



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Abim District

(Vote Code: 573)

| <b>Assessment</b>                           | <b>Scores</b> |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions             | 56%           |
| Education Minimum Conditions                | 70%           |
| Health Minimum Conditions                   | 90%           |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions      | 55%           |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions   | 30%           |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures           | 48%           |
| Educational Performance Measures            | 61%           |
| Health Performance Measures                 | 61%           |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures    | 60%           |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 35%           |

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements  | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification   | Score    |
|--|--|---|--|----------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |  |   |  |          |
| 1  | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>  | <p>The evidence provided indicated that the District implemented one project using DDEG funding and it was 90% completed as per the reports. This was the completion of Awach Administration Block at Ushs 50,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 10. A field visit to the project verified that the project was not yet complete and therefore not functional at the time of assessment.</p>   | <b>0</b> |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>              | <p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p> | <p>A copy of the result assessment presented by the Planner during the assessment indicated that the average score of LLG performance increased by 54% compared to the last year as per the computation below;</p> <p>The average score for the current year was 63%.</p> <p>The average score for the previous financial year was 41%</p> <p>Percentage change = Current percentage less previous percentage over old percentage.</p> <p><math>= (0.63 - 0.41 / 0.41) * 100\% = 54\%</math></p> <p>The LLG performance assessment for the current year increased by 54% from the previous year's performance.</p> | <b>3</b> |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>              | <p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>                     | <p>The DDEG project implemented in the FY 2022/2023 and was 90% completed as per the Annual Budget Performance report.</p> <p>1. Completion of Awach Administration Block at Ushs 50,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 10. Approved Budget on page 12.</p>  | <b>2</b> |

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0.      | The DDEG project implemented was budgeted for Ushs 50,000,000 in the FY 2022/2023 and was all spent as per the Q4 report on page 84.<br><br>1. Completion of Awach Administration Block at Ushs 50,000,000 as per the Annual Budget Performance Report page 10 | 2 |
| 3 | Investment Performance<br><br>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,<br><br>score 2 or else score 0 | The records on file were not adequate to enable the determination of the variation in the engineers estimate and actual amount spent on the project.   | 0 |

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 4 | Accuracy of reported information<br><br>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,<br><br>score 2 or else score 0  | A comparison of LG and LLG staff lists (Abim Sub County, Morulem Sub County and Abim Town Council) showed that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance;<br><br>The following staff were found in Morulem Sub County;<br><br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Akidi Stella, Senior Assistant Secretary</li> <li>2. Amaro Jane, Community Development Officer</li> <li>3. Obin Kizito Kaguta, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</li> <li>4. Akech Beatrice, Accounts Assistant</li> <li>5. Ojok Charles, Health Assistant</li> <li>6. Othii Ben Nicholas, Parish Chief</li> <li>7. Okidi Simon, Parish Chief</li> <li>8. Ayugi Evaline Oryono, Parish Chief</li> <li>9. Okello Andy Andrew, Office Attendant</li> </ol> | 2 |
| 4 | Accuracy of reported information<br><br>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:<br><br>• If 100 % in place:<br>Score 2, else score 0.<br><br><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b> | A site visit by the Assessment team on 5th December, 2023 provided evidence that the infrastructure ( Awach Administration Block) constructed using the DDEG was in place as reported in the ABPR for FY 2022/2023 page 10.  | 2 |

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;<br><br>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs<br><br>score 4 or else 0<br><br><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b> | The LLGs scores obtained from the internal District assessment and from the LLG IVA was;<br><br>DLG IVA<br>Abim S/C 78 72<br>Morulem S/C 93 83<br>Abim T/C 67 66<br>Nyakwea S/C 86 70<br><br>The performance of Nyakwea LLG was outside the credibility performance range of -/+ 10 which implied that the internal assessment of the LG was not credible. | 0 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

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

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0 | No evidence was provided at the time of assessment. | 0 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

**Human Resource Management and Development**

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff<br><br>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0 | The LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS on 29th September 2023 of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. | 2 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>            | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>                | <p>There was evidence that the District had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI. For instance in the month of July the worst performer was Ola Donato in the Administration Department with 14% attendance while the best performer was Akileng Jimmy with 90%.</p>                          | 2 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>            | <p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had 9 Heads of Departments but provided only two appraisals at the time of assessment as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arube Charles Ag. District Engineer was appraised on 2nd August 2023 by CAO</li> <li>2. Mwaka Phillip Isaac, DWO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Arube Charles, Ag. District Engineer</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>There was no evidence provided by the HR department that the LG had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines.</p>   | 0 |
| 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 provided by the HR department that the LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional.</p>  | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p> | <p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>                                 | <p>The LG recruited 22 Education Assistants on 8th June 2023. However the LG Human Resource department did not avail the payrolls, pay slips or any evidence for review during the assessment.</p>  | 0 |

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 following staff retired last FY however the  
HR department did not provide details of their  
effective retirement date and when they  
accessed the payroll.

1. Josephine Okello- Headteacher
2. Benson Ojum- Nursing Assistant
3. Awiri Anna Grace- Finance Officer
4. Oryono Ogwang Simon- Head Teacher
5. Ennu Moses- Head Teacher
6. Rose Apio- Nursing Assistant
7. Rose Adong- Nursing Assistant
8. Lokoyo Onynaga Dominic- Assistant  
Animal Husbandry Officer
9. Rose Okori- Inspector of Schools
10. Mathew Omara- District Education  
Officer

**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

The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below;

Abim S/c received Ushs 17,528,093

Alerek S/C received Ushs 10,973,266

Atunga S/c received Ushs 4,175,668

Awach S/C received Ushs 25,539,266

Camkok S/C received Ushs 4,175,668

Lotuke S/C received Ushs 17,528,093

Magamaga S/c received Ushs 8,124,758

Morulem S/c received Ushs 29,666,662

Nyakwae S/C received Ushs 33,186,847

Opopongo S/C received Ushs 4,175,668

Abim T/C received Ushs 22,734,018

Abuk T/C received Ushs 1,078,108

Alerek T/C received Ushs 1,078,108

Kiru T/C received Ushs 1,078,108

Morulem T/C received Ushs 1,078,108

Orwamuge T/C received Ushs 1,078,108

The direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY were as follows:

In quarter 1: The LG did not receive DDEG

In quarter 2: Release was on 14th October, 2022.

