frame.</li> </ol>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three projects were sampled two were +1.84% within +/-20% of the allowable variation while the other was -191.37% and did not comply.

The projects were,

The project 1: Construction of Okum Seed Secondary School.

Procurement ref:  
MoES/UGFIT/wrks/2021-2022/00003

Project 2: Construction of twin staff house at Okee primary school

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00004

Project 3: Construction of twin staff house at Acan Pii Primary school

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00003

Project: 1

Estimated Cost: Ugx 900,094,788/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 2,622,668,984/=

Variation Ugx -1,722,574,196/=

%age variation (-  
 $1,722,574,196/900,094,788) \times 100\% = -191.37\%$

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 145,000,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 143,869,328/=

Variation Ugx 1,130,672/=

%age variation  
 $(1,130,672/145,000,000) \times 100\% = 0.78\%$

Project 3:

Estimated cost: Ugx 145,000,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 142,335,639/=

Variation: Ugx 2,664,361/=

%age variation  
 $(2,664,361/145,000,000) \times 100\% = 1.84\%$

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There was evidence that education project, Okum Seed Secondary School, was not completed as per the work plan in the previous FY, this was as noted in the minutes of a site meeting held on 10th March, 2023 by the CAO, who commented that "the work had started extremely sluggishly and wondered why the contractor could not take up the construction seriously". However, the percentage of the work done at the time was not indicated in the quarter 4 nor in any supervision report seen during the assessment.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<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>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The LG staff structure provided for 679 primary school teachers, 633 were filled at the time of assessment = 93%.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG Consolidated Assets register for Otuke DLG 2023/2024 dated 12th July, 2023 captured assets for the 45 registered primary schools and 5 USE schools consisting of the following ; 1,156 classrooms, 1,132 latrine stances , 17,742 desks, 981 teachers houses and 74 laboratories' prepared by the DIS Mr. Akwar Markdonald	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>	This implies that all schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format .	
			50 X 100	
			50	
			= 100%	

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The teacher's deployment list from the District Education Officer's (DEO) office, dated 18th July 2023, was found to be consistent with the information gathered during on-site assessments at selected schools. For instance:

1. At Olilim Primary School, identified as semi-urban, the list displayed 15 teachers, with Mr. Ongora Cypriano serving as the head teacher. This information, posted inside the head teacher's office, was subsequently verified on the ground.

2. Anep Moroto Primary School, classified as a rural school, presented a list indicating 18 teachers, with Mr. Moses Ayina as the head teacher. This data harmonized accurately with the DEO's list.

3. Adwari Primary School, designated as an urban institution, featured a list of 18 teachers, with Mr. Ochoo Moses serving as the head teacher. The details on this list also aligned perfectly with those provided by the DEO.

This harmonization across the sampled schools implies that the accuracy of teacher deployment, as observed in these three instances, achieved a perfect score of 100%, denoted by the equation:

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

In other words, the deployment of teachers in these schools precisely matched the information contained in the DEO's list, indicating a high level of accuracy in the deployment process.

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>The DLG had maintained school asset registers that offered a comprehensive overview of the infrastructure in both UPE and USE schools. Evidence supporting this was derived from the detailed accounts obtained from three sampled schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adwari Primary School, identified as an urban institution, reported having 13 classrooms, 150 desks, 10 latrine stances, and 8 teacher's houses.</li> <li>2. Olilim Primary School, characterized as semi-urban, recorded 12 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 108 desks, and 4 teacher's houses, which accommodate 8 teachers.</li> <li>3. Anep Moroto Primary School, classified as rural, reported the following assets: 10 classrooms, 246 desks, 29 latrine stances, and 9 teacher's houses, accommodating 18 teachers.</li> </ol> <p>The verification process ensured that all the assets, infrastructures, and equipment reported were accurate and aligned with the information present in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register. This reflects the DLG's commitment to maintaining accurate and up-to-date records of the educational infrastructure within its jurisdiction.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) highlights of school performance,</li> <li>ii) a reconciled cash flow statement,</li> <li>iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and</li> <li>iv) an asset register:</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence in the sampled schools such as ;Adwari, Olilim, and Anep Moroto indicating that the head teachers in these schools complied with the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p>	0

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

The evidence presented supports the assertion that LG (Local Government) played a significant role in supporting schools in the preparation and implementation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs). During visits to several schools, reports highlighted the successful implementation of SIPs, many of which originated from recommendations made during inspections.

Among the sampled and visited schools—Adwari P/S, Olilim P/S, and Anep Moroto Primary School—it was observed that the respective headteachers possessed SIPs, and tangible progress in implementation was evident.

For Adwari Primary School, the feedback report indicated progress from the SIP dated November 30th, 2022. The implemented actions included construction of two teachers' houses, building a kitchen, provision of meals for teachers during school hours, regular involvement of the education department in school meetings, and renovation of a classroom block.

Similarly, Olilim Primary School received support from the LG education office, as documented in a report dated May 15th, 2023. The support covered various SIP areas, including the repair of furniture such as 20 desks, providing supportive supervision to teachers, and offering meals for teachers.

Anep Moroto Primary School also had SIPs in place, and their successful implementation involved conducting back-to-school campaigns within the community through mass campaigns facilitated by school governing bodies and leaders. Furthermore, school committees and departments were fully functional, contributing to successful fundraising for the construction of a school library.

In summary, the evidence gathered from these schools demonstrates a 100% success rate in the correct implementation of SIPs, showcasing the positive impact of LG support on school development

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Local Government (LG) failed to provide any evidence of compiled EMIS (Education Management Information System) return forms for all 45 Universal Primary Education (UPE) and 5 Universal Secondary Education (USE) registered schools from the previous fiscal year during the assessment.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

**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>Otuke 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 4,296,496,000/=.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District Local Government (DLG) deployed 633 primary school teachers for the 45 Universal Primary Education (UPE) schools, in accordance with the guidelines set by the education sector. At the time of assessment, staff lists revealed the following details for selected schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adwari Primary School, categorized as urban, had 18 teachers overseeing an enrollment of 1329 pupils.</li> <li>• Olilim Primary School, classified as semi-urban, had 15 teachers managing an enrollment of 1168 pupils.</li> <li>• Anep Moroto Primary School, identified as rural, had 18 teachers supervising a pupil enrollment of 1646.</li> </ul> <p>These figures demonstrate alignment with the education sector guidelines regarding the deployment of teachers based on school categorization.</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>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>	<p>There was evidence seen at the LG notice board of teacher's publicised information on their deployment dated 10th October, 2023.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>		
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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p>	<p>The all primary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO as below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oboth James, Head Teacher at Aleri PS was appraised on 12th December 2022 by Konga Annet, SAS</li> <li>2. Acar Patrick Waddimba, Head Teacher at Alengi PS was appraised on 14th December 2022 by Owach Moses, SAS</li> <li>3. Emor Moses, Head Teacher at Oluro PS was appraised on 18th December 2022 by Ocen Duke Adupa, SAS</li> <li>4. Ogwal Jimmy Alex, Head Teacher at Baralegi PS was appraised on 5th December 2022 by Odongo Jimmy Clavin, SAS</li> <li>5. Ongoro Cypriano, Alunga PS was appraised on 12th December 2022 by Konga Agnes, SAS</li> <li>6. Ejang Bena, Aminteny PS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by Akullo Agnes, SAS</li> <li>7. Omach Faustin, Oget PS was appraised on 14th December 2022 by Okol Patrick George, Town Clerk</li> <li>8. Alengo Joseph, Baljobi PS was appraised on 16th December 2022 by Ogongo Moses Okwir, SAS</li> <li>9. Inyang Charles Dick, Head teacher Okwongo PS was appraised on 16th December 2022 by Kiptum Denis, Assistant Town Clerk</li> <li>10. Odongo Tom Felix, Olilim PS was appraised on 30th December 2022 by Ayo Francis, Town Clerk</li> </ol>	



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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>The LG had 5 Secondary Schools and the Secondary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO as below;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adongo Christine, Head Teacher at Ogor Seed SS was appraised on 8th December 2022 by Odongo Quinto, DEO</li> <li>2. Erik Johnson, Head Teacher at Okwang SS was appraised on 8th December 2022 by Odongo Quinto, DEO</li> <li>3. Elasu Abraham, Head Teacher at Orum SS was appraised on 28th December 2022 by Odongo Quinto, DEO</li> <li>4. Onyong John, Head Teacher Otuke SS was appraised on 15th December 2022 by Ingoi James DDCAO</li> <li>5. Ocen James Newton, Head Teacher Awari SS was appraised on 8th December 2022 by Acheng Lucy Ag. DEO</li> </ol>	
			<p>The appraisal was done by the DEO (Odongo Quinto) and Ag. DEO (Acheng Lucy) instead of the DCAO</p>	
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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>All staff in the LG Education department had been appraised against their performance plans as below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obira James, Sports Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Aceng Lucy, Ag. DEO</li> <li>2. Ocherero Patrick, Education Officer- Guidance and Counselling was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Aceng Lucy, Ag. DEO</li> <li>3. Odongo Kenneth, Education Officer- Special Needs was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Aceng Lucy, Ag. DEO</li> <li>4. Akwar Markdonald, Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Aceng Lucy, Ag. DEO</li> </ol>	

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG HR department did not provide any evidence to show that the LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the District Local Government (DLG) did not provide written confirmation as evidence regarding the list of schools, their enrollments, and the allocated budget within the Program-Based Budgeting System (PBS).</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Otuke Local Government allocated UGX 37,800,000 for the fiscal year 2022/2023, as indicated in a letter of acknowledgment from the District Education Officer (DEO) to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) dated June 29, 2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter was released on 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 15th August, 2022 after 5 days.</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 13th October, 2022 after 10 days.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 10 days.</li> <li>• 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 2nd May, 2023 after 22 days.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 24th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 23th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 15th May 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

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

For the fiscal year 2022/2023, the Education Department prepared an inspection plan signed by both the District Education Officer (DEO) and the District Inspector of Schools (DIS). The plan prioritized the inspection of all government schools, consisting of 45 primary schools and 5 secondary schools. The pre-inspection plans were executed on the following dates:

1. Term III 2022 Meeting:

- Held on 1st September 2022
- Planned to cover all 50 schools between 13th September 2022 to 20th November 2022
- Minute Number: Min 4/9/2022

2. Term I 2023 Meeting:

- Held on 10th January 2023
- Planned to inspect 50 schools
- Inspection took place between 5th February 2023 to 15th April 2023
- Attendance: 7 members
- Minute Number: Min 04/01/2023

3. Term II 2023 Meeting:

- Held on 5th May 2023
- Planned to cover 50 schools
- Inspection scheduled from 7th June 2023 to 10th August 2023
- Attendance: 6 members

The overall compliance with the inspection plan was 100%, as evidenced by the successful execution of all three terms, covering the designated schools within the specified timelines.

