



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Soroti city

(Vote Code: 859)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	70%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	72%
Health Performance Measures	56%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	2%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**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>Soroti City implemented one project that was funded by USMID in FY 2022/2023. The project had three sub components namely Upgrading of Haridas Road, School Road and Edyagu Road. The project was budgeted for shs 17,564,686,087 as per city approved budget page 32, page 9 of the AWP and page 108 per city DDP III. The project was functional and utilised for the purpose intended.</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>In 2022, Soroti City did not conduct the LLG performance assessment and in 2023, the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment was 81%. The variance couldn't be computed and the average score in 2023 was less than 95%.</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>Soroti City implemented one project that was funded by USMID in FY 2022/2023. The project had three sub components namely Upgrading of Haridas Road, School Road and Edyagu Road. The project was budgeted for shs 17,564,686,087 as per city approved budget page 32, page 9 of the AWP and page 108 per city DDP III. The project was completed during FY 2022/2023 and total expenditure on the project amounted to shs 19,941,389,391 as per page 34 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023. The city received supplementary budget to complete the project of shs 2,376,703,304.</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:	The City budgeted shs 17,564,686,087 and spent all the USMID funds in FY 2022/2023 totalling shs 19,941,389,391 on eligible projects/activities as per the USMID grant, budget and implementation guidelines. The city sought supplementary budget of shs 2,376,703,304 from USMID in order to top up the original budgeted amount of shs 17,564,686,087.	2
		Score 2 or else score 0.		
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,	The percentage contract price variation for all the USMID-funded project was within the +/-20% of the Engineer's estimates, as indicated below for the respective project contracts.	2
		score 2 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tarmacking of Haridas road, Edyegu road and School road in Soroti city (MOLHUD/USMID/WRKS/2019/2020/00653). Contract price = 17,564,686,087 Estimated cost = 19,000,000,000 Percentage contract variation = -7.55%</li> <li>• Installation of additional 255 units of solar street lights in Soroti city (MOLHUD/USMID/WRKS/2019/2020/00653). Contract price = 2,550,000,000 Estimated cost = 2,550,000,000 Percentage contract variation = 0%</li> <li>• Design review and construction supervision of USMID road works in Soroti City Council (Soro763/USMID/SRVCS/2019/2020/00050) Contract price = 1,054,920,000 Estimated cost = 1,000,000,000 Percentage contract variation = 5.49%</li> </ul> <p>This project was started in the FY2019/2020 through FY2020/2021 and up to the FY 2022/2023 by Dott Services as the contractors.</p>	

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information on the positions filled in Divisions as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. In the two Divisions visited, data obtained indicated as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West Division, the approved staff structure provided for Town Clerk and as per the staff list, this position had been filled by Ochengel Badiru in Acting capacity</li> <li>2. East Division, the approved structure provided for Senior Assistant Accountant and this position was filled by Oluca Aloysius</li> </ol>	2
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>Soroti City implemented one project that was funded by USMID in FY 2022/2023. The project had three sub components namely Upgrading of Haridas Road, School Road and Edyagu Road. The project was budgeted for shs 17,564,686,087 as per city approved budget page 32, page 9 of the AWP and page 108 per city DDP III and expenditure totalled shs 19,941,389,391 after the city received a supplementary budget of shs 2,376,703,304</p>	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>	<p>The LG did not conduct a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise. One LLG (Eastern Div) had a deviation greater than +-10%, as indicated below.</p> <p>Eastern Division scored 79% as per the LG, 95% as per the IVA and gave a variance of 16%.</p> <p>Westen Division scored 82% as per the LG, 81% as per the IVA and gave a variance of -1%.</p>	0

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

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY 2024/25 to the MoPS by 30th September of the current FY. Evidence obtained from HRM revealed that the recruitment plan and requisition of wage funds dated 2/10//2023 worth 2,012,100,132/= was submitted to PS but date for acknowledgement of receipt of submission was 3/10/2023</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted daily tracking of attendance and analysis</p>	0

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted appraisal for all HODs. For details, see findings below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ikiring Betty Osako (Ag.CHO) was appraised on 3/7/2023</li> <li>2. Kokoi Rosset Stella (CPO) was appraised on 6/10/2023. The rest were all not appraised and they include;</li> <li>3. Oryokot Abraham (CFO)</li> <li>4. Kairu Robert (City Eng)</li> <li>5. Iteba Andrew (Snr. Planner)</li> <li>6. Emokor Patty (CEO)</li> <li>7. Engulo Eric Paul (Snr. NRO)</li> <li>8. Aremu Simon (Internal Auditor)</li> <li>9. Asekenye Damali (PCDO)</li> <li>10. Tukei William George (CCO)</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG implemented administrative rewards and sanctions. The rewards and sanctions Committee was established and composed of 5 members as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obore James Peter (DCity Clerk) Chairperson</li> <li>2. Emuru Lister (PHRO)</li> <li>3. Asekenye Damali (CCDO)</li> <li>4. Ikiring Betty Osaka (CHO)</li> <li>5. Emokor Patty (CEO)</li> <li>6. Aremu Simon (SIA)</li> <li>7. Oryokot Abraham (PA)</li> </ol> <p>The committee held a meeting on 10/08/2023 in City Clerk Office. The meeting was held to listen to Akello Regina Deputy Town Clerk, West Division who had been on interdiction from 31/01/2023 following an allegation that she misappropriated 52,000,000 for DDEG. The committee resolved to re-instate her to the position on condition that she refunds 47,712,619.</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of establishment of consultative committee</p>	0

8	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 City did not recruit any staff in the FY 2022/23	1
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	The city retired 13 staff but only 30% accessed pension payroll within two months from the date of retirement. They included;  1. Okello Robert (AIO) retired on 30/5/2023 and accessed pension in June 2023  2. Agunyo Annunciata (EA) retired on 25/3/2023 and accessed pension in May 2023  3. Atepu Emeriono (TA) retired 1/8/2022 and accessed pension in October 2023  4. Wanasolo Jimmy (AEO) retired on 18/1/2023 and accessed pension in March 2023. The rest didn't and they include;  5. Amukade Florence (Stenographer) retired on 3/3/2023 and accessed pension in June 2023  6. Imalingat Francis (AEO) retired 4/5/1963 and accessed pension in June 2023  7. Okello Bernard (EA) retired 22/10/2022 and accessed pension in June 2023  8. Aterar Justine (EA) retired 2/10/2022 and accessed pension in June 2023  9. Ongona Ecou (DHT) retired 12/9/2022 and accessed pension in June 2023  10. Areet James (DHT) retired 3/10/2022 and accessed pension in June 2023  11. Oriokot Joyce Mary (DHT) retired 29/11/1962 and accessed pension in June 2023  12. Arionget Elizabeth (HT) retired 9/10/2022 and accessed pension June 2023  13. Okiria Martin Obore (HT) retired 2/4/2022 and accessed pension in May 2023	0

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

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because Soroti acquired city status and therefore under funding by USMID.	0
----	--	--	--	---

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	The City did not receive funding from USMID during quarter three and quarter four in FY 2022/2023. In quarter one the City received communication from PS/ST on cash limits on 14th July, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01.Warranting was done on 18th July, 2022. Invoicing was done on 18th July, 2022. Transfers to divisions was done on 21st July, 2022. Communication to divisions by the TC was done on 22nd July, 2022.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	In quarter three, the City received communication from PS/ST on cash limits on 4th January, 2023 under reference BPD/102/155/01.Warranting was done on 9th January, 2023. Invoicing was done on 12th January, 2023. Transfers to divisions was done on 12th January, 2023. Communication to divisions by the TC was done on 16th January, 2023.	
			The City did timely (5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED).	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	The City invoiced and communicated all USMID funding in FY 2022/2023 divisions within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter as required.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	There was no evidence that Soroti City supervised or mentored the two divisions; West and East Divisions in at least once per quarter consistent as per guidelines. No reports were compiled in FY 2022/2023 to indicate that the two divisions were supervised and mentored	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		



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	In absence of the mentoring and supervision reports, scrutiny of the minutes of the City TPC for FY 2022/2023 did not indicate that supervision and mentoring reports were discussed to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow up.	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**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>	Soroti City maintained an up dated register to 31st October, 2023. All categories of assets like buildings, furniture, equipment, land, motor cycles, graders and garbage trucks were captured in the computerised assets register under IFMS. Examples: (i) Photo copier valued at shs 4,000,000 for the Engineering Department referenced USMID-WORKS-PC 0001. (ii) Pick up double cabin valued at shs 185,000,000 under the TC's Office Administration registration number LG 0020 - 132.  (iii) Garbage truck self loader valued at shs 280,000,000 for the Natural Resources Department registration number LG 0003-132 referenced CAC -001197.  The City complied with guidelines on the assets register issued by the Accountant General MOFPED.	<b>2</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	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:  Score 1 or else 0	The Board of Survey report for Soroti City for FY 2021/2022 was submitted to the Accountant General through the Town Clerk's letter dated 23rd August, 2022 under reference CR/SC/151/4. The TC's letter was copied to PS MOLG, Mayor and OAG. The letter was acknowledged by MOFPED on 24th August, 2022  Recommendations that were raised in the Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 included among others engraving of the district assets, updating of the assets registers and titling of the land owned by the city. 90% of the recommendations had been cleared at the time of the assessment.	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.