In quarter 3: Release was on 16th January, 2023.

In quarter 4: The LG did not receive DDEG.

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 10 | N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery | <p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG did not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: The LG did not receive DDEG</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 19th October, 2022, warrant was made in 16 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12nd January, 2023 which was 10 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4: The LG did not receive DDEG.</p>  | 0 |
| 10 | N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery | <p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done however it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 1 LG didn't receive DDEG funds,</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 14th October, 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 16th January, 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4, LG didn't receive DDEG funds.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring   | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Q 1 - the mentoring report indicates that the activity was conducted from 1st June 2022 to 30th August 2022 and it targeted all LLGs.</p> <p>Q 2 report indicated that the activity was done from 27th November 2022 to 14th December 2022.</p> <p>Q 3 mentoring report shows that the activity was done from 13th March 2023 to 17th March 2023.</p> <p>Q 4 mentoring report indicated that the activity was done from 13th May 2023 to 5th June 2023.</p>                      | 2 |



|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 11 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits for quarter two and three were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the Chairperson Echat Moses</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter one report was not discussed by TPC.</li> <li>2. Quarter two report was discussed on 21st December 2022- MIN.DTPC/1/21/04/22: Presentation of Q2 Monitoring report and Support supervision actions.</li> <li>3. Quarter three report was discussed on 21st April 2023- TPC- MIN.DTPC/4/21/04/23: Presentation of Q3 Monitoring report and Support supervision actions implemented.</li> <li>4. TPC did not discuss quarter 4 monitoring report.</li> </ol> | 0 |
|----|---|---|--|---|

**Investment Management**

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p> | <p>A review of the assets register presented by the CFO indicated that the register did not conform to the requirements as set on page 167 of the Accounting manual 2007 as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land for the schools did not have the cost of the land and when the land was purchased.</li> <li>- Motor cycles registration Nos. UG-0678Y and UG2941R did not have the engine numbers and serial numbers.</li> <li>- Most of office equipment's didn't have serial numbers and the date of purchase.</li> </ul> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>   | <p>There was no evidence that the DLG used the Board of Survey report of FY 2021/22to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets, and disposal of assets. The Board of Survey Report was not availed to the Assessment Teams.</p>  | 0 |

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>  | <p>There was evidence that the DLG had a functional physical planning committee which was appointed on 20th April 2022 by CAO Mr. Echat Moses. On file there was only three sets of minutes of Physical Planning committee for the previous FY. However, the minutes were not submitted to the Ministry below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 Minute were not on file.</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 minute were dated on 15th October 2022.</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 minute were dated on 9th February 2023.</li> <li>4. Quarter 4 minute were dated on 2nd June 2023.</li> </ol> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>No evidence of desk appraisal forms were availed by the district Planner at the time of assessment.</p>   | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>No evidence of field appraisal forms were availed by the district Planner at the time of assessment.</p>  | 0 |

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>No evidence was presented at the time of assessment to indicate that project profiles were discussed by TPC.</p>  | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>            | <p>The LG did not screen for environmental and social risks/impact and neither put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists. Below were some of the projects that the LG should have screened in the current FY, since they were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phase one Construction of Kanu Water supply system under Conditional Grant - Development 187-o/w Rural Water &amp; Sanitation Sub-grant at UGX. 22,783,000</li> <li>2. Phase one Construction of Kanu Water supply system under Conditional Grant - Development 186-o/w Piped Water Sub-grant at UGX. 177,423,000</li> <li>3. Drilling and Construction of 5 boreholes at Abuk Town Council under Conditional Grant - Development 187-o/w Rural Water &amp; Sanitation Sub-grant at UGX. 113,321,000</li> </ol> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>                       | <p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY, to be implemented using the DDEG were, incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan that was signed on 6th September, 2023 by the CAO, Alex felix Majeme. The planned infrastructure was Construction of 5-stance latrine at the District Headquarter at Ugx 40M.</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 sitting on 6th September, 2023 approved the consolidated procurement work plan for FY 2023/2024, under minute 03/DCC/06-09-23 which included projects to be implemented using DDEG.</p>   | 1 |

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else 0  | There was no evidence availed to show that the LG had properly established the project implementation team.  | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0                                     | There was no design seen to show that the DDEG infrastructure project implemented, followed standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer.  | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0 | There was a report dated 22nd December, 2022, by the DE to show that the relevant technical officers carried out supervision for the infrastructure project before payments. The report about for the construction of the office block at Awach sub-county.  | 2 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>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):<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0                | There were records on file which could not show that the LG verified works, certified and initiated payment of contractors within specified time frames as per contract. There was a request by Brookfield projects, raised on 17th October, 2022 of Ugx 56,582,800/=, certified by the District Engineer on 22nd December, 2022. However, there was no payment voucher to determine the date of receipt of the funds. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else 0   | There file did not have a signed contract for the works, the contract committee minutes and the evaluation report and PP1 form as required by the PPDA law.  | 0 |