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 indicated that 80% of government schools were inspected during various terms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Term III 2022 Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dated 21st November 2022</li> <li>• 44 out of 45 schools were inspected between 13th September 2022 and 20th November 2022.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Term I 2023 Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dated 24th April 2023</li> <li>• 12 out of 45 schools were inspected between 5th February 2023 and 15th April 2023.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Term II 2023 Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dated 16th August 2023</li> <li>• 33 out of 45 schools were inspected between 7th May 2023 and 10th August 2023.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>The findings show that 80% of government schools were covered in inspections across Term III 2022 and Terms I, II, and III 2023. The reports provide a comprehensive overview of the inspections carried out during the specified periods, highlighting the number of schools inspected and the respective dates.</p>	1
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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence presented indicating that inspection reports had been discussed and utilized to recommend corrective actions, and furthermore, that these actions had subsequently been followed up.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>2</b></p> <p>Head teachers of all the schools visited, revealed that the Inspectorate had not presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to them as required by the guidelines , among the schools was ; Olilim primary school, Anep Moroto primary school &amp; Adwari primary schools</p> <p>Evidence seen of DES submission was as follows:</p> <p>Term 3 2022 report dated 31st January, 2023 was handed over to DES on 3rd October, 2023.</p> <p>Term 1 2023 report dated 26th May, 2023 was equally handed to DES on 3rd October, 2023.</p> <p>Term 2 2023 report dated 15th September, 2023 handed to DES on 3rd October, 2023</p>
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 style="text-align: right;"><b>2</b></p> <p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 14th March 2023 at the District Council Hall where at least 11 members were present. Under Min no MIN 5/14/03/2023. Some of the key issues discussed under education included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of a twin staff house at Okee Primary School, work was progressing on well and it was at a ring beam level.</li> <li>- Site handover of Okum seed secondary was done and the contractors had started clearing the site.</li> <li>- Preparation for athletics competition was ongoing and 5 athletes were offered full bursaries, two boys in DOC, Lira City and three girls in Standard High School Zana, Kampala.</li> <li>- School inspection was also conducted.</li> </ul> <p>All issues addressed above were issues of service delivery that were done in the previous FY and discussed in council committee.</p>

11

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,

*score: 2 or else score: 0*

Evidence was observed of Back to School campaigns conducted by the Otuke DLG in a report dated 6th May , 2023. This initiative took place between 3rd January, 2023 and 6th January , 2023 in Ogwette and Olilim sub-counties, supported by GIZ partners. Present for this campaign were the RDC, various chairpersons, the CAO, and numerous political leaders, with the following objectives:

To mobilize all stakeholders to be involved in taking children back to school and ensuring their retention.

Adopting a better performance improvement plan to achieve improved Primary Leaving Examination (PLE) results.

Provide accountability to citizens on the use of resources and service delivery in all sectors.

Generate feedback from citizens on the challenges of service delivery, provide responses, and review plans to address emerging service delivery demands. Over 400 people were reached during this campaign.

## **Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Consolidated School Asset Register at the DEO's office revealed accurate reporting on the assets of 45 UPE schools and the 5 USE schools. The assessment focused on three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register, and the findings are presented below:</p> <p>Adwari Primary School, identified as an urban institution, reported having 13 classrooms, 150 desks, 10 latrine stances, and 8 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Olilim Primary School, characterized as semi-urban, recorded 12 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 108 desks, and 4 teacher's houses, accommodating 8 teachers.</p> <p>Anep Moroto Primary School, classified as rural, reported the following assets: 10 classrooms, 246 desks, 29 latrine stances, and 9 teacher's houses, accommodating 18 teachers.</p> <p>The verification process ensured that all the assets, infrastructures, and equipment reported were accurate and aligned with the information present in the consolidated Education Department Assets Register. This reflects the DLG's commitment to maintaining accurate and up-to-date records of the educational infrastructure within its jurisdiction.</p>	<b>2</b>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 16th August 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 81 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Construction of twin staff house at Achan Pii Primary School at Ugx 145,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.</li> <li>2. - Construction of a twin staff house at Ogwette Primary School at Ugx 145,000,000 and was recommended for field appraisal.</li> </ol> <p>The Desk Appraisal report was endorsed by the senior Planner and other technical staff.</p>	<b>1</b>



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of twin staff house at Achan Pii Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 12nd September 2022.</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a twin staff house at Ogwette Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 12nd September 2022.</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by District Planner, District Engineer, DCDO, DNRO and District Environment Officer.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The planned infrastructure included the renovation of classrooms at Alurkot, Okwong, Ociro and Adyerakonya- primary schools, as per procurement plan that was signed on 5th July, 2023 , by D/CAO , Ingoi James.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee before the commencement of construction. This was done when the Contracts Committee sat on 7th December, 2022, where the evaluation report was approved and contract award for construction of a twin staff house at Acan Pii primary school was done in minute CC/05/12/2022.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG did not establish a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. This was in a letter dated 5th January 2023 by the CAO, where the following persons were named on the team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otim Alex -Principal Assistant Secretary as Contract manager</li> <li>• Onyaga Patrick- Senior environment officer</li> <li>• Alany Jimmy Max- Ag. DE as Project manager</li> <li>• Ocen Sylvester- DCDO</li> <li>• Adeny Moses- Labour Officer.</li> </ul> <p>The letter left out the DEO as head of user department and clerk of works</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES, as was observed at Okum Seed Secondary School where it was noted that the external dimensions of the multi-purpose hall was 8.95 x 27.4 m as per the designs.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>	<p>There was evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY. There were minutes dated 10th March, 2023 to show ,that meetings had been held. These had been signed by the CAO, as chairperson and headteacher as secretary.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint opposed to monthly technical supervision involving engineers, environment officer, CDO as phad been conducted, this was in a report dated 10th March, 2023.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p>	1
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Voucher no 6429343 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 28,375,686; Certificate No 2, dated 13th June 2023; Contract No.2 OTUK 915/WRKS/22-23/00003, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Acanpii Primary School was certified by DEO on 14th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 14th June 2023, district Engineer on 14th June 2023 and DCDO on 14th June 2023, payment was initiated on 8th June 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within the time frame.</li> <li>2. - Voucher no 4281546 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 44,010,701; Certificate No 2, dated 13th June 2023; Contract No.2 OTUK 915/WRKS/22-23/00004, Project; Construction of a twin Staff House at Okee Primary School was certified by DEO on 12nd April 2023, District Environment Officer on 12nd April 2023, district Engineer on 12nd April 2023 and DCDO on 12nd April 2023, payment was initiated on 11st April 2023 and payments were made on the same day which was within the time frame.</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>LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30. They did the submission on the 5th April, 2023 and therefore complied with the requirement.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project: Construction of Seed Secondary School at Okum</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoES/UGFIT/wrks/2021-2022/00003, had the following documents on file</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 22nd December, 2022 with Mesco Limited</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 24th February, 2022.</li> </ul>	1

- Evaluation report dated 10th February, 2022
- Solicitor General letter dated 7th December, 2022 signed by JBR Suuza
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, acceptance and offer letters

Project: Construction of twin staff house at okee Primary school

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00004, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 22nd January, 2023, with Lordline General Enterprises

- Evaluation report dated 6th December, 2022

- Contracts committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022

- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, supervision reports, certificates of payment among the documents therein.

Project: Construction of twin staff house at Acan Pii primary school

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00003, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 11th January, 2023 with BP Enterprise and Construction.

- Evaluation report dated 6th December, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 5th April, 2023

- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids record, certificates of payment, supervision reports, among the documents on file.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

A complaint recorded on 10th March, 2023 of non-payment of wages to workers at Okum seed secondary school by C and G Consults contractors was handled and mediated on 15th March, 2023 in Grievances Redress committee (GRC) meeting held at the District council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.

3

15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	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  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence .of an attendance sheet dated 3rd January, 2023 and titled "Dissemination of sector guidelines at the Education Board Room for head teachers was availed where all acknowledged by signing receipt of the sector guidelines. And a sample of Olilim Primary School, Anep Moroto Primary School and Adwari Primary School confirmed receipt.	3
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of a costed ESMP which was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents for the construction of a twin staff house, kitchen and a 2 stance latrine at Okee primary school with a total BoQ costed at UGX. 144,952,499 and Element No. 12 preliminaries A and B for environment and social safeguards costed at UGX. 1,000,0000.	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, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was no proof of landownership availed for school construction projects.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	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 for the following projects below;  1. Monitoring report for the construction of a twin staff house, kitchen and 2 stance latrine at Acan Pii and Okee primary schools dated 23rd March, 2023 and 26th June, 2023  2. Monitoring report dated 22nd May, 2023 and 28th June, 2023 for the Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school, Abilyero, Abua, Ajuka, Acungapenyi, Adyerakunya, Amukugungu villages.  3. Monitoring report dated 30th June, 2023 for the micro-scale irrigation sites at Ogor seed secondary and Ocuricak Cell	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

Certification forms were approved and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example;

1. Certificate No. 2022/23/001 issued on 24th may, 2023 for the construction of a twin staff house, 2-stance latrine and kitchen at Okee primary school was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO

2. Payment certificate No. 2 issued on 2nd June, 2023 for the construction of a twin staff house at Acan PII primary school was signed by the Environment Officer and CDO

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<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>The review of the annual HMIS reports 107 for Otuke LG indicated a percentage drop in utilization of health services.</p> <p>We compared the annual total deliveries of the 3 sampled Health centres for FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23</p> <p>The 3 sampled Health facilities were: Orum HC IV ,Atangwata HCIII and Barjobi HCIII</p> <p>The annual deliveries for the FY 2021/2021 of the health facilities:</p> <p>were: 666, 267 and 316, respectively, making a subtotal of 1249.</p> <p>The annual deliveries for FY 2022/2023 of the same facilities were: 653,263 and 291</p> <p>respectively, making a sub total of 1207.</p> <p>From calculation, this makes a percentage drop of 3.4% in Health services utilization.</p> <p>According to DHO's DHT verbal report, this drop was attributed this to High stock out rate of Medicines and Health supplies. The district missed 2 cycles of medical supply.</p> <p>Was also attributed to withdrawal of the development Partner RHITES North Lango which was supporting MCH After phased out in July 2022</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Final results of LLGs presented to the assessment team by OPM, Otuke had Not applicable for the assessment of 2022 which implied that there was no assessment in 2023 for the Health sector. The absence of results for 2022 meant that there was no base data to determine whether there was an increase in performance between 2022 and 2023 were the LG scored 90% hence the score of zero.</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the letter from MOH to CAO dated 7th December 2022.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 1,070,074,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Construction of an Incinerator at Alango HC II at Ugx 7,000,000.</li> <li>2. - Construction of a Placenta pit at Alango HC II at Ugx 7,000,000.</li> <li>3. - Construction of a 2-stance drainable Pit Latrine at Orum HC IV at Ushs 17,725,000.</li> <li>4. - Construction of a Water Born Toilet at DHO Office at Ushs 25,000,000.</li> <li>5. - Renovation of a Staff house at Olilim HC III at Ushs 35,000,000.</li> </ol>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 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;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Voucher no 5877543 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 6,210,975 Certificate No 2, dated 15 June 2023; Contract No. OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/00007, Project; Renovation of Staff House at Olilim H/C III was certified by District Health Officer on 24th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 24th May 2023, district Engineer on 19th May 2023 and DCDO on 24th May 2023.</li> <li>2. - Voucher no 4769477 dated 18th April 2023 for Ushs 17,954,658 Certificate No 1, dated 10 January 2023; Contract No. contract no OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/00007, Project; Renovation of Staff House at Olilim H/C III was certified by District Health Officer on 13th March 2023, District Environment Officer on 13th March 2023 the certificate, district Engineer on 16th March 2023 and DCDO on 17th March 2023.</li> </ol>	2



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

The projects sampled were three. Two were +9.94% within +/- 20% the acceptable variation and while the third could not be determined and therefore did not comply. The projects sampled were;

Project: upgrade of Alango HCII to HCIII

Estimated cost: Was not provided both from work plan and the PP1 form at the time of assessment.