There was a functional Physical Planning Committee that was constituted and appointed by the Town Clerk with 7 members as per the Physical Planning (Amendment) Act 2020 section 13(a)-(f). The committee convened meetings on quarterly basis. Meetings were held as detailed below and accordingly submitted to MLHUD as provided hereunder.

In quarter one, the Physical Planning Committee met on 5th August, 2022 and minutes were submitted on 17th July, 2023 Ref No CR/SCPP/207 as stipulated in section 17 (3) of the physical planning act;

In quarter two, the Committee met on 9th December, 2022 and minutes were submitted on 17th July, 2023 Ref No CR/SCPP/207 as stipulated in section 17 (3) of the physical planning act;

In quarter three, the Committee met on 20th February, 2023 and minutes were submitted on 17th July, 2023 Ref No CR/SCPP/207 as stipulated in section 17 (3) of the physical planning act;

In quarter four, the Committee met on 6th April, 2023 and minutes were submitted on 17th July, 2023 Ref No CR/SCPP/207 as stipulated in section 17 (3) of the physical planning act.

Members of the Physical Planning Committee were appointed by the Town Clerk vide letter dated 1st July, 2021 referenced CR/SC/200/4. The members:

1. The Town Clerk and Chairperson.
2. Physical Planner
3. Surveyor
4. Environment officer
5. Engineer
6. Public health inspector
7. Architect

There was evidence that the Physical Development Plan was in place dated 20/June/2008 DWG No. SMC/PSP/ISP/2007/08 although it was outdated

The Building Plan Registration Book was in place and up dated to 21st June, 2022.

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>Soroti City implemented one project that was funded by USMID in FY 2022/2023. The project had three sub components namely Upgrading of Haridas Road, School Road and Edyagu Road. The project was budgeted for shs 17,564,686,087 as per city approved budget page 32, page 9 of the AWP and page 108 per city DDP III. Total expenditure was shs 19,941,389,391 as detailed in the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The desk appraisal report was dated 26th June, 2022 whereas the field appraisal report was dated 26th July,2022.</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>Technical feasibility, environmental, social acceptability and customized design for investment projects were addressed.</p> <p>Soroti City conducted the appraisal reports as follows:</p> <p>Field report dated 26th July, 2022 and desk report dated 26th July, 2022. Environmental issues were adequately covered as there was only one project funded under USMID.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The City implemented one project funded by USMID in current FY 2023/2024 namely street lighting in selected roads in the city: Solot Avenue, Adams Avenue, Market Street, Mosque Road, Pamba Road, Station Road, Fr Griffin Road, Professor Omaswa Road and Lira Road which was budgeted at shs 2,550,000,000 as detailed on page 36 of the city approved budget for FY 2023/2024. The project was captured on page 107 of the DDP III and page 7 of the AWP for FY 2023/2024.</p> <p>The desk and field appraisal reports for the project were dated 26th July, 2023.</p> <p>The project profiles with costing were developed and discussed by the city TPC in a meeting held on 28th February, 2023 under minute reference MIN 75/SCC/TPC/2023 departmental reports.</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 City implemented one project funded by USMID in current FY 2023/2024 namely street lighting in selected roads in the city: Solot Avenue, Adams Avenue, Market Street, Mosque Road, Pamba Road, Station Road, Fr Griffin Road, Professor Omaswa Road and Lira Road which did not require E&amp;S Screening</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City incorporated all the FY 2023/2024 USMID infrastructure projects in the City approved procurement plan approved on 14th/07/ 2023 as indicated on pages 3/6 of the procurement plan. Such planned projects included the supply and installation of street lights in the city at a planned cost of Ugx 3,000,000,000</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>The contracts committee of Soroti City approved the USMID infrastructure project (supply and installation of street lights in the city) for the FY 2023/2024 under minute number 3(a) of the minutes of the contracts committee dated 12th/09/2023.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	Soroti City did not properly establish the Project Implementation team for the FY 2022/2023 USMID infrastructure project. The appointment letter by the Town clerk dated 24th/10/2020 indicated the appointment of Eng. John Bigabwa as the project manager , appointment letter dated 27th/10/20220 indicated the appointment of Mr.Adutu George as the Environment officer and the appointment letter dated 22nd/10/2020 indicated the appointment of Mr.Alajo Hellen as the CDO. However, there was no evidence of appointment of contract manager, Clerk of works and Labour officer on the team	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	The USMID implemented road project (Tarmacking of Haridas road for 0.842Km, School road for 0.862Km and Edyegu road for 0.693Km) followed the road technical designs. The overall roadway width was 17.35m for Edyegu road, 13.85m for Haridas road and School road as per the approved designs, the drive lanes for all the three roads was 3.25m with walkways of 2m width . Reinforced concrete box culverts of 900mm diameter were installed at different road sections as per the designs and there were no progressive cracks, Ruts, road surface bleeding, potholes and among other failures were identified during the field road inspection.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	The Soroti City relevant technical officers provided supervision for the Tarmacking of the three city roads (Haridas road, School road and Edyegu road) as evidenced in the minutes of site meetings dated 18th/03/2022 and 22nd/02/2022 attended by the City CDO, City Environment officer and City Engineer. Also the Health and safety, social and Environment reports for the months of January 2022, July 2022, August 2022, September 2022 and October 2022 and the supervision report for quarter 4 of the FY 2022/2023 dated 30/6/2023 indicated the participation of all the relevant technical officers.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The Soroti city works department certified the road works on August 2, 2022, as per the substantial completion certificate. The payment requests by the contractor were made on August 24, 2022, as per the payment request letter, but the payment was made on March 15, 2023, two months later than the certification and payment request dates as per the payment certificate dated March 15, 2023.	0

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 City procurement unit had a complete procurement file for the implemented USMID project of the Tarmacking of the three City roads (Tarmacking of Haridas road for 0.842Km, School road for 0.862Km and Edyegu road for 0.693Km) as per the PPDA law.  The file had the evaluation report dated 23rd/06/2020 with Dott Services Limited as the best evaluated bidder at a contract price of 17,564,686,087, the minutes of contracts committee decision dated 25th/11/2020 was on file and lastly the works contract signed on 19th/10/2020 was also on file.	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.  Score: 2 or else score 0	The City had designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance / complaints) as evidenced by the Appointment letter of Mr Amolo Moses the Health Inspector by the City Town Clerk on 05/09/2022, Ref CR/SC/161/03  The City had also established a Central Grievance Redress Committee as evidenced by the appointment letters of the 6 committee members by the City Town Clerk on 07/07/2022 as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Okaja Emmanuel – Committee Chairperson</li> <li>• Mr Amolo Moses – Committee Secretary</li> <li>• Ms Akello Stella - Committee Member</li> <li>• Mr Oranit Samuel – Committee Member</li> <li>• Ms Onabo Judith - Committee Member</li> <li>• Mr Ochengel Badiru - Committee Member</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	The City had a specified system for Recording, investigating and responding to grievances as evidenced by the Grievance Log availed as a picfare book for all departments coded “Complaints Register-Soroti” in black ink	<b>2</b>

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	The City had no list of Grievance handling mechanism and reporting publicized on the district notice board by the Grievance Focal Person	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	The City Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets could not be accessed	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	The City had not disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines to the Divisions	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):	The City had incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plan (ESMP) into the design. BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for the only USMID infrastructure project for FY 2022/2023, other than health, education, water, and irrigation evidenced by Item 1700.00 (Environmental protection and waste disposal) at 360M and Item 18.2 of the BoQs in the bidding document for the construction works for Roads sub projects in Soroti under USMID-AF Cluster 2, Procurement Reference MLHUD/USMID/WRKS/19-20/00653 by Dott Services (Volume 2)	3
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:		
		score 3 or else score 0		

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	The City had an example of project with costing of the additional impact from climate change as evidenced by Item 1700.00 (Environmental protection and waste disposal) at 360M and Item 18.2 of the BoQs in the bidding document for the construction works for Roads sub projects in Soroti under USMID-AF Cluster 2, Procurement Reference MLHUD/USMID/WRKS/19-20/00653 by Dott Services (Volume 2)	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	N/A because only road infrastructure projects were executed under USMID in FY 2022/2023 which were already existing	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	The City EO and PCDO conducted support supervision and monitoring evidenced by the ESHS Monitoring Reports for the Construction of sub projects in Soroti City under USMID-AF Cluster2 Batch 1 (Haridas Road, School Road and Edyegu Road) on the following dates; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14/11/2022</li> <li>• 13/10/2022</li> <li>• 21/09/2022</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that E& S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and PCDO	<b>0</b>
<b>Financial management</b>				
16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	Soroti City operated one bank account namely the General Fund Account  Number 9039917808477 with Stanbic Bank Soroti branch. The account was reconciled up to 30th September, 2023 with a balance of shs 19,756,939.	<b>2</b>