## Environment and Social Safeguards

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>                             | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>                       | <p>The District i) designated Mr. Omugetum Charles the Principal Assistant Secretary (PAS) with an appointment letter on 5th July, 2022 to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with members constituted as of the appointment letters dated 5th July, 2022 below; Mr. Ogwaria Lawrence Karwoth; Ms. Aceng Jennifer, Mr. Ongom Advenson the Senior Labour Officer (SLO); Mr. Ogwang Cosmos the Commercial Officer (CO); Mr. Okello Sam Ayen (Opinion Leader); Ms. Awilli Joseph Odyek Person with Disabilities (PWD); Hon. Lowoth Cosmos (Workers-Representative Male) and Hon. Akot Judith Hopester (Workers Representative Female).</p> | 2 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>                             | <p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>A complaints log was availed with records of grievances that were handled for example, a complaint recorded on 14th February, 2023 of communities that were affected by the road construction works along the Otalabar-Koya road contracted to Hands (U) limited. The complainants demanded UGX. 4,500,000 as compensation and the matter was handled on 17th February, 2023 by the grievances Redress Committee (GRC) and a resolution reached and the communities accepted compensation of 2,000,000.</p>   | 2 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>                             | <p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>  | <p>The District did avail proof of the publicized grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p>   | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>  | <p>A review of the DDP III, Annual work plan for FY 2023/2024, and the approved budget FY 2023/2024 indicated that Climate change and the environment were integrated in DDP III on page 112, AWP on page 13, and the approved budget on page 54 which included wetland management, tree planting, training farmers in smart agriculture, etc.</p> <p>Community and mindset change, reducing negative cultural practices and attitudes as an intervention on Social issues were intergrated in to DDP III on page 114, AWP on page 15, and Approved Budget on page 56.</p>   | 1 |

|    |  |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management<br><br>score 1 or else 0  | No evidence for dissemination of DDEG guidelines was presented at the time of assessment.   | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | (For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):<br><br>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:<br><br>score 3 or else score 0 | The LG did not have any investments financed from the DDEG  | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.<br><br>Score 3 or else score 0   | There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change that were budgeted for in the previous FY.   | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0   | The completion of Awach sub county Administration block was located on land with proof of land ownership that was a certificate of title issued on 4th November, 2021 with instrument No. MOR-00000175 at Plot 99, Block 1. | 1 |

|                             |   |   |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 15                          | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0  | The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for the following projects below;<br><br>1. Monitoring report dated 18th July, 2023 for the construction of DHO's Office block<br><br>2. Monitoring report dated 31st May, 2023 for the construction of Alerek seed secondary school<br><br>3. Monitoring report dated 9th August, 2023 for irrigation sites | 1 |
| 15                          | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0 | The certification forms for all projects were not availed at the time of assessment.  | 0 |
| <b>Financial management</b> |   |   |   |   |
| 16                          | LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0  | There was no evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations at the time of assessment because IFMS was under maintenance and could not be accessed as explained by the CFO.   | 0 |
| 17                          | LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90<br><br>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0  | There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;<br><br>1st quarter report was produced on 15th October, 2022.<br><br>2nd quarter report was produced on 15th January 2023.<br><br>3rd quarter report was produced on 15th April 2023.<br><br>4th quarter report was produced on 15th July 2023.   | 2 |

|    |  |   |  |          |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC through the central registry on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023. The dates for submission for follow-up on quarterly internal audit queries to the LG PAC were as follows:</p> <p>The quarter one report was received on 15th October 2022.</p> <p>The quarter two report was received on 15th January 2023.</p> <p>The quarter three report was received on 15th April 2023.</p> <p>The quarter Four report was received on 15th July 2023.</p> | <b>1</b> |
|----|--|---|--|----------|

|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>A review of PAC minutes showed that PAC sat only once on 2nd October 2023 and reviewed reports for quarter two under Min no 5/LGPAC/27/09/2023: Examination of first quarter internal Audit report for FY 2022/23. PAC reviewed only 1 out of 4 reports.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|----|--|--|---|----------|

**Local Revenues**

|    |   |   |   |          |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 18 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 38,222,422 (Final Draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 37) and Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 220,520,578 which gave a variance of Ushs 182,298,156.</p> <p><math>(182,298,156)/38,222,422 \times 100\% = 476.9</math> which was outside the scorable range of -/+10%.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|----|---|---|---|----------|



|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul> | <p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 35 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 162,800,507</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 220,520,578</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 220,520,578- Ushs 162,800,507= Ushs 57,720,071</p> <p>= 57,720,071/162,800,507 x 100= 35%</p> <p>Therefore, the Own Source Revenue for FY 2022/23 increased by 35% compared to the last year collection. This indicated that the LG performed well.</p>   | 2 |
| 20 | <p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>   | <p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The shareable revenue of Ugx 109,804,236 which also included local service tax was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <p>Lotuke received Ushs 17,072,310</p> <p>Nyakwae received Ushs 15,779,636</p> <p>Abim received Ushs 8,172,568</p> <p>Morulem received Ushs 6,744,525</p> <p>Alerek received Ushs 5,900,289</p> <p>Awach received Ushs 2,890,309</p> <p>Magamaga received Ushs 1,082,720</p> <p>Opopongo received Ushs 1,000,000</p> <p>Chamkok received Ushs 1,000,000</p> <p>Atunga received Ushs 1,000,000</p> <p>Abim T/c received Ushs 29,840,880</p> <p>Orwamuge T/c received Ushs 13,863,500</p> <p>Abuk T/c received Ushs 2,400,000</p> <p>Kiru T/C received Ushs 1,057,500</p> <p>Alerek T/C received Ushs 1,000,000</p> <p>Morulem T/c received Ushs 1,000,000</p> <p>The transfers above consists of 35%, 65% and 100% to LLG and the district.</p> | 2 |

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder</p> <p>Procurement Refrerence: Abim801/WRKS/2022-2023/00017</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: Renovation of cold chain room at Abim Hospital</p> <p>Method of Procurement: Selective bidding</p> <p>Best Evaluated Bidder: Korinyang and Sons Enterprises</p> <p>Price: Ugx 14,986,236/= VAT Inclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 23rd December, 2022</p> <p>Date of removal: 9th January, 2023"</p> | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>A copy of LG performance assessment results was on file at the time of assessment. However, the stamp was not dated so I could not tell when it was put on file neither on the notice board. The LG was ranked No. 157 under crosscutting performance measures.</p>   | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The District Planner noted that during the previous FY LG didn't have any radio talk or Barraza with the public due to fund constraints.</p>  | 0 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>                                | <p>No evidence was presented during the assessment to confirm that the LG made publically available information on tax rates, collection procedures and appeal procedures.</p>   | 0 |

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 was no case worth IGG's attention and therefore the LG never prepared report in respect of actions taken in the implementation of the IGG recommendations during the previous the FY.