Contract cost: Ugx 912,527,336/=

Variation Ugx 13,764/=

%age variation

Project 2: renovation of a staff house at Olilim HCIII

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00007

Estimated cost: Ugx 35,000,000/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 33,849,480/=

Varaitaion Ugx 1,150,520/=

%age variation ( 1,150,520/35,000,000) x 100%= 3.28%

Project 3: Renovation of vaccine store at district office

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00008

Estimated cost: Ugx 40,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 36,025,164/=

Variation Ugx (3,974,836/40,000,000)x 100%= 9.94%

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1
- less than 80 %: Score 0

From quarter 4 report on page 54 of 178, the amount budgeted was indicated as Ugx 991,725,000/= and spent as Ugx 573,708,000/=. It does not indicate if its only for the health Centre upgrade or the entire budget for other developments in the department. Therefore not possible to determine the percentage of planned work for the health upgrade that has been completed.

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	The LG approved staff structure provided for 235 health worker positions and 187 were filled at the time of assessment = 79%.	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>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MOH, this was observed at Alonga HCII upgrade were the internal dimensions of the female ward confirmed as 6.8 x 7 m, this was as per design.	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	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for the 3 sampled health facilities; Orum HCIV, Barjobi HCIII and Atangwata HCIII was accurate as indicated below.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p><b>Orum HCIV</b> had 44 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>Barjobi HCIII</b> had 15 staff (DHO facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the facility noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p><b>Atangwata HCIII</b> had 14 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>	
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There were no facilities Upgraded in 2022/23	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		However, there was some construction done on Ating HCII maternity ward, Laboratory and Staff house but all these constructions were not yet complete at the time of assessment.	

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>There was evidence that the sampled Health facilities did not submit their annual workplans and budget for FY 2022/23 to the DHO's office timely, according to LG Planning Guidelines:</p> <p>Barjobi HC III submitted its annual work plan and budget on 1st August,2022.</p> <p>Atwangata HCIII submitted on 23rd July 2022.</p> <p>Orum HC III submitted on 17th October 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>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 sampled Health facilities Orum HC IV, Atangwata HCIII and Barjobi HCIII did not submit Annual budget performance reports for FY 2023/23.</p> <p>There was no report of these Health facilities in the DHO's Office at the time of assessment</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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; Orum HC IV, Atangwata HCIII and Barjobi HCIII did not submit the Facility improvement plans for FY 2023/24</p> <p>There were no plans in the DHO's Office at the time of assessment</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days</p>	<p>There was evidence that the 3 Sampled Health facilities submitted their HMIS 105 and quarterly 106 timely. Their submission dates are shown below:</p>	2

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

following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,

- score 2 or else score 0

## **HMIS 105**

### **July 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th August,2022.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 2nd August ,2022.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd August 2022

### **August 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th September ,2022.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 2nd September,2022.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 6th September,2022.

### **September 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 5th October,2022.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 6th October,2022.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th October ,2022.

### **October 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th November ,2022

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 5th November,2022.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd November ,2022

### **November 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th December,2022.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 6th December,2022.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 7th December,2022.

### **December 2022**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th January,2023.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 4th January,2023.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd January ,2023.

### **January 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th February,2023.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 2nd  
February 2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th  
February,2023.

### **February 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th  
March,2023.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 6th  
March,2023.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th  
Marh,2023.

### **March 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 6th April,2023.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th  
April,2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th April,2023

### **April 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th May,2023

Atang-gwata HCIII submitted on 8th  
MAY,2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd May,2023

### **May 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 2nd June,2023

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th  
June,2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd June,2023

### **June 2023**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th July,2023

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th  
July,2023.

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th July, 2023

### **Quarterly Report 106 a**

#### **Quartern 1**

Orum HC IV submitted on 6th  
October,2022

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th  
October, 2022

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 5th October,  
2022

#### **Quarter 2**

Orum HC IV submitted on 7th  
January,2023

Atang-gwata HCIII submitted on 7th  
January,2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 4th January,2023.

**Quarter 3**

Orum HC IV submitted on 5th April,2023.

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th April,2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 3rd April,2023.

**Quarter 4**

Orum HC IV submitted on 6th July,2023

Atangwata HCIII submitted on 7th July 2023

Barjobi HCIII submitted on 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 into PHC program as per the Letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per the Letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December 2022.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track the submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. He noted the new system doesn't send email notifications compared to the previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Otuke District LG developed a performance improvement plan for the weakest Health facilities. The plan was developed and approved on 4th July, 2023.</p> <p>The weakest Health facilities were: Barjobi HCIII and Atangwata HCIII.</p> <p>The areas of weakness for Barjobi HC III were: Poor staff attendance, Data variance for DPT3 and low ANC attendance.</p> <p>Planned activities for Barjobi HCIII were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold Joint meetings with DHT.</li> <li>• Technical support supervision and mentoring by Biostatistician to minimize the variance.</li> <li>• Increased Community mobilization and sensitization by VHT to promote ANC.</li> </ul> <p>The areas of weakness for Atangwata HC III were: Low uptake of IPT3.</p> <p>Data variance for deliveries</p> <p>Poor staff attendance.</p> <p>Planned actions for Atangwata HC III included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold Joint meetings with DHT</li> <li>• Technical support supervision and mentoring by Biostatistician to minimize the variance.</li> <li>• Procure more Fansida to strengthen IPT3 uptake</li> </ul>	1

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Otuke District LG did implement the improvement plan for weakest Health facilities.</p> <p>There was Report submitted 3rd October 2023 indicating implementation. For example, technical support supervision and mentoring was done by Biostatistician on on Barjobi HCIII on 4th September 2023 and 5th September 2023 on Atangwata HCIII.</p> <p>A joint meeting with DHT was held on the same dates.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Otuke district LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 2,915,905,000 (Approved budget estimates for Otuke LG 2023/24 page 48 of 120 , vote 915). 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. 2,915,904,892 as indicated on page 97 vote 915</p> <p>Therefore, Otuke 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

**Orum HCIV** had 44 out of 48 required health workers for HCIV, giving 91.7% of the required staffing norm for HCIV (Confirmed Staff list at Orum HCIV noticeboard)

**Barjobi HCIII** had 15 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 80% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Barjobi HCIII noticeboard)

**Atangwata 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 Atangwata HCIII noticeboard)

Therefore, 1 health facility (Atangwata HCIII) didn't have at least 75% of staff required hence Otuke district LG did not deploy health workers in all the health facilities 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).

**Orum HCIV:** 16 out of 44 health workers deployed to Orum HCIV were present on duty on the day of assessment.

However 5 health workers including Obua Ronald Simson; Public Health Dental Officer, Atim Cathrine; Enrolled Nurse, Obang Isaac; Enrolled Nurse, Akao Dorah, Theatre Assisstant and Ayo Joyce; Enrolled Midwife were for annual leave. 3 health workers (Ogwanga Geoffrey; Medical Officer, Opio Denis Mark; Clinical Officer and Ayo Joyce; Enrolled Midwife) were for study leave. The rest of the staff (19 health workers) were either absent or off duty.

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

1. Ogwang Kenneth ; Health Inspector was present on duty on 7th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 15 days in the month of November 2023.

2. Olum James ; Senior Medical Officer was present on duty on 7th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 15 days in the month of November 2023.

3. Opio Moses Innocent ; Clinical Officer

was present on duty on 7th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 19 days in the month of November 2023.

4. Koli Eunice; Enrolled midwife was present on duty on 7th December 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 13 days in the month of November 2023.

(Orum HCIV staff attendance book 7th December 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for November 2023).

**Barjobi HCIII:** 5 out of 15 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. However Adongo Gloria; Enrolled Midwife was off for her maternity leave and Opio Leo; Enrolled Nurse was for study leave, 2 Askaris (Bua Richard and Onyango Peter) were on interdiction and the rest of the health workers were Absent on the day of assessment.

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

1. Apita Samuel Peter; Nursing Assistant was present on duty on 7th December 2023.

2. Akot Dilish Health Assistant was present on duty on 7th December 2023.

3. Akello Ambrose Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 7th December 2023.

*(Barjobi HCIII staff attendance book 7th December 2023).*

*Though monthly attendance analysis for health personnel for this health facility was not, the evidence in the staff attendance book indicated that the staff for this health facility were working where they were deployed.*

**Atangwata HCIII:** 5 out of 14 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. However the monthly attendance Analysis for health personnel for the month of November 2023 indicated that 11 staff worked at the health facility, 2 staff were on study leave and the other staff was annual leave.

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

1. Akello Cathrine; Clinical Officer was present on duty on 8th December 2023 and the facility monthly attendance

analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 27 days in the month of November 2023.

2. Omar Jaspher; Laboratory Technician was present on duty on 8th December 2023 and the facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that he was present on duty for 18 days in the month of November 2023.

3. Aduk Winny; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 8th December 2023 and the facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 19 days in the month of November 2023.

*(Atangwat HCIII staff attendance book 8th December 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for November 2023).*

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

The displayed lists of staff at Orum HCIV, Barjobi HCIII and Atangwat HCIII Noticeboards had a total of 44, 15 and 14 staff respectively. (Orum HCIV, Barjobi HCIII and Atangwat HCIII Noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 .

2

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 DHO 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. For instance;

1. Tino Loyce- Alango HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Omara Moses, Senior Clinical Officer
2. Akello Betty- Ating HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Owach Moses, SAS
3. Ocwich Peter-Ogette HC III was appraised on 14th July 2023 by Omara Moses, Senior Clinical Officer
4. Erach Patrick-Acane HC II was appraised on 21st July 2023 by Opio Moses Innocent, Medical Clinical Officer
5. Ogwang Isaac- Oluru HC II was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Onyong John, Senior Clinical Officer
6. Okello Christopher- Anepmoroto HC II was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Ogwang Oyom George, Senior Clinical Officer
7. Onyong John- Barjobi HC III was appraised on 14th July 2023 by Ogwang Oyom George, Senior Clinical Officer
8. Egwal Charles- Atangwata HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Olum James, Senior Medical Officer
9. Okao John Bosco- Olirlm HC III was appraised on 19th July 2023 by Olum James, Senior Medical Officer

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 below;

1. Ogwang Isaac, Enrolled Nurse at Barocok HC II was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Onyong John, Senior Medical Officer
2. Okwir Jasper, Health Assistant at Ogwette HC III was appraised on 1st July 2023 by Ocwich Peter, Senior Clinical Officer
3. Achio Harriet Selah, Enrolled Nurse at Ating HC III was appraised on 19th July 2023 by Akello Betty, Clinical Officer
4. Akech Jackline, Nursing Assistant at Amunga HC II was appraised on 19th July 2023 by Okello Christopher, Enrolled Nurse
5. Abwoli Vincent, Laboratory Technician at Barjobi HC II was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Onyong John, Senior Clinical Officer
6. Otira Isaac, Laboratory Technician at Olilim HC III was appraised on 18th July 2023 by Okao John Bosco, Senior Clinical Officer
7. Ocaa Tony, Health Assistant at Okwongo HC III was appraised on 6th July 2023 by Omara Moses, Senior Clinical Officer
8. Arao Agnes, Enrolled Midwife at Okwang HC III was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Ogwang George Oyom, Senior Clinical Officer
9. Akullo Teddy Ogwang, Enrolled Nurse at Atangwata HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Egwel Charles, Senior Clinical Officer
10. Ayo Joyce, Enrolled Nurse at Orum HC IV was appraised on 1st July 2023 by Amongi Agnes, Assistant Nursing Officer

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

The LG had taken corrective actions based on the appraisals and these included; mentoring in leadership, time management, oxygen administration, and support supervision and mentorship.