17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City produced four quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2022/2023 as required. The quarterly reports were addressed to the speaker and copied to Mayor, chair person City PAC, RCC, TC, OAG, MOFPED, MOLG and IAG.</p> <p>Quarter One report was produced on 31st October, 2022. The report had six queries.</p> <p>Quarter Two report was produced on 15th January, 2023. The report had seven queries.</p> <p>Quarter Three report was produced on 28th April, 2023. The report had five queries.</p> <p>Quarter Four report was produced on 15th August, 2023. The report had four queries.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City provided information to the Council! Chairperson and the City PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023; information on follow-up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports as per evidence provided below:</p> <p>Internal Auditor's letter to City PAC dated 4th August, 2023 in respect of the recommendations and action required contained in the quarterly internal audit reports that was copied to chairperson City PAC, Mayor and TC.</p> <p>Internal Auditor's letter to the chairperson PAC dated 2nd November, 2023 in response to internal audit queries that were raised during FY 2022/2023. The letter was copied to the Chairperson, City PAC, TC, IAG, and MOFPED. All queries raised by the Internal Auditor for action had been cleared at the time of the assessment.</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>Internal audit reports for the previous FY 2022/2023 were submitted to the City Accounting Officer, City PAC and that City PAC reviewed them and followed-up. Although the City PAC was established in Soroti City it was not fully functional. The committee did not meet on quarterly basis as required for unknown reasons. For example, the City PAC convened a meeting on 21st December, 2022 but no report was compiled on recommendations raised by the Internal Auditor for consideration of the Council. Scrutiny of minutes of Council meetings that were held on 28th September, 2022; 20th December, 2022, 30th March, 2023 and 30th May, 2023 revealed no action of Council on recommendations of either the Internal Auditor or the City PAC.</p>	0

**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>Soroti City planned for collection of local revenue amounting to shs 3,260,000,000 as provided on page 8 of the city draft accounts for FY 2022/2023. The city realised shs 1,559,683,206 on closure of FY 2022/2023 as indicated on page 8 of the draft final accounts of the city. This was equivalent to 47% performance.</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>Soroti City realised shs 1,559,683,206 on closure of FY 2022/2023 as indicated as per the draft final accounts page 8 of the city. In FY 2021/2022, the city realised shs 519,525,367 as per audited accounts of the city for FY 2021/2022 page eight. the percentage increase was 200.2% more than 10%. the low performance in the FY 2021/2022 was due to the Covid effect.</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 local revenue amount transferrable to the City Divisions in FY 2022/2023 was shs 1,559,683,206 as per page 28 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023. Examples of local revenue that was transferred to divisions</p> <p>(i) Shs 40,814,606 was transferred to the East Division as per payment voucher number 6440365 dated 28th June, 2023 as the division's 50% share.</p> <p>(ii) Shs 11,814,479 was transferred to the West Division as per payment voucher number 5853325 dated 28th June, 2023 as the 50% share.</p> <p>(iii) The East Division received shs 79,164,938 as per payment voucher number 4280554 dated 16th March, 2023 as the 50% share.</p> <p>(iv) West Division received shs 26,105,177 as per payment voucher number 4280555 dated 16th March, 2023 as the 50% share.</p>	2

## Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	The contract awards were done by the MOLHUD and so the City had no evidence of publication of the awarded contracts.	<b>0</b>
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	The City performance results for FY 2021/2022 were publicised as required on various notice boards at the city headquarters and the two divisions; West and East as per City Planner's circular letter dated 19th August, 2023 under reference CR/22/41 to the TC. The city had a website in place.	<b>2</b>
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	There was no evidence that the City during FY 2022/2023 conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban forum, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation.	<b>0</b>
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	Soroti City made publicly available information on i) tax rates as evidenced by TC's circular letter dated 21st June, 2023 under reference CR/SC/104/2 to divisions and city headquarters.  Council minute number 35/CNL/SC/2023 on tax collection procedures after Council meeting held on 19th April, 2023.	<b>1</b>
22	Reporting to IGG  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure	a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0	There were no IGG issues in Soroti Cty. Perusal of meetings held by Council on dates indicated below had no IGG issues reported in Council for action.  Meeting held on 28th September, 2022; 20th December, 2022; 31st March, 2023 and 30th May, 2023.	<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>The PLE pass rates decreased by -7.7% between 2022 and 2020 school years.</p> <p>2020</p> <p>In 2020 the learners who passed in Div 1, Div 2 and Div 3 were 1734 out of 2020</p> <p><math>1734/2020 * 100 = 85.8\%</math></p> <p>2022</p> <p>3014 passed in Div 1,2, and 3 out of 3856 pupils, which represented 78.1% pass rate</p> <p>The percentage decrease in pass rate was <math>78.1\% - 85.8\% = -7.7\%</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>The USE pass rates decreased by -10.4% between 2022 and 2020 school years.</p> <p>2020</p> <p>In 2020 the students who passed in Div 1, Div 2 and Div 3 were 873 out of 1111</p> <p><math>873/1111 * 100 = 78.5\%</math></p> <p>2022</p> <p>941 passed in Div 1,2, and 3 out of 1381 students, which represented 68.1% pass rate</p> <p>The percentage increase in pass rate was <math>68.1\% / 78.5\% * 100 = -10.4\%</math></p>	<b>0</b>

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>	not applicable	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>The Education development grant of Ugx 206,000,000 was used on eligible activities for the F/Y 2022/23 which included; Construction of 5 stance pit latrines for each of the following 4 primary schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omadira-Arapai, Madera Girls, Onyakai and Kichinjaji primary schools</li> <li>• Procured Desks for the following schools; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agora, Otatai, Amen and Apuyo primary schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Renovated semi-detached Teachers houses at Madera boys' primary school.</li> </ul>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Soroti City implemented five projects during FY 2022/2023 out of which a sample of four projects was selected. (i) Payment to Ominya Enterprises Ltd for shs 22,144,916 in respect of construction a five stances pit latrine at Kinchinjaji Primary School in the East Division. Contract reference SORO 859/WRKS/2022/23/00040

Payment voucher number 6440230 dated 28th June, 2023. The DEO initiated payment on 6th June, 2023, Senior Environment Officer and City DCDO ON 8th June, 2023; the City Engineer on 10th June, 2023, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment On 10th June, 2023.

(ii) Payment to Owalei Emorikikinos Enterprises

for shs 55,700,112 in respect of rehabilitation of staff house in Modera Boys in East Division. Payment voucher number 6441975 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. The City Engineer, City CDO, Senior Environment Officer, CFO and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date.

(iii) Payment to M/s MO Opiro construction for shs18,503,949 in respect of construction of a five stances pit latrine in Onyakai Primary School in West Division. Payment voucher number 6441623 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. Equally,

the City Engineer, City CDO, City Senior Environment Officer, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date.

(iv) Payment to Panu General Service for shs 21,806,269 in respect of construction of a five stances pit latrine at Modera Primary School in East Division. Payment voucher number 6439736 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. Equally,

the City Engineer, City CDO, City Senior Environment Officer, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date.

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

The percentage contract variation for all three sampled education project contracts were within +/-20% as indicated below for the respective contracts.

- **Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S under Procurement number. Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00039)**

- Contract price = 25,111,275
- Estimated cost = 22,000,000
- Percentage change = 14.14%

- **Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Onyakai P/S under Procurement number. Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00041)**

Contract price = 25,382,154

Estimated cost = 22,000,000

Percentage change = 15.4%

- **Renovation of the semi-detached teachers house at Madera Boys P/S under Procurement number. Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00034)**

Contract price = 64,071,329

Estimated cost = 66,000,000

Percentage change = -2.9%

The percentage contract variation is computed as

$(\text{contract cost} - \text{Estimated cost}) / (\text{Estimated cost}) * 100$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Page 2 and 3 of the education sector annual progress report indicated that all the education projects for the FY 2022/2023 were 100% completed as per the annual work plan. These projects were;

- Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Amadira Arapai P/S
- Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Kichinjaji P/S
- Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S
- Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Onyakai P/S
- Renovation of the semi-detached teachers house at Madera Boys P/S

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The city did not meet the prescribed school staffing standards for Primary Teachers. The approved number of required teachers was 531 but the city managed to recruit only 384 teachers which translated to 72%</p>	1
---	---	---	--	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 28 UPE schools within the Soroti DLG met the basic standards set out by DES, for example all the 28 UPE schools had 378 classrooms representing 13 classrooms per school which is above the recommended 7 classes per school.</p> <p>The 28 schools, had 230 teacher accommodations representing 8 which is above the requirement of at least four permanent houses per school as required by DES.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was accurate deployment of teachers as indicated on the teacher's deployment list and the school staff lists were displayed in all the 3 sampled school notice boards i.e., Madera Girls' P/S had a total of 17 teachers out which 7 were female and 10 males, headed by Sr. Elizabeth Arionget .</p> <p>Kichinjaji P/S had a total 21 teachers, deployed and 21 teachers on its school staff list led by Ms Okwalinga Grace as the Head teacher.</p> <p>With 6 teachers being male and 15 being female.</p> <p>Pioneer P/S had 16 teachers, deployed, out of whom 9 are female and 7 were male led by Mr Enyidu Alfred.</p> <p>All the sampled schools had attendance registers and in use.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---