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification   | Score    |
|--|---|---|--|----------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |   |  |          |
| 1  | <p>Learning Outcomes:<br/>The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul> | <p>School year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was = 1500</p> <p>Total absentees were 11</p> <p>Total that sat were (1500 - 11 ) =1489</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&amp;3) = 51 +754 +386 = 1191</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>1191/1489 \times 100 = 79.98\%</math></p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was = 1687</p> <p>Total absentees were 27</p> <p>Total that sat were (1687 - 27 ) =1660</p> <p>Total grades (1,2&amp; 3)= 76 +838+357 = 1271</p> <p>% pass rate= <math>(1271/1660 \times 100 = 76.56</math></p> <p>% Decline = <math>76.56 -79.98 =-3.42</math></p> | <b>0</b> |

1

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

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

School year 2020

Total No. of candidates registered  
was=246

Total absentees were =1

Total that sat were (246 - 1) =245

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 13+ 59 +86 =  
158

% Pass rate =  $158/245 \times 100 = 64.48\%$

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates was  
= 367

Total absentees were = 6

Total that sat were (367 - 6) = 361

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 22 +78 +124  
=224

% pass rate=  $224/361 \times 100$

= 62.04%

% improvement =  $62.04 - 64.48 = -$   
2.44%

0

2

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

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

The average score of education LLG  
performance increased by 1%  
compared to the last year as per the  
computation below;

The average score for the current year  
was 54%.

The average score for the previous  
financial year was 47%

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

$= (0.54 - 0.47/0.47) * 100\% = 14\%$

The Education LLG performance  
assessment for the current year  
increased by 14% from the previous  
year's performance.

2

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>  | <p>It was noted by the District Planner that no development project was implemented in the previous FY using Sector development Grant.</p>  | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>No evidence of payment vouchers were on file the LG didn't implement any development project under education funded by the sector development fund.</p>  | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>The project sampled was 0% within +/- 20% the allowable variation which complied.</p> <p>The project was construction of Alerek Seed Secondary School.</p> <p>Procurement ref: MoES/wrks/2021-2022/00003/lot 23</p> <p>Project:</p> <p>Estimated Cost: Ugx 2,791,668/=</p> <p>Contract Cost: Ugx 2,791,668/=</p> <p>Variation Ugx 0</p> <p>%age variation 0%</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The was evidence that education projects Seed Secondary Schools were not completed as per the work plan in the previous FY. This was noted in the two reports by the District Engineer dated 28th April, 2023 and 8th May, 2023 where the percentage of work done was at 15% and 20% respectively.</p>   | 0 |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>                                   | <p>The LG staff structure provides for 537 primary school teachers and the LG had deployed 443 at the time of assessment. Hence the filled positions were 82%.</p>  | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul> | <p>The ABIM Consolidated Assets register for 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 35 registered UPE schools and 5 USE school was in place consisting of the following; 337 classrooms, 1,170 latrine stances, 3,262 desks, 210 teachers houses and 10 laboratories prepared by District inspector of schools and was approved by the district education officer Mr. Owiny Charles Dickens</p> <p>This implied that 100% of the UPE schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format</p> $40 \times 100$ $40$ $= 100\%$ | 3 |

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The DLG deployment list dated 17th October, 2023 consisted of 487 primary school teachers. The LG accurately reported on the teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving.

The LG teacher's deployment list from the DEO'S office matched that found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:

At Alerek primary school taken as semi-urban had 18 teachers listed and posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Ms. Akech Venty Obura as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the DEO'S list..

Morulem Girl's Primary School taken as urban School had 21 teachers with Owiny Mike Hussien as head teacher also matched well with the DEO's list at the DLG..

Adea primary school taken as rural had 12 teachers the head teacher Ms. Labii Lucy The list also matched well with that of DEO at the DLG..

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



|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>   | <p>Evidence indicated that the LG had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 35 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>337 classrooms, 1,170 latrine stances, 3,262 desks, 210 teachers houses and 10 laboratories prepared by District inspector of schools and was approved by the district education officer Mr. Owiny Charles Dickens</p> <p>Evidence from the sampled schools showed the following assets</p> <p>MORULEM Girl's primary school taken as urban had 7 classrooms, 161 desks, 28 stances of latrines and 18 teachers housing units with enrolment of 1602 pupils.</p> <p>ALEREK primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms 19 latrine stances , 110 desks &amp; 10 teacher's houses shared by 18 teachers with enrolment of 1651 pupils.</p> <p>ADEA primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 10 classrooms, 61 desks, 10 latrine stances &amp; 7 teachers houses with enrolment Of 1685 learners</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>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment that Head teachers in the schools sampled complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p>  | 0 |