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 HR department did not provide any evidence to show that the LG had conducted training for health workers in accordance to the training plans at District level.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG HR department did not provide evidence to show that the LG documented training activities in the training/CPD database.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that there was letter Letter from CAO to MOH confirming Health facilities to receive PHC funds.</p> <p>No copy of the Letter was available in the DHO's Office at the time of assessment</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the approved budget showed that on page 53 supervision &amp; monitoring was allocated UGX 52,172,000 and on (page 45) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 256,951,000.</p> <p>As per the computation <math>52,172,000 / 256,951,000 \times 100 = 20\%</math></p> <p>As per the computation the allocation of supervision and monitoring was more than 15% of PHC non-wage.</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 18th July, 2022 and warranted on 15th August, 2022 after 5 days.
- 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 13th October, 2022 after 10 days.
- 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 10 days.
- 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 2nd May, 2023 after 22 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 18th July 2022 and the communication was made on 24th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 23th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 15th May 2023 which was more than 5 days.

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the 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.



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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence to show that Otuke DHT conducted performance review meetings.

The dates on which the meeting took place were:

Quarter 1 Quarter meeting took place on 18th August 2022.

Quarter 2 Quarter Meeting took place on 22nd February 2023.

Quarter 3 Quarter meeting took place on 24 th May 2023.

Quarter 4 Quarter meeting took place on 10th August 2023.

There was evidence to show that the department implemented actions recommended in the performance review. For example:

In the quarter 1 meeting it was recommended to conduct more outreaches in Health facilities which reported low coverage of ANC visits

Quarter 2 meeting reported an increase in the number of outreaches in Health centers like Ating HCII, Alango HCII, Okang HC II and continuous Health education at entry points.

Ating Health centre alone increased the number of Outreaches from 15 to 30 .

Quarter 4 Performance review meeting also reported implementation of the Actions raised in the Quarter 3 meeting . For example:

Provision and utilization of HMIS tools by the Biostatistician to Health Facilities in order to improve on reporting.

This was done to all facilities and HMIS reporting improved .it is was timely by the end of the FY 2022/23(Quarter 4 Performance Review report dated 10 August 2023)

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Performance review meeting s involved facilities in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments For example:</p> <p>Quarter 4 meetings involved the following people:</p> <p><b>Some of the Health facility in charges:</b></p> <p>Okello Christopher I/C Among HCII</p> <p>Ocwic Peter I/C Ogwere HCIII</p> <p>Okwau John Bosco I/C Atangwata HCIII</p> <p>Ogwang Isaac I/C Baruochoch HCIII</p> <p><b>Some other departments' saff</b></p> <p>Owach Mose SAS Orum S/C</p> <p>Ocen Duke SAS Ogor S/C</p> <p><b>DHT members</b></p> <p>Okello Jesper SEHO</p> <p>Aciro Semmy DHO MCH</p> <p>Abot Denis Biostatician</p> <p>Development Partners</p> <p>Okwenge Walter USAID</p> <p>Rebecca Nekesa LPHS</p> <p>Peter okila RNL</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that Otuke DLG did support supervision on Orum HCIV</p> <p>Some of the dates of supervision were:</p> <p>3rd September 2022.</p> <p>15th December 2022</p> <p>26 th January 2023</p> <p>28thMarch, 2023</p> <p>5th April ,2023</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY.</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>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 to show that the district used results/ reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations and there were some corrections reported.</p> <p>For example ,the support supervision done on 27 June 2023 indentified leakage of a roof at Orum Health Centre IV in the medicine store.</p> <p>Upon the recommendation of the team, the roof was rectified</p> <p>The support supervision at Atangwata HCIII on 12 June 2023 reported low uptake of new Vaccine IPV2.</p> <p>Upon the recommendation and mentoring by the the Supervisory team ,the problem was rectified ,the Vaccine control book was filled properly ,Incharges started doing internal supervision, and there was an increased uptake of the new vaccine</p> <p>In Bajorba HC III the quarter 1 support supervision had identified discrepancy in data capture and there was no laboratory in vicinity to ANC clinic.</p> <p>Upon recommendation of the Supervisory team, a min Laboratory was put in a labor ward,internal supervisions and reporting systems were instituted.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Otuke LG did support supervision to health facilities on medicine management.</p> <p>On 26 September, 2022 MMS supervisor Opolot Tom , did Labss SPARS supervision and mentorship at Orum HCIV.</p> <p>On 25 September 22 MMS supervision was done on Atangwata HCIII where he found corrosive reagents kept together with inflammable .</p> <p>There were other SPARS supervisions done on the following dates:</p> <p>23rd January -31 January 2023</p> <p>18th -30th May 2023</p> <p>16th -27th July 2022</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the Approved Budget report showed that DHO allocation was UGX 45,000,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 13,969,900 was spent on Health promotion page 52 of approved budget.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = <math>13,969,900 / 45,000,000 \times 100 = 31\%</math></p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Otuke District LG led Health promotion, disease prevention activities.</p> <p>There was Community dialogue on Malaria done on 5th -12th may 2023.This took place in Olilim Subcounty;Ayiko ayola village.</p> <p>A total of 25 people attended.</p> <p>There was another community dialogue in Orum sub county.</p> <p>Health inspection and health promotion was done in Adwari Primary school. Amuga Primary school, Okwanga Secondary school.</p> <p>Inspection was done on 12 th July 2022</p> <p>There was a radio talk show done on QF.M on 15th and 20th May 2023 on Malaria</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of follow up done on Health promotion and disease prevention.</p> <p>There was no follow up report in the DHO's Office at the time assessment was done.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**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 to show that Otuke district had updated Assets register 2023, which sets out equipment for health facilities relative to basic standards. For Example;</p> <p>The Register had assets attached to DHO Office for example 2Double Cabins pick up ),</p> <p>3 CPU 1 Ambulace . There were also 5 mortocycles,</p> <p>Health facility equipments like fridges ,computers and other equipments attached to health facilities like ordinary Beds ,delivery weingh scaleDiagnostic equipments etc.</p> <p>The register also had Infrascuture for example facilities with OPD , General wards, Laboratory,theatre,Maternity wards,</p> <p>Medical waste management like incerators, Placenta pits etc</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and

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

score 1 or else score 0

The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under the Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived from DDP III page 81 and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.

- Construction of an Incinerator at Alango HC II at Ugx 7,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Construction of a Placenta pit at Alango HC II at Ugx 7,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Construction of a 2-stance drainable Pit Latrine at Orum HC IV at Ushs 17,725,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Construction of a Water-borne Toilet at DHO Office at Ushs 25,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

- Renovation of a Staff house at Olilim HC III at Ushs 35,000,000 and recommended for field appraisal.

All the projects were appraised on 8th August 2022 by the District Planner, Ag District Engineer, Ag DHO and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

- Field appraisal for construction of Incinerator at Alango HC II. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th September 2022 signed by Ag.DHO, District Planner, and Ag.Engineer.

- Field appraisal for construction of Placenta pit at Alango HC II. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th September 2022 signed by Ag.DHO, District Planner, and Ag.Engineer.

- Field appraisal for construction of a 2 stance drainable Pit Latrine at Orum HC IV. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th September 2022 signed by Ag.DHO, District Planner, and Ag.Engineer.

- Field appraisal for construction of Water born Toilet at DHO Office. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th September 2022 signed by Ag.DHO, District Planner, and Ag.Engineer.

- Field appraisal for renovation of Staff house at Olilim HC III. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 13th September 2022 signed by Ag.DHO, District Planner, and Ag.Engineer.

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no records on screening on Health facility investments but yet a list of health sector investments in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/23 was approved and should have been screened. Below is a list of the health sector investments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 2 Twin Staff House at HC II at UGX. 290,000,000 under UGIFT</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 blocks of 5 stance drainable pit Latrines at Alango HC II at UGX. 50,000,000 under UGIFT</li> <li>3. Construction of Maternity Wards at Alango HC II at UGX. 520,000,000 under UGIFT</li> <li>4. Construction of Incinerator at HC II at UGX. 7,000,000 under CG Grant - Development</li> <li>5. Construction of Placenta pit at Alango HC II at UGX. 7,000,000 under CG Grant - Development</li> <li>6. Construction of 2 stance drainable Pit Latrine at Orum HC IV at UGX. 17,725,000 under CG Grant -Development</li> <li>7. Construction of Water Born Toilet at DHO Office at UGX. 25,000,000 under CG Grant -Development</li> <li>8. Renovation of staff house at Olilim HC III at UGX. 35,000,000 CG Grant - Development</li> </ol>	<b>0</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department did timely by April 30 for the current FY, submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU on 12th April, 2023, for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan which was approved on 5th April, 2023. The projects planned for implementation were renovation of staff house at Okwang HCIII at Ugx 87M, Partial fencing of Orum HCIV at Ugx 13M and upgrade of Barjobi HCIII at Ugx 1BN.</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>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY. It was for renovation of staff house at Okwang HCIII, it was on 21st September, 2023.</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>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee sitting on 7th December, 2022 approved the award of the contracts in minute CC/05/12/20222, for renovation of staff house at Olilim HCIII, construction of 2-stance VIP latrine and renovation of district vaccine store.</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was a letter establishing the project implementation team (PIT) dated 5th January, 2022 signed by the CAO, which named the following persons to the team as per guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oremo Robert -DHO- Contract Manager</li> <li>• Alany Jimmy Max-Project Manager</li> <li>• Onyanga Patrick- senior environment officer</li> <li>• Ocen Sylvester- DCDO</li> <li>• Adeny moses- Labour officer</li> <li>• Ogom Samuel- Clerks of works</li> </ul>	<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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH, this was observed at Alonga HCII upgrade were the internal dimensions of the female ward confirmed as 6.8 x 7 m, this was as per design.</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records for clerk of works that were seen, for the facility upgrade being implemented in the district.</p>	<b>0</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 was no evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee; chaired by the CAO 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.</p>	<b>0</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 no evidence to show that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction.</p>	<b>0</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 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;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - Voucher no 5877543 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 6,210,975 Certificate No 2, dated 15 June 2023; Contract No. OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/00007, Project; Renovation of Staff House at Olilim H/C III was certified by District Health Officer on 24th May 2023, District Environment Officer on 24th May 2023, district Engineer on 19th May 2023 and DCDO on 24th May 2023. Payment was initiated on 2nd May 2023 and done 15th June 2023.</li> <li>2. - Voucher no 4769477 dated 18th April 2023 for Ushs 17,954,658 Certificate No 1, dated 10 January 2023; Contract No. contract no OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/00007, Project; Renovation of Staff House at Olilim H/C III was certified by District Health Officer on 13th March 2023, District Environment Officer on 13th March 2023 the certificate, district Engineer on 16th March 2023 and DCDO on 17th March 2023. Payment was initiated on 15th March 2023 and paid on 20th March 2023</li> </ol>	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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG had complete procurement files for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The procurement files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project: Upgrade of Alango HCII to HCIII</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoH-UGFIT/wrks/2022-2023/00001/lot 3 had the following documents therein;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 13th January, 2023 with WML Consult &amp; Engineering</li> <li>• Contracts committee dated 19th October, 2022</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 27th September, 2022</li> <li>• Solicitor letter dated 21st December, 2022 signed by JBR Suuza</li> <li>• Call for bids, issue and receipt bids records, among other documents therein.</li> </ul>	1

Project: Renovation of staff house at Olilim HCIII

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00007, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 22nd January, 2023 with Ms. Delex Construction limited
- Evaluation report dated 5th December, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids, award and acceptance letters, among documents on file.

Project: Renovation of vaccine store at district office

Procurement ref: OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00008, had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 22nd January, 2023 with Trends services limited
- Evaluation report dated 5th December, 2022
- Contracts committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bid, issue and receipt of records, supervision reports, payment records among documents therein.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

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

There were no records on grievances from the health sector projects that were availed at the time of assessment.