5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The infrastructure recorded in Soroti City primary school asset registers were all found present in all the visited sampled schools.</p> <p>Madera Girls P/S had 14 classrooms, 12 teachers' houses, 258 desks and 18 latrine stances which were all found on ground.</p> <p>Kichijanji P/S had 14 classrooms, 12 staff houses, 15stances of pit latrines, and 285 desks.</p> <p>Pioneer P/S had 480 desks, 32 classrooms, 18 latrine stances, teachers' houses are dilapidated.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>100% of schools submitted their annual school reports as evidenced from the required 3 sampled schools.</p> <p>Madera P/S submits its reports termly. The report included a total school enrolment of learners at the beginning of term and at the end of the term, total teaching staff and general status of the school and performance.</p> <p>Kichinjaji submits termly report and the report included a total school enrolment of 1012 learners with a staffing of 21 teachers, it included the successes registered in the term, challenges and way forward.</p> <p>Pioneer P/S submits termly reports as well. The report included a total school enrolment of learners, with staffing, the general status of the school including achievements, challenges and way forward.</p> <p>Percentage submission;  <math>3/3 * 100 = 100\%</math></p>	4

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>School Improvement plans were found in all the 3 sampled schools representing 100% i.e.</p> <p>Madera Girls' P/S', Kichinjaji P/S and Pioneer P/S.</p> <p>The school improvement plan of Madera Girl's P/S prioritized;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Renovate floors of dormitories,</li> <li>-Plant trees and grass</li> <li>-Capacity building for teachers</li> <li>-Repair learners' bathrooms,</li> <li>-Purchase learning materials (text books)</li> </ul> <p>Kichinjaji P/S prioritized;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_Renovate 4 classroom PAPSCA blocks</li> <li>_Construction of staff latrines</li> <li>_ Have the school land surveyed and plant live fence.</li> </ul> <p>Pioneer P/S prioritized,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_Complete fencing of the school</li> <li>_ Fixing of glasses in the school doors and windows</li> <li>_Acquiring of furniture for learners and teachers among others.</li> </ul> <p>Percentage</p> <p><math>3/3*100=100\%</math></p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The list of schools on PBS and OTIMS corresponded well with each having 28 UPE schools and 4 USE schools</p> <p><math>32/32*100=100\%</math></p>	4

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision	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:	The City budgeted Ugx 3,291,726,334 for 28 head teachers and 425 teachers in 28 primary schools of Soroti City as per the approved budget FY 2022/23 .	4
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 4 or else, score: 0		
7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision	b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,	Teachers had been deployed as required by the sector guidelines with a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per class for schools with classes reaching P.7.	3
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 3 else score: 0	Madera Girls' P/S had a head teacher Sr Elizabeth Arionget and a total of 17 teachers.  Kichinjaji P/S had a head teacher Ms. Grace Okwalinga with a total of 21 teachers.  Pioneer P/S had a head teacher Mr Enyidu Alfred with a total of 16 teachers	
7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision	c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,	All the primary schools sampled namely; Madera Girls', Kichinjaji and Pioneer Primary schools had staff lists displayed on their office notice boards dated January ,2023.	1
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	score: 1 else, score: 0		

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The city had 28 Primary School Head Teachers and majority were not appraised as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ogari Emmanuel (Agama) not appraised</li> <li>2. Alimo Aida (Nakatunya) was appraised on 15/2/2022</li> <li>3. Ariokot Annet Grace (Madelala Boys) not appraised</li> <li>4. Echeke Samuel (Agora) was appraised on 18/8/2022</li> <li>5. Aromait Simon (Owalei) was appraised on 28/12/2022</li> <li>6. Enyidu Alfred (Pioneer) appraised on 30/12/2012</li> <li>7. Oumo Simon (Opumo) not appraised</li> <li>8. Ebetu Alli (Aminit) not appraised</li> <li>9. Ocung Samson (Arapai) appraised on 2/10/2023</li> <li>10. Erongu Peter (Hilders) not appraised</li> </ol>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence as their appraisal was being handled by the ministry.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all Education Department staff were appraised against their performance plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emokor Patty (CEO) and</li> <li>2. Opolot Simon (Inspector) of schools were all not appraised</li> </ol>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was a training plan for the FY 2022/23 for the training department included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building of head teachers in performance appraisal</li> <li>- Sports, MDD and Ball games</li> <li>- Facilitated learners to go to Mbarara for ball games</li> <li>- Facilitated learners to go to Kyotera for National MDD competition</li> <li>- 2 choirs were facilitated to participate in the TESO region competition held in Serere .</li> </ul>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Letter from TC dated 30/04/2023 reference CR/151/4 was in place directed to PS Ministry of Education and Sports.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The City did not make allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with sector guidelines. Ugx 26,000,000 was allocated representing a percentage allocation of 65 % and the education sector guideline requires the LG to allocate Ugx 40,000,000 to inspection and monitoring functions.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

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

The PS/ST communicated cash limits for the Education Sector in quarter one on 4th August, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01. Warranting was done on 8th August, 2022, Invoicing was done on 10th August, 2022; Transfers to schools was done on 10th August, 2022 and communication to divisions was done on 10th August, 2022.

In quarter two, the communication from PS/ST was done on 5th October, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01, Warranting on 10th October, 2022; Invoicing on 13th October, 2022. Transfers to schools was done on 13th October, 2022 and communication to divisions was done on 13th October, 2022.

The PS/ST communicated cash limits for the Education Sector in quarter three on 30th December, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01. Warranting was done on 6th , January, 2023, Invoicing was done on 23rd January, 2023; Transfers to schools was done on 23rd January, 2023 and communication to divisions was done on 23rd January, 2023.

The PS/ST communicated cash limits for the Education Sector in quarter four on 14th April, 2023 under reference BPD/102/155/01. Warranting was done on 18th , April, 2023, Invoicing was done on 23rd May, 2023; Transfers to schools was done on 23rd May, 2023 and communication to divisions was done on 23rd May, 2023.

There were no delays experienced by the Soroti City.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that Soroti City invoiced and the CEO's communicated and publicized capitation releases to schools on 20th October, 2022 and invoicing was done on 25th October, 2022 as per CEO's circular letter reference CTY/08/EDUC/2022-2023. Sampled schools included at Kinchinjaji Primary School in East Division; Madera Primary School in East Division. This was not within three working days of release from MoFPED as witnessed by sampled schools by the Education expert. The release from MOFPED took place on 16th October, 2022 and communication to schools took place on 30th October, 2022 and therefore not within three working days. There was evidence that the City G invoiced and the City Education Officer communicated and publicized capitation releases to schools after three working days of release from MoFPED as witnessed by sampled schools by the Education expert at Onyakai Primary School in West Division. The circular on release of capitations to schools was equally not compliant with MOFPED deadlines.

10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	The inspection workplan for 2022/23 was in place covering all 28-government aided primary schools within Soroti City for 3 terms and the Inspection reports were discussed and findings followed up by each schools' SMC and PTA committees.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:  • If 100% score: 2  • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80%: score 0	The City had an inspection plan for the 28 primary schools with a budget of Ugx 26,000,000  Meetings to plan for school inspections were done by the Principle Education Officer. All the 28 schools had been inspected in the 3 school terms accounting to 100%.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,  Score: 2 or else, score: 0	There was evidence of dissemination of findings arising from the inspection reports .  This was also evidenced from the files found at the sampled schools (Madera Girls, Kichinjaji and Pioneer primary schools).	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Inspection findings had been presented to all the 3 sampled primary schools i.e. Pioneer P/S, Kichinjaji P/S, and Madera Girls P/S.  The inspection and monitoring reports had been forwarded to DES as evidenced from DES acknowledgement sheets dated 11/04/2022, 05/12/2022.	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Council Committee responsible for education was constituted and was also referred to as the Geral Purpose Committee which convened meetings on a quarterly basis. In quarter one, the committee met on 31st August, 2022 and discussed quarter four report of financial year 2021/2022. In quarter two, the committee met on 17th November, 2022 and discussed departmental reports of the city. In quarter three, the meeting was held on 31st March, 2023 and discussed planning and budgeting. In quarter four the committee met on 3rd May, 2023 and discussed departmental reports.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was a report on mobilizing parents in order to attract learners, the Education Officer conducted Radio talk shows on ETOP Radio 99.4FM, and Voice of Teso 88.4 FM geared towards encouraging parents to bring expectant P.7 learners to go and sit for primary leaving exams. This mobilization yielded good results because 6 learners came and sat for PLE at the following schools; Apuyo P/S, Moruapesur P/S, Majengo P/S, Amen P/S, and Onyakai P/S .</p> <p>The mobilisation helped to raise the enrolment from 21,520 in 2022 to 22,796 out of whom 11,972 were girls.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was an asset register for 2022/23 listing all assets of the 28 primary schools of Soroti City.</p> <p>There were a total 378 classrooms, 329 stance latrines, 6241 desks and 230 teachers' houses.</p>	2
----	--	---	---	---