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 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>4</p> <p>There was evidence seen to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs in a report dated 25th October, 2023 the LG conducted the following to ensure that the SIPS are implemented;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conducted departmental and head teachers meeting on the 5th April,2023 and a number of issues were discussed such as school supervision and monitoring, capacity building programs, innovativeness and inventiveness in schools among others</li> </ul> <p>From the sampled and visited Schools;</p> <p>MORULEM Girl’s primary school taken as urban; had a SIP plan on the notice board of the head teachers office having plans such as ensuring improved performance of pupils, ensuring teachers efficiency but no report was seen to see how far they had reached.</p> <p>ALEREK primary school a report dated 25thseptember , 2023 had the following improvement done;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 4 stance latrine for boys which was completed in September, 2023.</li> <li>- Putting up a flag stand at the school.</li> <li>- Ensuring a clean learning environment.</li> <li>- Making of 2 book shelves.</li> </ul> <p>ADEA primary school had no evidence of an ongoing school the improvement plan at the time of assessment.</p> |
| 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>4</p> <p>The education office had submitted 35,966 learners for both primary and secondary as seen by 19th May,2023 as signed by Owiny C harles Dickens the DEO.</p>  |

**Human Resource Management and Development**

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> | <p>The LG had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY at Ugx 4,207,646,412/=</p>                           | 4 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>  | <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>   |   |   |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p>   | <p>The DLG deployed 487 teachers according to sector guidelines, as reflected in the staff lists at the time of assessment. Each school had at least one teacher assigned, as illustrated in the examples provided below:</p> | 3 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>  | <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>   | <p>Morulem Girls Primary School, classified as an urban school, had 21 teachers. The head teacher was Owiny Mike Hussien, consistent with the DEO's list.</p>   |   |
|   |  |  | <p>Alerek Primary School, categorized as semi-urban, had 18 teachers. The head teacher was Akech Venty Obura, in line with the DEO's list.</p>  |   |
|   |  |  | <p>Adea Primary School, identified as rural, had 16 teachers. The head teacher was Labii Lucy, matching the DEO's list.</p>   |   |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>   | <p>The teacher deployment data of 443 teachers had been disseminated or publicized on the LG notice board dated 15th February 2023.</p>   | 1 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>  | <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

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

1. Arena Christine Achan Headteacher- Achangali PS, was appraised on 5th December 2022 by Lokinomoe Joseph, Ag. CDO
2. Owiny Emmanuel Headteacher- Pupukamuya PS, was appraised on 20th November 2022 by Kithacho Abraham, Ag. CDO
3. Oryono John Pius- Oryeotyene PS, was appraised on 2nd December 2022 by Akongo Sandra, Parish Chief
4. Okothe Anjella- Gangming PS, was appraised on 17th November 2022 by Akomerach Pamela Sandra, Parish Chief
5. Alero Rose Margret- Oreta PS, was appraised on 25th November 2022 by Kithacho Abraham, Ag. CDO
6. Okwi Ben Mathias- Moleng Boys PS, was appraised on 12th December 2022 by Okori Bradford, Town Clerk
7. Owira Angel- Amita PS, was appraised on 10th December 2022 by Achiro Gloria, Parish Chief
8. Ariokot Hellen Margaret- Ayuwe PS, was appraised on 5th December 2022 by Ochero Aldous, Town Clerk
9. Labii Lucy- Loyoroit PS was appraised on 25th November 2022 by Kintu Moses, Parish Chief
10. Moding David- Rogom PS was appraised on 8th December 2022 by Kithacho Abraham, Ag. CDO

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The HR department did not provide any appraisals for secondary school head teachers.

|   |  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 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<br/>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>The staff in the LG Education department were appraised against their performance plans as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Auma Margaret- Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Owiny Charles Dickens- Ag. DEO</li> <li>2. Olyech Fausine- Inspector of Schools was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Auma Margaret, Senior Inspector of Schools</li> </ol> <p>The pprraisals for Senior Education Officer, Education Officers, and Sports Officer were not provided by the Human Resource Department at the time of assessment.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

|   |  |   |   |          |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 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,<br/>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of a training plan dated 5th July 2022, prepared by the DEO to address the capacity gaps identified in a report dated 30th June 2023, as stipulated below:</p> <p>On 14th July 2022, there had been training for head teachers on the use of the TELA system and capturing of EMIS data.</p> <p>On 5th April 2023, there was training for school sports teachers on athletics management conducted by the district sports officer, and 35 teachers were trained.</p> <p>Additionally, on 29th June 2023, there was training for 35 school head teachers in accounting and financial management.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|--|---|---|----------|

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

|   |   |  |   |          |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.<br/>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of submission to PBS the list of schools, their enrolment and budget done on 15th March, 2023 by the DEO of 37,813 learners for 35 primary schools, 5 secondary schools, i technical and 520 teachers on pay roll endorsed by the CAO in a letter addressed to the permanent secretary.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|---|--|---|----------|

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.<br/>If 100% compliance, score:2<br/>else, score: 0</p>  | <p>The allocation for inspection was seen, it was prepared as per sector guidelines for all terms. It was dated 10th September, 2022 with a budget attached of UGX; 17,776,000 for FY 2022/2023 and UGX: 34,276,000 for FY2023/2024</p>  | 2 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>   |  |  |   |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters<br/>If 100% compliance, score: 2<br/>else score: 0</p>   | <p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 8th August, 2022 after 30 days.</li> <li>• 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 19th October, 2022 after 16 days.</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 10 days.</li> <li>• 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 25th April, 2023 after 14 days.</li> </ul>  | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>   |  |  |   |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.<br/>If 100% compliance, score: 2<br/>else, score: 0</p> | <p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 12nd July 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 14th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 16th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 10th April 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>   |  |  |   |