0

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of an attendance list dated 12th October, 2022 titled "Dissemination of MOH Guidelines" that was availed plus a training report dated 11th May, 2023 on Health care waste management that followed a training meeting held at Otuke District Council Hall.</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>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>There was evidence of a functional system for medical waste such as an incinerator and placenta pit at the HCIV, coded waste bins for segregating medical waste in all health units, waste pits for burning of non-wet waste generated on a routine basis.</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>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a training report dated 11th May, 2023 on Health care waste management that followed a training meeting held at Otuke District Council Hall.</p>	<b>1</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Since there were no records of health investment files availed at the time of assessment therefore costed ESMPs could not be verified.</p>	<b>0</b>

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Since there were no records of health sector investment files availed at the time of assessment therefore ascertaining proof of land ownership of the health sector projects could not be verified.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Since there were no records of health sector investment files availed at the time of assessment therefore ascertaining whether the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs could not be verified.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Since there were no records of health sector investment files availed at the time of assessment therefore ascertaining whether the Environment Officer and CDO certified works prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects could not be verified.</p>	0

**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>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Otuke DLG in the previous FY was 66%.</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>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Otuke DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 84%.</p>	<b>1</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>From the Final results of LLGs presented to the assessment team by OPM, Otuke had Not applicable for the assessment of 2022 which implied that there was no assessment in 2023 for the water sector. The absence of results for 2022 meant that there was no base data to determine whether there was an increase in performance between 2022 and 2023 were the LG scored 74% hence the score of zero</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

The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 88% were:-

Drilling of 3 borehole installed with hand pump, construction of a 4 stance drainable VIP latrine and rehabilitation of 1 borehole in Alango S/C with a safe water coverage of 79%, rehabilitation of 1 borehole and construction of a piped water supply system in Ogwette S/C with a safe water coverage of 82%.

The projects that were implemented during the year under review as captured in page 6 of the annual budget performance report were:-

Drilling of 6 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, rehabilitation of 10 boreholes, and construction of a piped water supply system and construction of a 4 stance drainable VIP latrine.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 7 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 18 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was  $7/18 \times 100\% = 39\%$



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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling and installation of 6 boreholes in various Lower Local Governments:

Engineer's estimate = UGX 161,745,000

Contract Sum = UGX 136,751,400

Various = UGX 24,993,600

Percentage variance =  $24,993,600/161,745,000 \times 100\% = 15\%$

2). Construction of a piped water supply system in Acanpii village in Ogwette S/C.

Engineers estimate = UGX 132,047,100

Contract price = UGX 114,271,982

Variation = UGX 17,775,118

Percentage variation =  $17,775,118/132,047,100 \times 100\% = 13\%$ .

3). Construction of a 4 stance drainable VIP latrine in Alango market in Alango S/C.

Engineer's estimate = UGX 25,593,000

Contract Sum = UGX 23,533,435

Various = UGX 2,059,565

Percentage variance =  $2,059,565/25,593,000 \times 100\% = 8\%$ .

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 as captured on page 6 of the annual budget performance report included the following:-</p> <p>Drilling of 6 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps in various Sub-Counties, rehabilitation of 10 boreholes in various LLGs, construction of a piped water system in Ogwette S/C and construction of a 4 stance drainable VIP latrine in Alango S/C. The total planned projects were 18 however. The completed projects were 18 in number, therefore the percentage of the completed projects as per the annual report was:</p> <p><math>18/18 * 100\% = 100\%</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>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no 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 66% and FY 2022/2023 was 66% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage increase was <math>66\% - 66\% = 0\%</math></p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 84% and 84% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage increase therefore was <math>84\% - 84\% = 0\%</math></p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY as captured on page 6 of the annual budget performance report (quarter 4 progress report) which was dated 31st June, 2023 from where the following facilities below were sampled;

1). Drilling of a deep borehole in Okum Seed Secondary School in Orum sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 71144 and completed on 11th June, 2023.

2). Construction of a piped water system in Acanpii in Ogwette sub-county, funded under UGIFT, and completed on 21st June, 2023.

3). Construction of a 4 stance drainable VIP latrine in Alango market in Alango sub-county, funded under DWSCG, and completed on 30th March, 2023.

These projects were completed as per the plan,

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

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 28th October, 2022, on page 7, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments in a summary table.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 3rd February, 2023 on page 8; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties of the District.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 3rd May, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on pages 6.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 31st December, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 10.</p> <p>Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 10th August, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form4 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>The copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment, the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 41%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the least performing 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 &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 at Ugx 44,597,000/=</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>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer at Ugx 210,944,000/=.</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. Okello Joel, Assistant Engineering Officer Water was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Obong James Lawrence, Senior Engineering Officer. This was late appraisal</li> <li>2. Odongo Geoffery, Borehole Maintenance Technician was appraised on 17th July 2023 by Okello Joel, Assistant Engineering Officer Water. Appraisal was passed the stipulated timelines.</li> </ol>	0
---	--	--	---	---

7

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3

The HR department did not provide any evidence to show that the DWO had conducted training for water staff the previous FY.

0

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

8

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO allocated over 68% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 88%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Alango S/C with safe water coverage of 79% was allocated drilling of 2 boreholes, Orum S/C with a safe water coverage of 85% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole, Okwongo T/C with a safe water coverage of 79% was allocated construction of 4 stance drainable VIP latrine and Okwang S/C with a safe water coverage of 86% was allocated construction of a piped water supply system.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 274,427,000

The total annual development budget for Otuke DWO for the current FY was UGX 392,689,000

Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was = $274,427,000 / 392,689,000 * 100\% = 70\%$

1

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

In this file there was a letter dated 18th August, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Alango, Okwang, Orum, Olilim, and Okwongo T/C.

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 also made a presentation during the district budget conference which was held on 15th November, 2023 in slides number 4 and 5 in his presentation where the allocations were summarized.

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 technical monitoring reports, together with quarterly progress reports, which were reviewed and the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 5th October, 2022, it was noted that there was a summary table in the report which showed that 451 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 16th January, 2023, a total of 420 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 16th April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 418.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 26th June, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 441.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was =  $451 + 420 + 418 + 441 = 1,730/4 = 433$ .

Otuke DLG had a total of 471 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was  $433/471 * 100\% = 92\%$

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 did not conduct the DWSCC meetings quarterly; the DWO presented only three sets of meeting minutes implying that there was no meeting conducted in the first quarter.



9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 88% as per the letter dated 18th September, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties;</p> <p>Alango, Okwang, Orum, Olilim, and Okwongo T/C.</p> <p>The letter detailed the projects allocated to these LLGs together with their budgeted amounts as follows; Alango S/C UGX 48,000,000 for drilling of 2 boreholes, Okwang S/C UGX 178,427.000 for a piped water supply system and drilling of a production well, Orum S/C UGX 24,000,000 for drilling 1 borehole, Olilim S/C UGX 48,000,000 for drilling 2 boreholes and Okwongo T/C UGX 25,000,000 for construction of 4 stance drainable VIP latrine.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Otuke DLG water sector was UGX 59,022,686. The DWO allocated UGX 25,694,546 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was <math>25,694,546 / 59,022,686 * 100\% = 44\%</math>.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&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 24th June, 2023. The training period spanned from 15th to 23rd June, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&amp;M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others. Under O&amp;M emphasis was put on identification of faults, preventive maintenance and minor and major repairs</p> <p>The trainers were; Okello Joel AEO, Angwech Winnie ADWO in charge mobilization, Odongo Geoffrey the BMT.</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:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of an up dated asset register; the DWO presented the up dated asset register to the assessor at the time of assessment. The following new facilities were seen in the asset register; Okum Seed S.S. borehole in Orum S/C, Abilonyero borehole in Alango S/C, Abua borehole in Alango S/C and Amukugungu borehole in Adwari S/C.</p>	<b>4</b>
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>No desk appraisal forms for current FY water projects were presented at the time of assessment. It was noted by the District Planner that the projects delayed a bit due to procurement process.</p>	<b>0</b>

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>All the budgeted investments for the current FY had completed application forms from the beneficiary communities as per the records reviewed from a file of community application forms presented by the DWO to the assessor. Some of the sampled community applications included:</p> <p>1). Application from Otuke village in Ogwette S/C, the application date was 2nd December, 2022, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 16th December, 2022. The application was endorsed by Ago Hellen, the LCI with Angwech Betty and Achola Ketty on behalf of the community.</p> <p>2). Application from Anyomi village in Alango S/C, the application was dated 10th March, 2023, and was endorsed by Atei Alfred the LCI together with Okello Peter, Apio Margret and Otim Tom representing the community.</p> <p>The DWO cleared it for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on the 16th July, 2023.</p> <p>3). Application from Abarler village in Orum S/C, this application was dated 17th October, 2022 and was endorsed by Ogwal Dickson the LCI together with Acuma Jasper, Ojok Isaac and Odongo John Bright representing the community. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 20th February, 2023 by the District Water Officer.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>No filed appraisal forms for current FY water projects were presented at the time of assessment. It was noted by the District Planner that the projects delayed a bit due to procurement process.</p>	0

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

All water infrastructure projects for the current FY were not screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and neither were ESMPs prepared but yet were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were the water sector project that should have been screened;

1. Drilling and installation of Deep Borehole at Anyomi village at UGX. 23,000,000 under CG Grant - Development

2. Drilling and installation of Deep Borehole at Abeler village at UGX. 23,000,000 under CG Grant - Development

3. Drilling and installation of Deep Borehole at Aleri village at UGX. 23,000,000 under CG Grant - Development

4. Drilling and installation of Deep Borehole at Alula Te Bung at UGX. 23,000,000 under CG Grant - Development

5. Design of piped water scheme at Olil B Village at UGX. 15,889,000 under CG Grant - Development

6. Construction of piped water scheme at Olil B Village at UGX. 118,356,000 under CG Grant - Development

7. Construction of 4 stances Drainable Latrine with 2 urinals at Okwongo TC at UGX. 25,000,000 under CG Grant - Development

8. Retention for Construction of 5 stance latrine at Alango market at UGX. 1,200,000 under CG Grant - Development

9. Retention for the drilling of boreholes by East Africa at across all sub-counties at UGX. 6,850,000 under CG Grant - Development.

10. Rehabilitation of 8 deep boreholes at across all sub-counties at UGX. 45,700,000 under CG Grant -Development

11. Installation of Borehole sensors (18 Boreholes) at across all sub counties at UGX. 3,600,000 under CG Grant -Development

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan, which was signed by the D/CAO, Ingoi James, on 5th July, 2023. The investments planned included; Rehabilitation of 8 boreholes at Ugx 45M, drilling test pumping and installation of 5 deep hand pump boreholes at Ugx 115M and construction of piped water scheme at Ugx 100M.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY, were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done by the Contracts Committee in their sitting on 22nd December, 2022. The committee approved the evaluation report and contract award for drilling, pump testing, casting and installation of hand pump of 6 deep boreholes in minute CC/05/12/2022</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines. This was in a letter dated 5th January, 2023, where the following persons were named to the team;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obong James Lawrence- DWO- contract manager</li> <li>• Alany Jimmy Max- project supervisor</li> <li>• Onyanga Patrick-Senior environment officer</li> <li>• Ocen Sylvester-DCDO</li> <li>• Adeny Moses- Labour officer</li> <li>• Okello Joel- Clerk of works</li> </ul>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example a boreholes in Okum Seed S.S. of Orum S/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm, respectively 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 was evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects, as was noted in a supervision report for piped water scheme for Acan Pii rural growth centre dated 23rd June, 2023, by the district water officer</p>	2

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 payment to the contractors were within specified timeframes in the contracts for example;

1. - Voucher no.6441360 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 15,973,288 with certificate no. 1 Dated 20th June 2022; contract no. OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/000010; Design of Solar powered piped water by Brio Engineering Co Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 20th June 2023, payment was initiated on 17th May 2023 and made on 20th June 2023 which was within 30 days.
2. - Voucher no.6423671 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 91,163,315 with certificate no. 1 Dated 14th June 2022; contract no. OTUK915/WRKS/22-23/00002; Drilling, pump testing, casting and installation of 6 deep boreholes by East Africa Boreholes was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 15th June 2023, payment was initiated on 12nd June 2023 and made on 15th June 2023 which was within 30 days.