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Education Department in the city implemented five projects during FY 2022/2023 out of which a sample of three projects was selected. (i) Construction of five stance pit latrine at Onyakai Primary School in West Division. The project was budgeted for shs 25,382,154 as per page 25 of the approved city budget for FY 2022/2023, page 6 of the AWP and page 97 of the DDP III.</p> <p>Toal expenditure amounted to shs 19,685,052 as per draft accounts of Soroti city for FY 2022/2023. The desk appraisal report was dated 13th July, 2022 and the Field Appraisal report was dated 13th July, 2022.</p> <p>(ii) Construction of a five stance VIP latrine at Madera Girls Primary School in East Division budgeted for shs 25,111,275 as per approved city budget page 25, AWP page 6 and DDP III page 97. Total expenditure during FY 2022/2023 amounted to shs 23,198,158.</p> <p>The desk appraisal report was dated 13th July, 2022 and the Field Appraisal report was dated 13th July, 2022. (iii) Rehabilitation of semi-detached teacher's house at Madera Boys Primary School in East Division which was budgeted for shs 64,071,329 as per page 25 of the city approved budget for FY 2022/2023, page 5 of the AWP and page 96 of the DDP III. Total expenditure on the project amounted to shs 59,255,438 as per draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023. The Desk Appraisal Report and the Field Appraisal Report were dated 13th July, 2022.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Technical feasibility, environmental social acceptability and customized designs of the previous FY were complied with.,</p> <p>Environmental were equally addressed.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The education planned sector infrastructure projects for the FY 2023/2024 were incorporated in the 2023/2024 approved procurement plan on page 3 of 6 of the procurement plan. The incorporated projects included the construction of the two 5-stance VIP latrines</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	All the planned school infrastructure projects that was to be implemented in the FY 2023/2024 had not been approved by the contracts committee at the time of assessment. One of the planned projects for the FY 2023/2024 included the construction of the two 5-stance VIP latrines.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	Soroti City did not properly establish the project implementation team for all the education projects as per the PPDA guidelines. The appointment letter by Town clerk dated 2nd/05/2023 indicated the appointment of Mr .Oramit Samuel (City Engineer) as the Projects manager and the rest of the team members including the CDO, Environment officer, Clerk of works, Labour officer and Contract managers were not appointed.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES  <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	This is not applicable for the city where there are no seed secondary schools as specified in the manual. However, field observation and technical checks on all the three sampled education projects (Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Amadira Arapai P/S, construction of the 5-stance latrine at Kichinjaji P/S and construction of the 5-stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S) indicated that the structures were implemented following the specifications provided in both the approved architectural and structural designs. The window and door types and numbers installed were in line with the specifications for all the structures; there were known structural cracks on the walling and floors; a physical scratch check on the plaster indicated a good-class mortar was used; the roof covering type used (Gauge 26) was that in the specifications and the block work was done well; and all the building component dimensions were fulfilled.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all the school construction projects. No minutes of monthly site meetings and monthly supervision reports were availed for review at the time of assessment.	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

There was no evidence that during critical stages of construction of education sector infrastructure projects, joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs were conducted

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

Soroti City implemented five projects during FY 2022/2023 out of which a sample of four projects was selected.

Sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to

contractors made within specified time frames within the contract as provided in the example below.

(i) Payment to Ominya Enterprises Ltd for shs 22,144,916 in respect of construction a five stances pit latrine at Kinchinjaji Primary School in the East Division. Contract reference SORO 859/WRKS/2022/23/00040

Payment voucher number 6440230 dated 28th June, 2023. The DEO initiated payment on 6th June, 2023, Senior Environment Officer and City DCDO ON 8th June, 2023; the City Engineer on 10th June, 2023, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment On 10th June, 2023.

(ii) Payment to Owalei Emorikikinos Enterprises

for shs 55,700,112 in respect of rehabilitation of staff house in Modera Boys in East Division. Payment voucher number 6441975 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. The City Engineer, City CDO, Senior Environment Officer, CFO and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date.

(iii) Payment to M/s MO Opiro construction for shs18,503,949 in respect of construction of a five stances pit latrine in Onyakai Primary School in West Division. Payment voucher number 6441623 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. Equally,

the City Engineer, City CDO, City Senior Environment Officer, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date.

(iv) Payment to Panu General Service for shs 21,806,269 in respect of construction of a five stances pit latrine at Modera Primary School in East Division. Payment voucher number 6439736 dated 28th June, 2023. Payment was initiated by the City Education Officer on 12th June, 2023. Equally,

the City Engineer, City CDO, City Senior Environment Officer, City Treasurer and TC signed the documents to certify payment on the same date

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, score: 1, else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education department timely submitted the procurement plan to procurement unit on 28th/04/2022 before the deadline date of 30th/April/2022 as per the PPDA requirement. The procurement plan included projects like the Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Amadira Arapai P/S, Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Kichinjaji P/S, construction of the 5-stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S and among other projects implemented in the FY2022/2023</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 score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City had complete procurement files for all the school projects implemented in the FY 2022/2023 as indicated below for the respective projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Onyakai P/S (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00041) with the evaluation report dated 3rd/4/2023 with MS Opiro Enterprise as the best evaluated bidder at a cost of 25,382,154, Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and the works contract signed on 28th/04/2023 was on file.</li> <li>• Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00034) with the evaluation report dated 3rd/4/2023 having Panu General Services as the best evaluated bidder at a cost of 25,111,275, Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and the works contract signed on 28th/04/2023 was on file.</li> <li>• Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Kichinjaji P/S (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00040) with the evaluation report dated 3rd/4/2023 having Ominya Enterprises Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at a cost of 26,807,624, Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and the works contract signed on 28th/04/2023 was on file.</li> <li>• Construction of the 5-stance latrine at Amadira Arapai P/S (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00038) with the evaluation report dated 3rd/4/2023 having Arcadian Construction Consults ltd as the best evaluated bidder at a cost of 27,384,966, Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and the works contract signed on 28th/04/2023 was on file and</li> <li>• Renovation of the semi-detached teachers house at Madera Boys P/S (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00034) with the evaluation report dated 3rd/4/2023 having Owalei Emarikinos Enterprises ltd as the best evaluated bidder at a cost of 64,071,329, Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and the works contract signed on 28th/04/2023 was on file</li> </ul>	1

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>The City had no grievance recorded under education sector for FY 2022/2023 by the time of assessment, however the Central Grievance Log was available as a picfare book for all departments coded "Complaints Register-Soroti" in black ink</p>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The was no evidence of guidelines on Environment and safeguards</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The City had a costed ESMP incorporated within the BoQs as evidenced by Item E (planting 15 tree seedlings of selected species) at 150,000/= under environmental mitigation and Item F (Gender and HIV mainstreaming) at 500,000/=, page 1 of the BoQs for the Renovation of Semi-detached Teachers' house at Madera Bovs P/S with Procurement Reference No. SORO859/WRKS/2022/2023/00034 by Owalei Emorikinos Enterprise</p>	<b>2</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The City had proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects by the time of assessment as evidenced by the Land title for Soroti Municipal Council (Moruapesur P/S) of P.O.Boxa 61, Soroti of 7.0980 hectares plot 24-48, Eretu Road at Teso Inn of 08/09/2021</p>	<b>1</b>

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>Monthly support supervision and monitoring of education projects in FY 2022/2023 was conducted as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Completion Report for the construction of two class room block with office space at Moruapesur P/S by the EO and PCDO on 31/07/2023</li> <li>• E&amp;S Monitoring Report for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kichinjaji P/S by the EO and PCDO on 01/06/2023</li> <li>• E&amp;S Monitoring Report for the Rehabilitation of a twin staff house at Madera Boys P/S by the EO and PCDO on 01/06/2023</li> <li>• E&amp;S Monitoring Report for the construction of 5 stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S by the EO and PCDO on 01/06/2023</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The SNRO and the PCDO signed on the engineer's payment certificate as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payment Certificate of 23,198,158/= for the construction of 5 stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S on 12/06/2023</li> <li>• Payment Certificate of 59,255,438/= for the Rehabilitation of a twin staff house at Madera Boys P/S on 12/06/2023</li> <li>• Payment Certification of 23,331,252/= for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kichinjaji P/S on 10/06/2023</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