|    |   |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>   | <p>There was evidence that the DLG Education Department had prepared an inspection plan for schools in the LG, developed by the DIS according to the respective terms, as presented below:</p> <p>For Term 3, 2022, the plan was dated 16th November 2022, focusing on the inspection of 54 schools from 17th November 2022 to 21st November 2022. In attendance were 9 inspectors.</p> <p>For Term 1, there was no inspection plan, as inspection funds were redirected for UPE UNEB exams, as reported by the DIS Auma and approved by the DEO Owiny Charles Dickens.</p> <p>For Term 2, 2023, the planning meeting was held on 16th July 2023, and inspections were scheduled to be carried out between 9th August 2023 to 30th August 2023.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence indicated that 35 UPE schools had been inspected in a report dated 24th November, 2022 for term 3 2022 which was done between 21st to 24th November ,2022 as compiled by Auma Margret the DIS indicated that 28 out of 35 schools were inspected, there were no details seen for term one, term 2 report dated 15th August,2023 was carried out between 30th , June,2023 to 6th July, 2023 prepared by District inspector of schools also indicated 54 (all UPE and 19 private) schools covered for term 2 2023 .</p> <p>Two-thirds of the schools, or 66.6%, were inspected and monitored according to the DIS and DEO but this could not be verried by the Assessment.</p>  | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence that inspection reports for Term 3, 2022, and Term 2, 2023, had been discussed in a meeting held on 24th October, 2023, with minutes recorded as 2/10/2023.</p>   | 2 |

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of submission and acknowledgement by the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) of receiving the Inspection findings from Abim DLG Education Department, as shown below:</p> <p>On 19th September 2023, the inspection report for Term 3, 2022, was acknowledged by DES.</p> <p>For Term 1, 2023, no report was handed over to DES as no inspection took place.</p> <p>The Term 2 inspection report dated 20th June 2023, submitted by Auma Magret, the DIS, was equally acknowledged by DES on 19th September 2023, having been received by Komugabe Edith on behalf of DES.</p>  | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>              | <p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education sat and discussed delivery issues in a meeting that was held on 30th May 2023 at the District Council Hall where at least 20 members were present. Under Min no 5/30/5/23. Service delivery issues for education were tackled and these included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staffing levels were to be increased by recruiting more primary school teachers to improve the teacher-pupil ratio.</li> <li>- The Education Management Information System (EMIS) was to be upgraded to track pupil and student enrolment, dropout and retention.</li> <li>- Construction and renovation of school infrastructures.</li> </ul> <p>All the above were geared towards improved education service delivery.</p> | 2 |



|    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that the Abim DLG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called “Go back to school” campaign in a report dated 16th February, 2023 in partnership with SAO the education department prepared an outreach in the communities of Aojapiro parish together with the Lotuke sub county leaders and the PTA, SMC and parents in those communities and encouraged them to push the campaign to other communities so as to ensure numeracy and literacy.</p> <p>Further still parents were reminded of their responsibilities towards the education of their children the report had pictorial evidence attached as the various leaders were addressing the masses, 157 people were in attendance.</p> |
|----|---|---|---|

## **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>Evidence indicated that the LG had recorded school assets registers dated 15th February, 2023 that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 35 UPE schools as captured below;</p> <p>337 classrooms, 1,170 latrine stances, 3,262 desks, 210 teachers houses and 10 laboratories prepared by District inspector of schools and was approved by the district education officer Mr. Owiny Charles Dickens</p> <p>Evidence from the sampled schools showed the following assets</p> <p>MORULEM Girl's primary school taken as urban had 7 classrooms, 161 desks, 28 stances of latrines and 18 teachers housing units with enrolment of 1602 pupils.</p> <p>ALEREK primary school taken as semi-urban had 7 classrooms 19 latrine stances, 110 desks &amp; 10 teacher's houses shared by 18 teachers with enrolment of 1651 pupils.</p> <p>ADEA primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 10 classrooms, 61 desks, 10 latrine stances &amp; 7 teachers houses with enrolment Of 1685 learners.</p> <p>This accurately matched those in the consolidated assets register of the education department.</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>No desk appraisals were on file since the education department didn't implement development project funded by sector development grant.</p>   | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>   | <p>No field appraisals were on file since the education department didn't implement development project funded by sector development grant.</p>  | 0 |

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | 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>                    | The LG Education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects, had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The planned infrastructure included the construction of Alerek Seed Secondary School phase II, as per procurement plan that was signed on 6th September, 2023, by CAO, Alex Felix Majeme.                | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><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> | There were Contracts Committee minutes for the sitting of 28th August, 2022 which approved the evaluation report and contract award for construction of the Alerek Seed Secondary school of the in minute 04/CC/8/02/2022. There was also a letter dated 26th August, 2022 from the Solicitor General clearing the contract.   | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>                               | There was a letter dated 27th October, 2022, by the CAO, were Akumu Joshua and Otim Ambrose were named as Project manager/supervisor and Clerk of works respectively. The letter left out the CDO, Environment officer and labour. Hence the Project implementation team was not propely established as per sector guidelines.   | <b>0</b> |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES<br><br><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>  | There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES, as was observed at Alerek Seed Secondary School, where it was noted that on the office block one of the office rooms measured 3.9 x 3.4 m, reception room was 3.4 x 4.8 m and the staff room was 8.9 x 7 m all being internal dimensions as per the designs. | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><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 were supervision reports by the District Engineer dated 28th February, 2023, 31st March, 2023, 28th April, 2023 and 8th May, 2023 to show that supervision was done. However, there were no minutes to show that monthly site meetings had been held.  | <b>0</b> |

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted score: 1, else score: 0 | There was no evidence to show 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, CDO had been conducted.   | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, score: 1, else score: 0  | There were no payment vouchers provided at the time of assessment to verify this indicator as the LG reported that they did not implement any infrastructure project under education development fund.  | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, score: 1, else, score: 0  | There was evidence that the LG Education department did not timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30. This was done on 12th June, 2023, which was beyond the set timeline for the sector procurement plan submission to PDU.  | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | 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  | The LG had a complete procurement file in place for the contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The file reviewed was for;<br><br>Project: Construction of Seed Secondary School at Alerek<br><br>Procurement ref: MoES/wrks/2021-2022/00003/lot 23, had the following documents;<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 27th October, 2022 with Mangron Investments Limited</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 17th February, 2022.</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 4th February, 2022</li> <li>• Solicitor General letter dated 26th August, 2022 signed by Magomu David Andrew</li> <li>• PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids records, acceptance and offer letters</li> </ul> | 1 |