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the LG had complete procurement files for water infrastructure investments in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files reviewed were;

Project: Drilling, pump test, casting and installation

Procurement ref:  
OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00002  
had these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 22nd January, 2023 with East Africa boreholes
- Evaluation report dated 6th December, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 7th December, 2022
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue of and receipt of bids, offer and acceptance letters among the documents on file.

Project: Construction of Solar powered water system at Acan Pii

Procurement ref:  
OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00011,  
with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 6th June, 2023 with Real Irrigation Engineering
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 26th May, 2023
- Evaluation minutes dated 19th May, 2023
- PP1 form, call for bids, issue of and receipt of bids, offer and acceptance letters among the documents on file.

Project; Construction of a 4-stance VIP latrine at Alango Market

Procurement ref:  
OTUK915/wrks/2022-2023/00009  
had these documents

- Signed works contract dated 22nd January, 2023 with Ebwe Technical Services limited
- Evaluation report dated 12th December, 2022
- Contracts Committee minutes dated 6th December, 2022.



## Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of grievances handled arising out of water sector projects for example, a complaint recorded on 8th November, 2022 for repair of a malfunctioned borehole at Akaidebe village that serves the communities of Olimi primary school and the police barracks.</p>	<b>3</b>
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of records availed that showed that the DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on Water source &amp; catchment protection and Natural resource management to CDOs. Minutes of the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee meeting that was held on 11th November, 2022 at the District Natural Resources Boardroom were availed and under Min. 6. Dissemination of Guidelines on Water Sources and Natural Resources Management the CDOs were taken through the content of the guidelines.</p>	<b>3</b>

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0

Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented for example, screening as well as the respective ESMPs were carried out for the projects below;

1. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school prepared on 12th February, 2023

2. Drilling and installation of deep boreholes at Acungapenyi village, Adyerakunya, Adwari sub-county prepared on 24th January, 2023

3. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Amukugungu village, Adwari prepared on 26th January, 2023

4. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Ajuka village, Alango sub county prepared on 27th January, 2023

5. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Abua village prepared on 7th February, 2023

6. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Abilyero prepared on 8th February, 2023

7. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school at 12th February, 2023

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:

Score 3, If not score 0

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:-

1). Land agreement signed on 16th July, 2022 between Enyel Tom and the community of Abilonyero village of Alango S/C. This agreement was signed by Ogwang Sam Bob the LCI together with Akullo Ketty, Omoo Isaac on behalf of the community.

2). Land agreement signed on 5th July, 2023 between Ocwich John Bosco and the community of Ajuki village of Alango S/C, and was signed by Okwir Jacob the LCI with Aluga Doreen, and Okwir Naboss on behalf of the community.

3). Land agreement signed on 10th May, 2023 between Emina Mateo and the community of Amukugungu village of Adwari S/C, it was also signed by Aryam Bosco the LCI with Adongo Unice and Ejang Hellen on behalf of the community.

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>Certification forms for water projects were not consistently completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/ certificates at interim and final stages of projects. The requirement for certification of project were that all certificates must be signed on by the Environment Officer and CDO and not being selective on a few projects as and when they choose. Below are examples of projects that were sampled;</p>	0
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 14th June, 2023 for the hydrological survey and supervision of drilling, siting, pump testing and installation of 6 boreholes signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> <li>2. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 16th June, 2022 for drilling, pump testing, casting and installation of 9 boreholes signed by the Environment Officer and CDO</li> <li>3. Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 20th June, 2022 for the design of solar powered piped water system at AcanPII-Ogwette sub county was not signed by both the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> </ol>	
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officers monitored the water projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports as below;</p>	2
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring report dated 28th June, 2023 for the Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school, Abilyero, Abua, Ajuka, Acungapenyi, Adyerakunya, Amukugungu villages.</li> <li>2. Monitoring report dated 22nd May, 2023 for the Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school, Abilyero, Abua, Ajuka, Acungapenyi, Adyerakunya, Amukugungu villages.</li> <li>3. Monitoring report dated 16th February, 2023 for the Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school, Abilyero, Abua, Ajuka, Acungapenyi, Adyerakunya, Amukugungu villages</li> </ol>	

**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 fiscal years, disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>The Q2 report, dated 12th April 2023, submitted to MAAIF by DPO, showed the following acreage for irrigated land per Sub-County for the financial years 2021/2022 and 2022/2023.</p> <p>In 2021/2022, the DLG recorded 119 acres of land under irrigation, i.e., Otuk T/C had 7 acres, Orum S/C – 4.5, Olilim S/C- 15.5, Olilim T/C- 5, Ogwette S/C- 4, Adwari S/C- 10, Okwongo T/C - 4, Adwari T/C – 8, Alango – 18, Okwang- 13, Okwang T/C- 6, Barajobi- 6, Barajobi T/C- 3, and Ogor- 13.</p> <p>In 2022/2023, the DLG recorded 147.5 acres of land under irrigation, i.e., Otuk T/C had 8.5 acres, Orum S/C – 6.0, Olilim S/C- 18.0, Olilim T/C- 9, Ogwette S/C- 5, Adwari S/C- 11, Okwongo T/C - 6, Adwari T/C – 10, Alango – 20, Okwang - 15, Okwang T/C- 7, Barajobi- 8, Barajobi T/C- 4.5, Ogor- 16.5, and two Ugift demonstrations- 3.0 acres.</p> <p>MOUs were presented for the two (2) UgFIT Demo sites that were established in Ogor Seed Sec School (1.5 acres), Ogor S/C, signed on 23rd of June 2023, and a host farmer in Otuke T/C (1.5 acres), signed on 23rd of June 2023."</p>	<b>2</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>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>This district LG had One hundred and nineteen (119) acres of irrigated land in FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>LG presented 147.5 acres of land under irrigation in the FY 2022/2023 making a total of 266.5 acres.</p> <p>Increase in acreage.</p> <p>= (266.5-119)/266.5 (100)</p> <p>= 55.3%</p>	<b>2</b>

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>From the Final results of LLGs presented to the assessment team by OPM, Otuke had Not applicable for the assessment of 2022 while for 2023, the performance was 71%</p>	4
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the development component of the Micro-Scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. The budget performance sections were not populated in the quarterly progress reports and an annual budget performance report was not presented.</p> <p>However, the approved annual work plan and budget FY 2022/2023 that was prepared by the SAO, verified by the DPO, and approved by the CAO, Simon Peter on 07th December 2022. The work plan reveals that.</p> <p>i). Awareness raising of leaders at the parish, LLG, and LG was costed at Ugx 18,676,011 (Less than 15% Max).</p> <p>li). Awareness raising for farmers 40,770,000 ( Less than 40% of the budget)</p> <p>iii). Farm visits cost UGX 23,586,011 (15% Min).</p> <p>iv). Demos, equipment, and machinery cost UGX 43,053,300 (27.30%).</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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>Otuke was a phase II district and was still in its first year of implementation. Therefore, farmer acceptance forms were not yet signed.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Variations in the contract price for the installed demonstration sites were within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates and it was calculated as follows.	1
	Maximum score 6		SAE costed figure = UGX 47,172,222	
			Contractor's costed figure = UGX 43,053,300	
			Percentage Contract Variation = ((Contractor's Costed Figure - SAE Costed Figure)/SAE Costed Figure)X100	
			Percentage Contract Variation = ((43,053,300 - 47,172,222) / 47,172,222)X100	
			Variation ≈ -0.0874×100	
			Percentage Contract Variation≈-8.74%	
			Hence the variation in contract prices was within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	The completion rate for the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation equipment ranged between 80% and 99%. The two planned demonstrations were successfully installed. Supplier contracts were signed on 9th May 2023 between Otuke DLG and Lucky Hands Construction and General Supply Limited, as well as Delex Construction Company Limited. System-generated payment vouchers of Ugx 20,305,000 for Lucky Hands Construction and General Supply Limited and 22,748,300 for Delex Construction Company Limited were processed and paid on 28th June 2023. Goods received notes (GRN) were also on file.	1
	Maximum score 6	<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>	However, manholes and manhole covers were not installed, and completion certificates were not awarded to the contractors.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	The LG-approved staff structure provided for 24 extension worker positions and 18 were filled at the time of assessment	1
	Maximum score 6	<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>	= (18 / 24)*100	
			=75%.	

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>The irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs did not meet 100% standards as defined by MAAIF. Site acreages were in line with MAAIF standards i.e Ogor Seed Sec School (1.5 acres) and host farmer in Otuke T/C (1.5 acres)</p> <p>The three irrigation technologies were demonstrated on the two sites. Sprinkler, drip, and drag hose systems. The two sites were both solar-powered with submersible pumps which were in line with MAAIF standards.</p> <p>Low flow micro sprinkler was installed on 1/2 an acre, storage tank of 5000L, tank stand structure made from Steel, head of 3M, GI pipe of Dia, 40mm for supply and wash outlet. It had 8 sprinkler rise pipes, QRC service saddle, and QRC end caps.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there were deviations from MAAIF specifications. Sprinkler heads were absent and not available in the inventory for Ogor seed school site. The PVC sprinkler risers installed were only 0.5 meters above the ground, falling short of the required standard of no less than 1 meter. Additionally, the sprinkler head on the farmer demonstration site was undersized and did not align with the specifications outlined in the supplier's Bill of Quantities (BOQs).</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the 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 one demo installation was functional, and the other was not.</p> <p>The Ogor Seed Sec School demo site was tested and found functional; however, the sprinkler head had not been installed.</p> <p>The host farmer demo located in Otuke Town Council was installed with underrated sprinkler heads and were not in line with the standard.</p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**



5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information on positions of extension workers filled was accurate. For instance;</p> <p>At Orum sub-county, extension workers included;</p> <p>Adur Isabella, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</p> <p>At Otuke Town Council</p> <p>Ouni Lamech, Veterinary Officer</p> <p>Amongi Evaline Stella, Agriculture Officer</p> <p>At Along sub-County</p> <p>Owiny Jimmy Eron, Agriculture Officer</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>The Goods Received Notes of June 13, 2023, indicated that the supplied equipment underwent inspection and were deemed satisfactory, meeting the specifications outlined in the Bill of Quantities (BOQs). However, upon a site visit, it was observed that the demonstrations were only partially functional, and some of the supplied components, including hydrant assemblies, were not standard.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence indicating the quarterly collection of information on newly irrigated land, the functionality of installed irrigation equipment, the provision of complementary services, and Farmer Expression of Interest (EOI). Furthermore, no quarterly supervision and monitoring reports were presented.</p>	0

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date LLG information entry into MIS.</p> <p>For example, 315 EOI and EOI with prepared farm visits = 110, 73 farm visits, Workshop and seminar held with farmers for awareness raising = 4814</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 316 candidates.</p> <p>SAE 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>	1
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG prepared quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p> <p>Quarterly reports signed by the CAO - Q2 (10th Jan 2022), Q3 (7th April 2023), and Q4 (13th July 2023; - reported late). These reports presented key statistics generated from the MIS dashboard. For instance, graphical data on Expression of Interest (EOIs) per Sub-county and 67 farm visits. The Q4 report included information about eight awareness-raising events conducted in the eight sub-counties and six town councils.</p>	1
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). Otuk is a Phase II district and PIP was only applicable to Phase I districts.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				