**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 sampled health facilities had the following deliveries:</p> <p>FY2021/22</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Kichirijaji HC III</td> <td style="text-align: right;">96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Division HC III</td> <td style="text-align: right;">816</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Princess Diana HC IV</td> <td style="text-align: right;">751</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>1663</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>FY2022/23</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Kichirijaji HC III</td> <td style="text-align: right;">51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Division HC III</td> <td style="text-align: right;">814</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Princess Diana HC IV</td> <td style="text-align: right;">979</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>1884</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>Average change <math>(1884-1663)/1663*100 = 10.98\%</math></p>	Kichirijaji HC III	96	Eastern Division HC III	816	Princess Diana HC IV	751	<b>Total</b>	<b>1663</b>	Kichirijaji HC III	51	Eastern Division HC III	814	Princess Diana HC IV	979	<b>Total</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>0</b>
Kichirijaji HC III	96																			
Eastern Division HC III	816																			
Princess Diana HC IV	751																			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1663</b>																			
Kichirijaji HC III	51																			
Eastern Division HC III	814																			
Princess Diana HC IV	979																			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1884</b>																			
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable	<b>0</b>																
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>	Not applicable	<b>0</b>																



3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	The LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for FY 2022/2023 on eligible activities. The LG spent the health development grant on the construction of the health department administration block in the West Division which was in line sector grant guidelines on page 15. The city budgeted shs 2,240,643,000 as a development grant for FY 2022/2023 as per Approved Budget Estimates on page 22 of 44. Shs 2,582,348,000 was a revised budget as per the quarterly performance report on page 17 of 110. Shs 2,371,700,000 was spent by closure of FY 2022/2023 as reflected on page 17 of 100 of the quarterly performance Report for FY 2022/2023 Performance was 106%. The city implemented one project under the health department namely construction of the health department administration block in the West Division in Soroti City and shs 179,389,853 was paid to contractor M/S Letso Investments Lld during FY 2022/2023 as per payment voucher number 6432954 dated 28th June, 2023. Another payment to the same contractor was done on 30th June, 2023 for shs 345,909,097 per payment voucher number 6458009 dated 30th June, 2023.	2	
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	Soroti City implemented one project in the department during FY 2022/2023 namely construction of Health Administration Block in Soroti City Centre. There was only one lump payment to the contractor M/s LETSO INVESTMENTS LTD during FY 2022/2023 as detailed below:  Payment for shs 179,389,853 per payment voucher number 6432954 dated 28th June, 2023 in respect of construction of health administration block in the city center.  The City Health Officer initiated payment on 13th June, 2023 and on the same date, the TC, City Treasurer, City CDO and City Engineer signed the payment documents.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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 implemented health project contract had a percentage contract variation of within +/-20%, as indicated below for the construction of an office for health the department at the City headquarters (Procurement Reference no. Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00035)  Contract price = 199,747,049  Estimated cost = 194,619,850  Percentage contract variation = 2.63%	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure					

3	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	There was no HC II being upgraded to HC III in the FY 2022/2023	2
---	---	---	---	---

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure  • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0	The LG had recruited for all HC's and HC IV as follows:  Princess Diana HC IV    46 out of 48 Eastern Division HC III  13 out of 19 Kichirinjaji HC III        12 out of 19 Soroti HC III                13 out of 19 Western Division HC III 14 out of 19 Total                            98 out of 124  98/124*100 =79%	1
---	--	--	---	---

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.  • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0	There was no HC II being upgraded to HC III in the FY 2022/2023	2
---	--	--	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The In-Charges of Princess Diana HC IV and Eastern Division HC III did not present their staff lists to the Assessor to compare with the City updated list. Kichinjaji HC III had 12 H/Ws on the list dated 23/07/2023 same as District dated 20/11/2023.	0
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no facility upgraded in the FY2022/2023.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled health facilities Princess Diana HC IV, Eastern Division HC III and Kichirinjaji did not submit the Annual Workplans and budgets FY 2023/2024 to the CHO.</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>The sampled health facilities Princess Diana HC IV, Eastern Division HC III and Kichirinjaji HC III did not submit the Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 to the CHO.</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>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>Princess HC IV, Eastern Division HC III and Kichinjaji HC III did not develop performance plans for FY 2023/2024.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The City did not present the monthly and Quarterly HMIS reports to the Assessor.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
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>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>Not applicable</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

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>	Not applicable.	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>Quarter 1 report was submitted on 10th October, 2022; Quarter 2 report was submitted on 12th January, 2023; Quarter 3 reports was submitted on 17th April, 2023; Quarter 4 report was submitted on 14th July, 2023.</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The was no evidence provided that the City developed a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>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 no plan to implement.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

**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>According to the LG Annual Budget Estimates 2023/2024, the LG budgeted 2,433,460,000= for 108 health workers out of the 151 required.</p> <p><math>108/151*100=71.5\%</math>. This was below the required 75%.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Only Princess Diana HC IV 46/48 (89.5%) had at least 75% staff filled of the 8 health facilities.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the Staff deployment list from the City dated 20/11/2023, Princess Diana had 46 H/Ws on the list and were in the attendance book. Eastern Division HC III had 13 H/Ws and were found in the attendance book. Kichinjaji HC III had 12 H/Ws on the list and were found in the attendance book. The example of H/Ws in the attendance books were as follows:</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Princess Diana HC IV Dr. Anyonga Alfred Senior Medical Officer Eastern Division HC III Emiti Cuthbert Senior Clinical Officer Kichinjaji HC III Abuku Beatrice Enrolled Midwife</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kichinjaji HC III displayed 12 H/Ws list dated 23/07/2023 on the notice board. Princess Diana HC IV and Eastern Division HC III did not display the staff list on the notice board.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The city had 5 health facility in charges and some were not appraised as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emunia David (CO) Kichinjaji HCIII was not appraised</li> <li>2. Omoding Stephen Erasmus (MCO) western division HCIII was not appraised</li> <li>3. Malinga Samauel (SCO) Soroti HCIII western division was not appraised</li> <li>4. Emiti Cuthbert (SCO) eastern division HCIII was appraised on 10/10/2023</li> <li>5. Anyonga Alfred (MO) eastern Division HCIV was not appraised</li> </ol>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that all Health Facility Workers were appraised against the agreed performance plans. All were not appraised and they include	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Asio Gladys (Lab Asst) western division HCIII</li> <li>2. Amuchu Rosemary (E/M) kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>3. Apecho Christine (ANO) kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>4. Acom Ruth (ANO) Kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>5. Edepu Francis (Porter) kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>6. Ecanyu Kimera Joseph (Askari) Kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>7. Malinga Oswald (N/A) kichinjaji HCIII</li> <li>8. Echengu Joseph (Askari) Western Division HCIII</li> <li>9. Amongin Harriet (HIA) eastern division HCIII</li> <li>10. Apecho Anna (E/N) eastern division HCIII</li> </ol>	
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence and no reason given	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	The Nursing Officer Soroti City trained 39 H/Ws on RH indicators on 14-17/03/2023. The H/Ws were from Arapai HC II, Moruapesur HC II, Eastern Division HC III, Opango HC II, Western HC III, Kichinjaji HC III and Soroti HC III.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			



8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The training of 39 H/Ws in RH indicators was entered in the training database.</p>	<b>1</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

**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>The City Town Clerk confirmed the 10 facilities that receive PHCNWR in letter Ref: CR/SC/152/5 on 26/07/2023 and received on 31/07/2023. The list rhymes with the one submitted in budget for FY2023/2024.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

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>Fund allocation to the Health Department during FY 2022/2023 amounted to shs 153,520,000 as reflected on page 22 of 44 the city approved budget for FY 2022/2023. The monitoring and service delivery was allocated shs 5,500,000 as per page 11 of the approved LG budget. This was below the requirement of 15%.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

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 City received communication from PS/ST on quarter one cash limits on 4th August, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01, Warranting was done on 8th August, 2022, invoicing was done on 17th August, 2022, Transfers to Health Centers on 17th August, 2022 and communication to Health Centers by TC on 17th August, 2022.

In quarter two, communication on cash limits from the PS/ST was received on 5th October, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01, Warranting was done on 10th October, 2022; Invoicing was done on 18th October, 2022; Transfers to Health Centers was done on 18th October, 2022 and communication to Health Centers was done on 18th October, 2022.

In quarter three, communication from the PS/ST was received by the City on 30th December, 2022 under reference BPD/102/155/01, Warranting was done on 6th January, 2023; Invoicing was done on 17th January, 2023; transfers to Health Centers was done 17th January, 2023 and communication to Health Centers by the TC was done on 17th January, 2023.