## Environment and Social Safeguards

|    |   |   |   |          |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.<br><br><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0  | Projects implemented in the Education sector in the previous FY did not register any grievances throughout the implementation cycle.  | <b>3</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery.<br><br><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>   | Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation<br><br><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>   | There was no proof on dissemination of the education guidelines to schools that were sampled for example, Alerek primary school, Morulem Girl's Primary School and Adea primary school.   | <b>0</b> |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0  | A costed ESMP incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents for the construction of a kitchen with store at Rogom primary school at a total BoQ costed at UGX. 21,252,000 with Bill No. 8 for Environmental mitigation costed at 250,000.  | <b>2</b> |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0  | The construction of Magamaga seed secondary school was secured on land with a certificate of title issued on 3rd August, 2023 with instrument No. MOR-00000665 on Plot 175, block 1   | <b>1</b> |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score:0 | 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 report dated 31st May, 2023 for the construction of Alerek Seed secondary school. | <b>2</b> |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments<br><br><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>  | There were no certification files availed at the time of assessment to ascertain if the Environmental Officer and CDO signed prior to executing the project contractor payments.  | <b>0</b> |

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>  | <b>Definition of compliance</b>  | <b>Compliance justification</b>  | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|--|--|--------------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |  |  |              |
| 1  | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>                        | <p>From the annual HMIS reports 107, the annual deliveries for the 3 Health facilities: Nyakwae HCIII, Orwamuge HCIII and Areke HCIII, respectively for FY 2021/22 were : 263,636 and 450. The total annual deliveries of the same Health facilities for the FY 2021/22 was 1349</p> <p>The annual deliveries of the same Health Facilities respectively for the FY 2022/23 were 275,733 and 590. The total annual deliveries of the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 was 1598.</p> <p>From the calculation, it shows there was a percentage increase in utilization of Health care services (focus on deliveries) of 18.4% when you compare the deliveries of 2 two years 2021/22 and 2022/23.</p> | <b>0</b>     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>              | <p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>                             | <p>The average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 70% as per the OPAMS.</p>  | <b>2</b>     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>              | <p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There were no RBF activities during the FY under review. This was because of a letter from the Permanent Secretary (Dr. Diana Atwine) Ministry of Health, dated 7th December 2022 (Ref: ADM.45/545/02), addressed to all CAOs on "outstanding RBF funds". The letter highlighted a halt in the payment of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator was not applicable and it was agreed that a score of zero is given to all LGs.</p>  | <b>0</b>     |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>  | <p>No development project was implemented in the previous FY under Health.</p>  | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>The assessment found no evidence of payment vouchers on file. It was reported by the DHO that the LG did not implement any development project under using the sector development fund during the FY 2022/2023.</p>  | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The project sampled was 0.09% within +/- 20% the acceptable variation and therefore complied.</p> <p>The project was for renovation of cold chain room at Abim hospital</p> <p>Project:</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 15,000,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx 14,986, 236/=</p> <p>Variation Ugx 13,764/=</p> <p>%age variation (13,764/15,000,000) x 100%= 0.09 %</p>   | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There were no RBF activities during the FY under review. This was because of a letter from the Permanent Secretary (Dr. Diana Atwine) Ministry of Health, dated 7th December 2022 (Ref: ADM.45/545/02), addressed to all CAOs on “outstanding RBF funds”. The letter highlighted a halt in the payment of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator was not applicable and it was agreed that a score of zero is given to all LGs.</p> | 2 |

|   |   |  |   |          |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The LG structure provided for 335 health worker positions and 272 health workers positions were filled at the time of assessment putting the staffing levels at 81%.</p> | <b>1</b> |
|---|---|--|---|----------|

|   |   |  |   |          |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was no health facility upgrade (HC II being upgraded to HC III) implemented by the District during the FY 2022/2023.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|---|--|---|----------|

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

|   |  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparing the DHO staff deployment list and the Staff lists at the 3 sampled health facilities; Orwamuge HCIII, Nyakwae HCIII and Alererk HCIII, there was evidence to show that the health workers were in places where they were deployed.</li> </ul> | <b>2</b> |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

**Orwamuge HCIII** had 18 staff on the facility noticeboard. This was corresponded with the DHO's staff deployment list for this Facility.

**Nyakwae HCIII** had 11staff on the facility noticeboard. This was corresponded with the DHO's staff deployment list for this Facility.

**Alererk HCIII** had 14 staff on the facility noticeboard. This was corresponded with the DHO's staff deployment list for this Facility.

|   |  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 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 upgrade of any Health HCII to HCIII in Abim district in FY 2022/2023 as was reported in the ABPR for the year that ended on 30th June, 2023.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|--|--|--|----------|



|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 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>While the sampled health facilities submitted their annual work plans and budgets for the previous FY, these were submitted after the stipulated timelines. For instance;</p> <p>Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 17th November 2022- which was beyond the stipulated timelines</p> <p>Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 2nd July 2022</p> <p>Areke HCIII, submitted on 15th July 2022</p> <p>The Health facilities submitted their work plans and budgets later than 31st March of the previous FY hence non compliance to the stipulated timelines.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence to show that the Sampled Health facilities of Abim LG did not submit their annual Budget performance reports according to Budget and Grant Guidelines.</p> <p>Here below find the dates they submitted their annual Budget performance reports to DHO's Office:</p> <p>Nyakwae HCIII did not submit the report for 2022/23. Its report was not available in DHO's office at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 20th July ,2023.</p> <p>Areke HCIII, submitted on 10th July, 2023</p> <p>Only Areke HCIII submitted its Budget performance report according to the Budget and Grant Guidelines; by July 15th of the previous FY</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the Sampled Health facilities developed facility improvement plans and reported on the implementation as shown below:

Nyakwae HCIII submitted its Plan on 6th August 2023.