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 at Ugx 1,047,000,000/=	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

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

Maximum score 6

ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0

Otuke LG had deployed agricultural extension workers as below;

1. Adur Isabella, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer at Orum Sub County
2. Ouni Lamech, Veterinary Officer at Otuke Town Council
3. Owiny Jimmy Eron, Agriculture Officer in Alango Sub County
4. Adona Bosco, Agriculture Officer in Olilim Sub County
5. Ogwal Benard, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Ogwette Sub County
6. Ogwang Patrick, Veterinary Officer in Olilim Sub County
7. Amongi Evaline Stella, Agriculture Officer Otuke Town Council
8. Akello Sidi, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Otuke Town Council
9. Okello Martin, Agriculture Officer in Barjobi Sub County
10. Area Samuel, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Barjobi Sub County
11. angena Jasper, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Okwango Town Council
12. Otiti Bonny, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Alango Sub County
13. Omara Benson, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Okwang Sub County
14. Obonyo Tony Vincent, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Ogor Sub County
15. Ogwal Charles, Agriculture Officerin Ogor Sub County
16. Bua Geoffery, Agriculture officer in Okwang Sub County
17. Okonye Tonny Odongo, Agriculture officer in Adwari Sub County
18. Odur Daniel, Agriculture Officer in Ogwette Sub County

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the three LLGs visited, there was evidence that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed as below</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>Adur Isabella, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer at Orum Sub County</p>	
			<p>Ouni Lamech, Veterinary Officer at Otuke Town Council</p>	
			<p>Amongi Evaline Stella, Agriculture Officer Otuke Town Council</p>	
			<p>Akello Sidi, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Otuke Town Council</p>	
			<p>Okonye Tonny Odongo, Agriculture officer in Adwari Sub County</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the three LLGs visited, there was evidence that extension workers' deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff lists on the LLG notice board. From the sampled sub-counties, it was found that;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obonyo Tony Vincent, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was in Ogor Sub County</li> <li>2. Ogwal Charles, Agriculture Officer in Ogor Sub County</li> <li>3. Bua Geoffery, Agriculture officer in Okwang Sub County</li> <li>4. Okonye Tonny Odongo, Agriculture officer in Adwari Sub County</li> </ol>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY as below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>		<p>Appraised:</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adona Bosco, Agriculture Officer in Olilim Sub County was appraised on 30th June by Odongo Jimmy Calvin, SAS</li> <li>2. Ogwang Patrick, Veterinary Officer in Olilim Sub County was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Okol Patrick Geroge, Town Clerk. This was late appraisal.</li> <li>3. Amongi Evaline Stella, Agriculture Officer Otuke Town Council was appraised on 3rd July</li> </ol>	

- 2023 by Okol Patrick Geroge, Town Clerk. This was late appraisal
4. Akello Sidi, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Otuke Town Council was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Odong Jimmy Calvin, SAS
  5. Okello Martin, Agriculture Officer in Barjobi Sub County was appraised on 8th July 2023 by Ocaya Christopher, SAS
  6. Angena Jasper, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Okwango Town Council was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Okello Benard, SAS
  7. Otiti Bonny, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Alango Sub County was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Akullo Agnes, SAS. This was late appraisal
  8. Omara Benson, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Okwang Sub County was appraised on 31st June 2023 by Ocaya Christopher, SAS
  9. Owiny Jimmy Eron, Agriculture Officer in Alango Sub County was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Akullo Agnes, SAS. This was late appraisal

#### Not Appraised

1. Adur Isabella, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer at Orum Sub County
2. Ouni Lamech, Veterinary Officer at Otuke Town Council
3. Ogwal Benard, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Ogwette Sub County
4. Area Samuel, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Barjobi Sub County
5. Obonyo Tony Vincent, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer in Ogor Sub County
6. Ogwal Charles, Agriculture Officer in Ogor Sub County
7. Bua Geoffery, Agriculture officer in Okwang Sub County
8. Okonye Tonny Odongo, Agriculture officer in Adwari Sub County
9. Odur Daniel, Agriculture Officer in Ogwette Sub Count

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had taken corrective actions from the appraisals which included training on equipment maintenance, financial management, laboratory techniques, artificial insemination, monitoring and evaluation, IT skills and fisheries & water resource management.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The LG HR department did not provide evidence to show that training activities were conducted for extension workers in accordance to the training plans at District level.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	The LG HR department did not provide evidence to show that training activities were documented in the training database. Some certificates of training were presented for some extension workers for the online courses / modules of Micro-Scale irrigation program.	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The LG had appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services  The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 157,240,075 of which UGX 117,930,056 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 39,310,018 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services.	2
---	--	--	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 which was in phase 2 ,100% micro scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.5,896,502</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.15,724,007</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.11,793,005</p> <p>15% farmer visits was Ushs 5,896,502</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>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>No evidence was provided that the LG used farmer co-funding since they were still in their first year of project implementation.</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>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding e.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awareness creation report (farmer registration) of EOI on irrigation program dated 28th December 2022.</li> <li>2. Progressive report on Ugift expression of interest and farm visit dated 28th June 2023.</li> <li>3. Awareness raising for the LLG at Ogwette Sub County dated 14th December 2022.</li> <li>4. Awareness raising for the LLG at Olilim Sub County dated 15th December 2022.</li> <li>5. Awareness raising for the LLG at Otuke Town Council dated 20th December 2022.</li> <li>6. Awareness raising for the district local government dated 15th January 2023.</li> </ol>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>There was no evidence that the DPO had monitored the installed micro-scale irrigation equipment on a monthly basis.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Otuke DLG was in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	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	There was no evidence that the Local Government (LG) provided hands-on support to the Local Level Government (LLG) extension workers during the implementation of complementary services in the previous financial year. Supervision reports were not on file, and minutes of field meetings were also not documented.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Otuke DLG was in its first year of implementation and had not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines, for example, the awareness-raising reports for the LLGs and Town Councils. These included;  Awareness creation report (farmer registration) of EOI on irrigation program dated 28th December 2022.  Awareness raising for the LLG at Ogwette Sub County dated 14th December 2022.  Awareness raising for the LLG at Olilim Sub County dated 15th December 2022.  Awareness raising for the LLG at Otuke Town Council dated 20th December 2022.	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Evidence was presented about the training of staff and political leaders at the District and LLG levels. forexample an awareness raising for the district local government dated 15th January 2023.	2

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to host farmers/institutions in the previous FY under Ugift Demos. Inventory report dated 25th June 2023 showed inspected supply and installed irrigation system. The goods received note dated 13th June 2023 also showed the quantity received versus the ordered quantities.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file and verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers who submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p> <p>MIS data in the Q4 report (30th June 2023) showed that out of 107 successfully prepared farm visits, only 67 farm visits had been done by the end of the previous FY.</p> <p>Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) dated 7th December 2023 in the current financial year approved/mandated the production department to proceed with the implementation of the program to the approved farmers.</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>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no information found on the LLG noticeboards publicizing eligible farmer approval.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	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.	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were not planned for and incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY, that was signed on 5th July, 2023 by the D/CAO, Ingoi James.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	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	Although the LG did not request for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). They did get quotation from pre-qualified suppliers of the district, who had been approved by the contracts committee on 12th September, 2023. The quotations were got from these companies; M/s. Lucky hand construction and general supply and M/s. Delex construction company limited.	2
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	There was evidence that the LG concluded the selection of irrigation equipment suppliers based on the set criteria of awarding the contract to the lowest bidder, when the contract was awarded to Delex construction company limited who quoted Ugx 22,748,300/= as compared to Bakatola Enterprises who quoted Ugx 22,873,380/= that was higher.	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 was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee. The Contracts Committee did so in their sitting of 27th April, 2023 and approved the supply and establishment Micro-scale irrigation systems in minute CC/05/04/2023.	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 that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier. The contract was signed with M/s. Delex construction company limited who quoted Ugx 22,748,300/= the lower of the two companies as required by the sector guidelines as compared to Bakatola who quoted Ugx 22,873,380/=.	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence presented that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed were in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App).	2
	Maximum score 18		This is because the DLG was in its first year of implementation, and for all Ugift demonstrations, the DLG received approved designs from MAAIF that they customized to fit site conditions and specifications.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Evidence was presented indicating that the Local Government (LG) conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects through relevant technical officers. For instance, a monitoring report on the establishment and management of microscale irrigation demonstration dated 14th July 2023 by DAO, DPO, and internal auditors. Monitoring report dated 12th June 2023 under the Production department in quarter four of the financial year 2022/2023.	2
	Maximum score 18		The LG was using visitors books on the two sites because Ugift site books were not provided by MAAIF.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG oversaw the irrigation equipment testing for functionality.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	There was no evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during the handover of the equipment to the approved farmer.	0
	Maximum score 18		However, DAO presented a payment voucher for the contract, dated 28th June 2023 for the supply and installation of MSI equipment.	
			The handover had not been done yet (less than 6 months after installation).	

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>The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) observed that the Local Government (LG) was in the first year of implementing the micro-scale irrigation project. While approved farmers have been identified for co-funding, the arrangements are not yet operational.</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 with a document as required by the PPDA law</p> <p>Project: Establishment of irrigation demonstration for drag and sprinkler in Ogor sub-county</p> <p>Procurement ref: OTUK915/supp/2022-2023/00008</p> <p>had these documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed contract dated 9th May, 2023 with Delex Construction company limited</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 26th April, 2023</li> <li>• Contracts committee minutes dated 27th April, 2023</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

**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>The LG did not display a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework. There were no GRM displayed in the multiple public areas such Production department noticeboard, and the LLG noticeboards.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complaint raised by the District Board of Governors on the relocation of the micro-scale irrigation project under unclear circumstances that had been planned for the community of Okum Seed Secondary school to the Otuke Town Council was handled in Grievances Redress Committee (GRC) meeting held at the District Council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.</p>	<b>1</b>
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complaint raised by the District Board of Governors on the relocation of the micro-scale irrigation project under unclear circumstances that had been planned for the community of Okum Seed Secondary school to the Otuke Town Council was handled in Grievances Redress Committee (GRC) meeting held at the District Council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.</p>	<b>1</b>
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complaint raised by the District Board of Governors on the relocation of the micro-scale irrigation project under unclear circumstances that had been planned for the community of Okum Seed Secondary school to the Otuke Town Council was handled in Grievances Redress Committee (GRC) meeting held at the District Council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.</p>	<b>1</b>
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a complaint raised by the District Board of Governors on the relocation of the micro-scale irrigation project under unclear circumstances that had been planned for the community of Okum Seed Secondary school to the Otuke Town Council was handled in Grievances Redress Committee (GRC) meeting held at the District Council Hall on 9th March, 2023 Min 3/9/03/2023: communication from the chair and Min. 6/9/03/2023: discussion and way forward.</p>	<b>1</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 that LGs disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to farmers to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals, and safe disposal of chemical waste containers. The LG disseminated the following guidelines.  Micro-scale irrigation program improving farmers' livelihood guide for farmers dated April, 2023 part 1 and 2.  UgIFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program Improving Farmers' Livelihood Technical Guidelines version 3, April 2023.  A report dated 30th June 2023 on environmental and social issues at Micro-scale irrigation sites in Ogor Seed Secondary School and a host farmer site in Ocuricak cell village.	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	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening were carried out and ESMPs developed by the Environment Officer and the CDO prior to installation of irrigation equipment for the project sites below;  1. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023  2. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ocuricak village prepared on 1st June, 2023  And the respective ESMPs were prepared as listed below;  1. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023  2. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ocuricak village prepared on 6th June, 2023	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was evidence on monitoring report dated 30th June, 2023 for the micro-scale irrigation sites at Ogor seed secondary and Ocuricak Cell.	1