In quarter four, communication from the PS/ST was received by the City on 14th April, 2023 under reference BPD/102/155/01, Warranting was done on 18th April, 2023; Invoicing was done on 10th May, 2023; transfers to Health Centers was done 10th May, 2023 and communication to Health Centers by the TC was done on 10th May, 2023.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers in FY 2022/2023 to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter as per evidence provided below: In quarter one in FY 2022/2023 invoicing was done on 17th August, 2022. Communication to PHC NWR transfers was done 19th August, 2022 for shs 98,098,000 within five days from when funds were released. In quarter two, invoicing was done on 18th October, 2022. Communication to PHC NWR transfers was done 21st October, 2022 for shs 102,000,000 within five days from when funds were released. In quarter three, invoicing was done on 17th January, 2023. Communication to PHC NWR transfers was done 2th January, 2023 for shs 74,000,000 within five days from when funds were released. In quarter four, invoicing was done on 10th May, 2023. Communication to PHC NWR transfers was done 12th May, 2023 for shs 96,000,000 within five days from when funds were released. Communication from the CAO in respect of invoicing and release of funds on PHC NWR to health facilities were verified at notice boards at Aukot HC II in Aukot sub county and Ocokican HC II in Ocokican sub county. The same communication was pinned at the notice board of HC IV in Soroti City.</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city 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; for example circular letter under reference SORO/SCC/HQ/02 dated 14th October, 2022 verified in East and West divisions HC III notice board. Circular letter under reference SORO/SCC/HQ/02 dated 24th April, 2023. The releases were publicized beyond the five days and therefore not compliant with the guidelines.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City held Performance Review meetings at Soroti City Hall on 1/02/2023 and 21/06/2023 but made no recommendations.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Performance Review meetings held on 1/02/2023 and 21/06/2023 were attended by Health Workers only.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The City did not supervise Princess Diana HC IV but supervised Betheseda Hospital a PNFP only once on 13-19/12/2022.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The Nursing Officer from Princess Diana HC IV supervised Arapai HC II, Moruapesur HC II, Eastern Division HC III and Kichinjaji HC III on 17/03/2023. The rest of the quarters there was no supervision done.</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 no evidence that recommendations were made after supervision visits.</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>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>The health facilities were supported in prescription, storage and dispensing of medicines as follows: Princess Diana HC IV, Teso Safe Motherhood HC III and Bethesda Hospital 22-27/06/2023.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>Fund allocation to the Health Department during FY 2022/2023 amounted to shs 153,520,000 as reflected on page 22 of 44 the city approved budget for FY 2022/2023. The allocation for health prevention and promotion activities was allocated shs 5,550,000 as per page 45 of the approved LG budget. This was equivalent to 30%.</p>	<b>2</b>
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>The Health Educator led Polio Campaign Socio-Mobilisation using Public Address System (Community Drive) from 4/11/2022. The HE conducted Advocacy meeting with the Religious, Cultural, Traditional leaders on Polio campaign on 7/11/2022 at City Board room.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>The Health Assistant Eastern Division in a report written to the CHI carried School Health inspection for Teso City P/S on 20/04/2023, Teso City Nursery School on 17/04/2023. On 1/11/2022 Queen Elizabeth Girls Hostel, Community S.S.S and Pioneer P/S.</p>	<b>1</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>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>The City had an updated asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.</p> <p>Princess Diana HC IV had Anaesthetic Machine, Microscope, Baby Warmer and BP machine.</p> <p>Eastern Division HC III had Patient beds, BP machine and Adult Weighing scale.</p> <p>Kichinjaji HC III had BP machine, Autoclave, Delivery couch and Infant weighing scale.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City implemented one project during FY 2022/2023 -,</p> <p>Construction of health administration block in Soroti city center which was budgeted at shs 199,747,047 out of which expenditure totalled shs 179,389,853 as per page 22 of the approved city budget for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The project was captured in the DDP III page 96, and AWP page 5. The Field Appraisal Report was dated 26th July, 2022 and the Desk Appraisal Report was dated 26th July, 2022.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Technical feasibility, environment, social acceptability and customized designs social and environment issues were addressed.</p> <p>The Field Appraisal Report was dated 26th July, 2022 and the Desk Appraisal Report was dated 26th July, 2022.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City health facility investment was screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist as evidenced by the E&amp;S Screening form for the construction of Health Administration Block by the EO and PCDO on December 8, 2022. The mitigation measures included planting trees around the facility, provision of ramps for PWDs and among others</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Health sector timely submitted all its infrastructure and other requests to procurement unit by April 18, 2023, before the deadline date of 30th/April/2023 as per the PPDA requirement, and was incorporated in the FY 2023-2024 approved procurement plan on page 3 of the plan. The Construction of a HC III in Otatai ward and Completion of office block was the only project that had been planned to be implemented in FY2023-2024:</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City health department had not submitted the procurement request form (FormPP1) to the PDU for the FY 2023/2024.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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 approved all the health infrastructure investments for the FY2022/2023 in the minutes of the contracts committee dated 2nd/12/2022 under minute number 3k.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG did not properly establish the project implementation team as per the PPDA guidelines. The appointment letter by Town clerk dated 2nd/05/2023 indicated that Mr. Orunit Samuel (City Engineer) was appointed as the project manager and there was no evidence of appointment of other team members as per the PPDA guidelines</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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no HC II being upgraded to HC III in the FY 2022/2023</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>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 was no evidence that the clerk of works maintained daily records during the construction of the health infrastructures</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 HC II being upgraded to HC III in the FY 2022/2023</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 evidence that the City 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 as in the following supervision reports;</p> <p>Technical supervision report for the health administration block dated 21st/6/2023 and the Technical supervision report for the health administration block dated 18/7/2023. All the relevant technical officers including the environment officer (Mr. Englu Eric Paul), CDO (Akello Stella) and City Engineer (Oranit Samuel)</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City implemented one project in the department during FY 2022/2023 namely construction of Health Administration Block in Soroti City Centre. There was only one lump payment to the contractor M/s LETSO INVESTMENTS LTD during FY 2022/2023 as detailed below:</p> <p>Payment for shs 179,389,853 per payment voucher number 6432954 dated 28th June, 2023 in respect of construction of health administration block in the city center.</p> <p>The City Health Officer initiated payment on 13th June, 2023 and on the same date, the TC, City Treasurer, City CDO and City Engineer signed the payment documents.</p> <p>The City Engineer verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days after receiving payment requests) as required.</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>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>The LG had a complete procurement file for the health Infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law as indicated below for the respective project;</p> <p>Construction of the an office block for health department at Soroti City (Soro859/Wrks/2022-2023/00035)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation report dated 30th/03/2023 with</li> <li>• Letsom Investment Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at 199,747,049,</li> <li>• Minutes of contracts committee decision dated 4th/04/2023 and works contract signed on 27th/04/2023</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The City had not recorded any grievance under health in the FY 2022/2023 by the time of assessment, however, the Grievance Log was availed as a picfare book for all departments coded "Complaints Register-Soroti" in black ink</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG disseminated guidelines WASH IN HEALTH CARE FACILITIES on 01/11/2022. Waste segregation charts were found in Princess Diana HC IV, Eastern Division HC III and Kichinjaji HC III.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a functional system for Medical waste management. Princess Diana HC IV, Eastern Division HC III and Kichinjaji HC III had bin liners for segregation of waste, safety boxes, waste pits and placenta pits. Soroti Regional Referral Hospital and Princess Diana HC IV each had an Incinerator.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The CHO created awareness in health care waste management during the distribution of health care waste management guidelines on 1/11/2022.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City had incorporated costed ESMPs into designs, BoOs as evidenced by Item F (Planting 10 tree seedlings) at 150,000/= and item G (sensitization of community on HIV/AIDS) at 400,000/= page 379 of the BoQs in the bidding document for the construction of an office block for the Health department with Procurement Reference No. SORO859/WRKS/2022/2023/00035 dated 10/02/2023 by Letsom Investments Ltd</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The City had proof that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the it had ownership, access as evidenced by the Land title for Soroti Municipal Council of P.O.Box 109 Soroti of 3.44 hectares, plots 14-16, Kennedy Square, Soroti dated 01/03/2004 for 99 years</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Monthly support supervision and monitoring of health projects was conducted as evidenced by the Progress Report for construction of Health Administration Block by the EO and PCDO on;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31/07/2023</li> <li>• 30/06/2023</li> <li>• 01/06/2023</li> </ul>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The SNRO and the PCDO signed on the engineer's payment certificate as evidenced by the Payment Certificate of 189,000,024/= for the construction of Health Administration Block on 12/06/2023</p>	2

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>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>	N/A	<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>	N/A	<b>0</b>
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>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>	N/A	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	<b>0</b>

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	N/A	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>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>	N/A	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>	N/A	0
<b>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</b>				
4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	N/A	0

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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  <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>	N/A	0

### **Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	N/A	0
---	--	---	-----	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resource Officer budgeted for staff in the department totalling to 31,945,000/= for the following;</p> <p>1. Engulu Eric Paul (Environment Officer)</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>	N/A	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	N/A	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	0
---	---	---	-----	---



8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	N/A	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	N/A	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	N/A	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	0

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	N/A	0
----	--	---	-----	---

**Investment Management**

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:  Score 4 or else 0	N/A	0
----	---	---	-----	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:  Score 4 or else score 0.	N/A	0
----	---	--	-----	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2	N/A	0
----	---	--	-----	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
----	---	---	-----	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	0
----	---	--	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else</p>	N/A	<b>0</b>
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	N/A	<b>0</b>
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	N/A	<b>0</b>
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 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>	N/A	<b>0</b>