15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	There were no files availed on certification forms from the irrigation projects to verify whether the Environmental Officer completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	<b>0</b>
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	There were no files availed on certification forms from the irrigation projects to verify whether the CDO completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	<b>0</b>

**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 neither substantively appointed a Chief Finance Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	<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.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Etil Tom was substantively appointed as District Planner on 23rd January 2019 under Minute no. 84/2018.	<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 nor was there a seconded staff.	<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	Ebong Boniface was substantively appointed as Natural Resources Officer on 29th June 2020 under Minute no. DSC 69/OTDSC/2020.	<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	Anyuru Thomas was substantively appointed as District Production Officer on 1st November 2018 under DSC Minute no. 57(IV)/2018.	<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	Ocen Silvester was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer on 1st November 2018 under DSC Minute no. 57(III)/2018.	<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	Okello Emmanuel was substantively appointed as District Commercial Officer on 12th June 2023 under DSC Minute no. 25.1/OTDSC/23.	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.	Achiro Juliet Ekut was substantively appointed as Senior Procurement Officer on 23rd January 2019 under DSC Minute No.87(I)/2018.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Atim Jemimah was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer on 12th June 2023 under DSC Minute no. 25.10(i)/OTDSC/23.	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	Ochen Jackson Okoth was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer on 29th April 2019 under DSC Minute no. 6(f)/2019.	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	Onyanga Patrick was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 29th June 2020 under DSC Minute no. 70/OTDSC/2020.	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	Nyengo Richard was substantively appointed as Physical Planner on 25th March 2014 under DSC Minute no. 49/2014.	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	Ogang Patrick was substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 31.2/OTDSC/22.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	Kamala Francis was substantively appointed as Principal Internal Auditor on 25th January 2022 under Minute no. DSC 3/OTDSC/22.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Ogwang Florence was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 27/OTDSC/22.	2
2	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	a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).	The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerks (Town Councils) in 9 LLGS as below;  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ayo Francis- Olilim Town Council was appointed on 7th September 2022 under Minute no. 48.1/OTDSC/22</li> <li>2. Odongo Moses Okwiri- Barjobi Sub County was appointed on 22nd May 2019 under Minute no. 10.13.5/2019</li> <li>3. Ochen Duke Adupa- Ogor Sub County was appointed on 25th August 2019 under Minute no. DSC.15.5.8/2019(ii)</li> <li>4. Okello Benard- Adwari Sub County was appointed on 21st May 2019 under Minute no. 10.13.5/2019</li> <li>5. Okol Patrick George- Otuke Town Council was appointed on 17th June 2020 under Minute no. 63/OTDSC/2020</li> <li>6. Ocaya Christopher- Ogwette Sub County was appointed on 29th June 2020 under Minute no. DSC 26.2/OTDSC/22</li> <li>7. Odongo Jimmy Calvin- Okwang Sub County was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 26.1/OTDSC/22</li> <li>8. Odongo Richard-Adwari Town Council was appointed on 23rd January 2019 under Minute no. 83/2018</li> <li>9. Acuma Francis- Okwang Town Council was appointed on 7th September 2022 under Minute no. DSC 48.2/OTDSC/22</li> </ol>	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed Community Development Officers / Senior CDOs in case of Town Councils, in 9 LLGS as below;

1. Omara Patrick - Adwari Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.11(i)/OTDSC/23
2. Oluge Elvis- Barjobi Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.11(ii)/OTDSC/23
3. Amongi Sarah- Alango Sub County was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 40.4/OTDSC/22
4. Ogwang Vincent- Olilim Town Council was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 38.4/OTDSC/22
5. Akullu Joy- Okwang Sub County was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 40.2/OTDSC/22
6. Amuge Eveline- Orum Sub County was appointed on 23rd May 2019 under Minute no. 20(c).5/2019
7. Anila Judith- Barjobi Town Council was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 38.1/OTDSC/22
8. Adyeny Moses- Adwari Town Council was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 38.2/OTDSC/22
9. Ogwal Joel Omara- Otuke Town Council was appointed on 29th June 2022 under Minute no. DSC 38.5/OTDSC/22

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 14 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants /Accounts Assistants in 8 LLGS as below;

1. Ojom Bosco- Orum Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 26.6(i)/OTDSC/23
2. Nakirya Suzan- Otuke Town Council was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.9(vi)/OTDSC/23
3. Apio Stella-Alango Sub County was appointed on on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.6(ii)/OTDSC/23
4. Along Amos- Otuke Town Council was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.9(iv)/OTDSC/23
5. Opeta Brenda- Okwang Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.6(iv)/OTDSC/23
6. Lwak Bonny- Olilim Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.9(iii)/OTDSC/23
7. Ongom Walter- Adwari Sub County was appointed on 12th June 2023 under Minute no. 25.6(iii)/OTDSC/23
8. Chagara Tom-Barjobi Sub County was appointed on 26th July 2012 under Minute no.118.2/2012

### 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 100% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;

The Budgeted amount was UGX 761,431,904

Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 758,271,878 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 15).

(UGX 758,271,878 /761,431,904)\*100= 100%.

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 36% for community-based service as per the computation below;	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	The warranted amount was UGX 285,280,865	
		score 2 or else 0.	The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 240,994,971 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 15).	
			(UGX 240,994,971 /UGX 285,280,865)*100=84%	
			This gives a variance of UGX 44,285,891. Therefore, the released was; 84%.	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,	There was no screening carried out for Environmental, Social and Climate Change of DDEG projects for the previous FY because they were not budgeted for. However, there was an already phased DDEG project that had been carried out in the previous but one FY. The DDEG project that was still being implemented in the previous FY was the partial Construction of the Main Administration Block, Phase VII at Ushs 64,114,000.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	Since there was no screening of DDEG projects in the previous FY therefore no ESIAs were relevance.	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);;	Since there was no screening of DDEG projects in the previous FY therefore no costed ESMPs were prepared.	4
---	---	--	---	---

Maximum score is 12

**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;	Otuke LG had unqualified audit opinion for FY 2022/2023	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 25th November 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	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 4th July 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		



8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year  maximum score 4 or else 0	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,  score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 10th August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.	4
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year  Maximum score is 4	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,  score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;  Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 28th December 2022  Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 26th February 2023  Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 17th May 2023  Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 10th August 2023  From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.	4

**Education 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 substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Otuke LG had neither substantively appointed a District Education Officer nor was seconded staff.	<b>0</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.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Otuke LG had substantively appointed District Inspector of Schools as below;  <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Acheng Lucy was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 28th May 2021 under Minute no. DSC 13/OTDSC/21.</li><li>2. Akwar Markdonald was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools on 30th May 2018 under Minute no.50/2018.</li><li>3. Areng Bosco was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools on 30th May 2018 under Minute no. DSC 41.(b).v./OTDSC/23</li></ol>	<b>40</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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)

The Maximum score is 30

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 carried out by the Environment Officer and CDO for the following Education sector investments;

1. Construction of a twin staff houses, and 2 stance latrine and kitchen at Acan Pii primary school prepared on 20th April, 2023

2. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school prepared on 12th February, 2023

3. Construction of a twin staff house, kitchen and 2 stance latrine at Okee primary school prepared on 25th February, 2023

4. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school at 12th February, 2023

5. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023

And the respective ESMPs were prepared and implemented;

1. Construction of a twin staff house, kitchen and 2 stance latrine at Okee primary school prepared on 28th February, 2023

2. Construction of a twin staff houses, and 2 stance latrine and kitchen at Acan Pii primary school prepared on 23rd April, 2023

3. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school at 12th February, 2023

4. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023

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)

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

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

**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.	<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 neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing nor was there a seconded staff.	<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>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Opio Patrick was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health on 29th April 2019 under Minute No. 6(a)/2019.	<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.	Okello Jasper was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 25th January 2022 under Minute No. DSC 8/OTDSC/22.	<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>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	Omonya Basil was substantively appointed as Senior Health Educator on 12th June 2023 under Minute No. 25.4/OTDSC/23.	<b>10</b>

- 1 New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. Abot Delis was substantively appointed as Biostatistician on 23rd May 2017 under Minute No. 37/2017.

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. Odora Samuel was substantively appointed as District Cold Chain Technician on 29th April 2019 under Minute No. 6(d)2019.

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

- 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	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p>	<p>If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for all Health sector projects for the current FY, in spite of the fact that they were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were the projects that should have been screened;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score is 30</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pipe water connection to theater at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 130,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>2. Construction of a theater at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 500,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>3. Construction of General ward at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 300,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>4. Construction of an incinerator at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 12,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>5. Construction of a 4 stance drainable Pit latrine at Barjobi HC III at UGX. 42,000,000 under Transitional CG- Development grant</li> <li>6. Construction of a twin staff house at Alango HC II at UGX. 76,000,000 under CG Grant - Development grant</li> <li>7. Construction of a twin staff house at Alango HC II at UGX. 20,898,000 CG Grant - Development grant</li> <li>8. Construction of a mortuary at Orum HC IV at UGX. 40,000,000 under DDEG</li> <li>9. Fencing of Orum HC IV at UGX. 13,274,000 CG Grant - Development grant</li> </ol>	
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Since no screening had been carried out therefore, ESIAs were not relevant because ascertaining projects that would qualify for ESIA necessitates screening to be done first.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score is 30</p>			

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions**

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

**Human Resource Management and Development**

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Okoch Dennis was substantively appointed as Senior Agricultural Engineer on 12th June 2023.</p>	<b>70</b>
---	---	---	--	-----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the irrigation projects as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023</li> <li>2. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ocuricak village prepared on 1st June, 2023</li> </ol> <p>The respective ESMPs were prepared as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ogor seed secondary school prepared on 1st June, 2023</li> <li>2. Micro-scale irrigation projects at Ocuricak village prepared on 6th June, 2023</li> </ol> <p>However, the projects that were implemented in the irrigation sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.</p>	<b>30</b>
---	---	--	--	-----------

**Water & Environment  
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.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Obong Lawrence was substantively appointed as Senior Civil Engineer on 25th January 2022 under Minute no. DSC 12/OTDSC/2022.	<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.	Okello Joel was substantively appointed as Assistant Engineering Officer (Water) on 10th March 2015 under Minute no. 13/2015.	<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>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Odongo Geoffrey was substantively appointed as Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer on 25th March 2014 under Minute no. 50/2014.	<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.	Ebong Boniface was substantively appointed as Natural Resources Officer on 29th June 2020 under Minute no. DSC 69/OTDSC/2020.	<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.	Awor Anna Mary was substantively appointed as Environment Officer on 28th May 2021 under Minute no. DSC 10/OTDSC/21.	<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>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Ocen Isaac was substantively appointed as Forestry Officer on 28th May 2021 under Minute no. DSC 9/OTDSC/21.	<b>10</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**



2

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

If the LG:

a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY below;

1. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school prepared on 12th February, 2023
2. Drilling and installation of deep boreholes at Acungapenyi village, Adyerakunya, Adwari sub-county prepared on 24th January, 2023
3. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Amukugungu village, Adwari prepared on 26th January, 2023
4. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Ajuka village, Alango sub county prepared on 27th January, 2023
5. Drilling and installation of deep borehole at Abua village prepared on 7th February, 2023
6. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Abilyero prepared on 8th February, 2023.
7. Drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Okum seed secondary school at 12th February, 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 they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning

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 presented for assessment. The District Water Officer confirmed that there was no abstraction permit issued to them by the MoWE.