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	N/A	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	N/A	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	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:  Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	0
14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	0

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>

**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>	Not Applicable	<b>0</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>	Not Applicable	<b>0</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>	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
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>	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	Not Applicable	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	Not Applicable	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			



6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	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	Not Applicable	<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	Not Applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

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

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	-----------------------	----------

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	-----------------------	----------

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	-----------------------	----------

**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>Not Applicable</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	-----------------------	----------

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>Not Applicable</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	-----------------------	----------

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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

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	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

### Environment and Social Safeguards

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



14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0  iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable because Micro-scale Irrigation is not assessed in Cities	0

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable because Micro-scale Irrigation is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>
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	Not Applicable because Micro-scale Irrigation is not assessed in Cities	<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	Not Applicable because Micro-scale Irrigation is not assessed in Cities	<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 position of City Chief Finance Officer was vacant. However, the duties of CFO had been transferred to Mr. Oryokot Abraham a substantive Principal Accountant/Treasurer. As a Principal Accountant, Oryokot was appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (b)	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Iteba Andrew was substantively appointed as Senior Planner as per the appointment letter dated 23/5/2017 under Min No. 30/5/2017	<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 position of City Engineer was not substantively filled. However, Muluvu Kairu Robert a substantive Senior Engineer – Civil was assigned duties of City Engineer on 18/11/2022. There was no staff seconded	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of City Natural Resource Officer was found vacant at the time of assessment and has never been filled due to wage and there was no staff seconded	<b>0</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of City Production Officer was found vacant. However, Ms. Kokoi Rosset Stella an Agriculture Officer was found offering support into the position and never had any letter of assignment. There was no staff seconded</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of City Community Development Officer was not substantively filled. However, Asekenye Damali was assigned duties of SCDO by City Town Clerk on 29/6/2023. There was no staff seconded</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was not substantively filled at the time of assessment. However, Tukei George William was assigned by City Town Clerk as the Ag. Principal Commercial Officer on 28/6/2021. There was no staff seconded</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Ms. Alayo Serida was substantively appointed as SPO as per the appointment letter dated 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (c)</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position was not on the approved staff structure dated 28/04/2022</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Emuru Joseph Lister was substantively appointed as PHRO as per the appointment letter dated 9/7/2018 under Min No. 54/7/2018</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was not on the approved staff structure dated 28/04/2022. What they had on their approved structure was the position of Principal Environment Officer which was found vacant.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was not appearing on the approved staff structure dated 28/04/2022. What they had on their approved structure was the position of Principal Land Management Officer which was found vacant.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was not appearing on the approved staff structure dated 28/04/2022</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Eremu Simon was substantively appointed as Senior Internal Auditor as per the appointment letter dated 29/5/2017 under Min No. 29/5/2017 (29.2)</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position for PHRO City Service Commission was not substantively filled. However, Mr. Elioku Thomas the substantive HRO was assigned by Town Clerk as Ag. PHRO but still the letter of assignment was missing on the file. There was no staff seconded</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Soroti City had two Divisions (East &amp; West) and all Division Town Clerks were not substantively appointed as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abraham Omaido was assigned duties of East Division Town Clerk on 10/02/2023</li> <li>2. Ochengel Badiru was acting in the position of West Division Town Clerk but never had a letter of assignment. It should be noted that Badiru Ochengel was substantively appointed as Principal Assistant Town Clerk</li> </ol>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Soroti City had 4 CDO and all were substantively appointed as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Olinga Justine (Senior CDO) West Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (c)</li> <li>2. Dekura Caroline Egimu (Senior CDO) East Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (c)</li> <li>3. Esangu William (CDO) East Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (c)</li> <li>4. Alajo Hellen (CDO) East Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (a)</li> </ol>	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Soroti City had two Senior Assistant Accountants and all were substantively appointed as shown below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adeke Cecilia (SAA) West Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (a)</li> <li>2. Atai Betty (SAA) East Division was substantively appointed on 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (a)</li> </ol>	5

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  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	As for the Natural Resources Department, shs 31,945,000 was warranted for the Department as reflected on page 18 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023.  Shs 31,945,000 was released as detailed on page1 18 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023. Performance was 100% as required.	2
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.	Shs 23,121,140 was warranted for the Community Based Department as reflected on page 18 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023.  Shs 23,121,140 was released as detailed on page1 18 of the draft final accounts for FY 2022/2023. Performance was 100% as required.	2
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	The City had carried out Environment and Social Screening of the USMID projects in FY 2022/2023 as evidenced by the E&S Screening forms by the EO and PCDO as follows;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the Construction of Adams Road on 26/09/2019</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the Construction of Edyegu - 0.692km Road on 26/09/2019</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the Construction of School - 1.188km Road on 26/09/2019</li> </ul>	4
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),  score 4 or 0	Certificate of Approval of the Environment Impact Assessment for the sub projects in Soroti City under USMID-AF Cluster2 Batch 1 (Haridas Road, School Road and Edyegu Road) Certificate No. 0010540 dated 23/08/2017	4

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The City had prepared a C-ESMP for the USMID project that was implemented in FY 2022/2023 by the DDEO &amp; DDCDO as evidenced by the C-ESMP (Contractor's Environment and Social Management Plan) for the Construction works for Sub projects in Mbale. Soroti and Tororo Local Governments under USMID-AF, Cluster 2, Batch - 1- infrastructure investment program by UB Consulting Engineers Ltd, Procurement Reference No. MLHUD/USMID/WORKS/19/19-20/00653 submitted to Central Registry on 22/02/2021</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

Maximum score is 12

### Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Soroti City had Un-qualified Auditor General's opinion in the FY 2022/2023.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The DLG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for FY 2021/2022 through the City Town Clerk's letter to the OAG dated 20th February, 2023 under reference CR/250/4. The IAG acknowledged receipt of the letter on 23rd February, 2023. Issues raised included among others the requirement to increase on local revenue collection, unaccounted for funds by closure of FY 2022/2023. The issues raised were cleared at the time of the assessment. Similarly, the response to the PS/ST in respect of the IAG's findings in FY 2021/2022 was done through the TC's letter dated 11th November, 2022. All the eight queries had been cleared at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The response by the Soroti City was executed within the prescribed time frame i.e by end of February, 2023.</p>	10



7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY  Maximum Score 4	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,  score 4 or else 0.	The Annual Performance Contract was submitted through City TC's letter dated 14th July, 2023 under reference CR/SC/210/7. The letter was copied to PS OPM, PS MOLG, OAG, Mayor, IAG, and MOFPED.	4
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 Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 was submitted by the Soroti City Town Clerk through the PBS system and letter under reference CR/SC/152/2 on 31st August, 2023 and copied to PS MOLG, OAG, OPM, IAG and MOFPED. This was within the prescribed time frame as required. The Annual Performance Report was approved by MOFPED on 31st August, 2023.	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.	Soroti City submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of FY2022/2023 by August 31st of the current FY 22023/2024. Submission of the quarterly reports was done through the PBS system as detailed below:  Quarter One on 9th February, 2023; Quarter Two on 2nd March, 2023; Quarter Three on 14th July, 2023; Quarter Four on 23rd August, 2023.	4

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The position of City Education Officer was found vacant at the time of assessment and there was no staff seconded	<b>0</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Mr. Opolot Simon was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools as per the appointment letter dated 31/7/2023 under Min No. 10/07/2023 (ii)	<b>40</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	<p>The City had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening of all education projects prior to commencement of all civil works for FY 2022/2023 as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the construction of 5 stance latrine at Madera Girls P/S by the EO and PCDO on 14/11/2022</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the Rehabilitation of a twin staff house at Madera Boys P/S by the EO and PCDO on 08/12/2022</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kichinjaji P/S by the EO and PCDO on 08/06/2023</li> </ul>	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	All education projects that were implemented in FY 2022/2023 did not require ESIAs given their small scope, according to the National Environment Act NO. 05 of 2019	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

**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.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.		

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The position of CHO was not substantively filled. However, Ikiring Betty, the Senior Health Educator was assigned duties of CHO on 27/9/2021 and there was no staff seconded	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The position of PHO was not substantively filled but Ms. Acanit Constance was assigned duties of Principal Health Officer - Maternal on 2/8/2021	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	Ms. Ikiring Betty was substantively appointed as SHE as per the appointment letter dated 18/11/2022 under Min No. 4/09/2022 (b)	<b>20</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. The City had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change of the only Health project for FY 2022/2023 as evidenced by the E&S Screening form for the construction of Health Administration Block by the EO and PCDO on 08/12/2022 **15**

Maximum score is 30

2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0. The only health project for FY 2022/2023 did not require ESIAs given their small scope according to the NEA No. 05 of 2019 **15**

Maximum score is 30

**Micro-scale Irrigation 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 Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	N/A	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG:  Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	Not Applicable because Micro-scale Irrigation is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</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.	N/A	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	N/A	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities	<b>0</b>

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.

Not Applicable because water is not assessed in Cities