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th July ,2023

.Arerek HC III submitted on 12th July,2023

Orwamuge HCIII incorporated issues to address Low DPT3 coverage. This was among the gaps earmarked in quarter 3 Health facility report. The actions incorporated in the plan included: Establishing more outreaches from 6 to 9 in a month.

VHT trained on Mobilization skills.

Line listing Children due for DPT3.

The Progress report of 15th September indicated Implementation of the planned activities and improvement of DPD3 coverage to from 65% to 80% .

Nyakwae HCIII incorporated planning issues like Line listing mothers due for ANC4.

Assign VHT to follow up of pregnant mothers in order to improve the identified gap of ANC4 uptake.

Health facility progress report dated 15th September indicated implementation of planed actions and ANC4 had improved from40% to 60%.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the sampled Health facilities submitted their HMIS 105 and 106a reports timely. Here below are their submission dates of the HMIS reports.

### **HMIS 105**

#### **July 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th August ,2022.

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 5th August ,2022.

Arerek HCIII submitted on 7th ugust,2022.

#### **August 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th September ,2022.

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 7th Septembre, 2022

Arerek HCIII submitted on 7th September, 2022

## **September 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 7th October 2022

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 6th October,2022

Arerek HCIII submitted on 7th October,2022

## **October 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 7th November,2022

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 7th November ,2022

Arerek HCIII submitted on 7th November ,2022

## **November 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th December ,2022

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 6th December ,2022

Arerek HCIII submitted on 1st December 2022.

## **December 2022**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th January,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 5th January,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th January, 2023

## **January 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th February,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 6th February,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th February,2023

## **February 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th March,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 2nd March ,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th March ,2023

## **March 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th April,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 5th April,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 5th April,2023

## **April 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th May,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 4th May,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 5th May,2023

### **May 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 7th June,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 3rd June ,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th June ,2023.

### **June 2023**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th July,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 4th July,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th July, 2023

### **Quarterly Report 106 a**

#### **Quarter 1**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th October ,  
2022.

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 6th October  
2022.

Arerek HCIII submitted on th October, 2022.

#### **Quarter 2**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 5th January,  
2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 5th  
January,2023.

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th January,2023.

#### **Quarter 3**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th April,2023.

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 5th April,2023

Arerek HCIII submitted on 5th April,2023

#### **Quarter 4**

Orwamuge HCIII submitted on 6th July,2023

Nyakwae HCIII submitted on 4th July,2023.

Arerek HCIII submitted on 6th July,2023.

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>           | <p>There was a letter from the Permanent Secretary (Dr. Diana Atwine) Ministry of Health, dated 7th December 2022 (Ref: ADM.45/545/02), addressed to all CAOs on “outstanding RBF funds”. The letter highlighted a halt in the payment of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable and it was guided that all LGs to be scored 0 for this indicator. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a letter from the Permanent Secretary (Dr. Diana Atwine) Ministry of Health, dated 7th December 2022 (Ref: ADM.45/545/02), addressed to all CAOs on “outstanding RBF funds”. The letter highlighted a halt in the payment of RBF.</p> <p>Likewise, according to the checklist for Health Specialists (section 5.2.1, 2b) provided by OPM, this indicator is not applicable and it was guided that all LGs be scored 0 for this indicator. Indicator to be dropped from the maximum score during analysis.</p>    | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>                                   | <p>The Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. He noted the new system doesn’t send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</p>   | 0 |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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>Abim district Local government did not have a Performance improvement plan for the weakest Health facilities.</p> <p>There was no approved plan for the weakest facilities seen in DHO's Office at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no Report for improvement of the weakest facilities seen in DHO's Office at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

**Human Resource Management and Development**

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Abim district LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The LG approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx. 5,117,331,000 (Approved budget estimates for Abim LG 2023/24 page 29 of 67 , vote 801). This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 .</p> <p>Therefore, Abim LG budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:

ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

**Orwamuge HCIII** Had deployed 18 out of 19 required health workers for HCIII, giving 94.7% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed Staff list at Orwamuge HCIII noticeboard).

**Nyakwae HCIII** had deployed 11 out of 19 required health workers at HCIII giving 57.9% of the required staffing norm for HCIII (Confirmed staff list at Nyakwae HCIII noticeboard).

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

Therefore, 2 out of 3 sampled health facilities (Nyakwae HCIII and Alererk HCIII) didn't have at least 75% of staff required hence Abim district LG did not deploy health workers in accordance with the staffing norms.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

**Orwamuge HCIII:** 9 out of 18 health workers deployed to Kacheri HCIII were present on duty on the day of assessment. 2 Clinical Officers (Awio Costa and Acar jimmy) and Enrolled Nurse (Ocheng Michael) were off for study leave, 4 health workers (Owona Daniel; Clinical Officer, Alimo Christine; Enrolled Midwife, Owona Daniel; Senior Clinical Officer and Auma Emillina; Enrolled Nurse) were off for their annual leave Atyanga Grace Nursing Assistant had just retired effective from 1st December 2023 and Owilli Andrew Health Assistant was away for field activities on the day of assessment.

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

1. Akuruth Ruth; Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 4th December 2023.

2. Auma Christine; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 4th December 2023.

3. Ochero Jimmy; Health information assistant was present on duty on 4th December 2023.

**(Orwamuge HCIII staff attendance book 4th December 2023).**

**Nyakwae HCIII:** 8 out of 11 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. A Nursing officer (Omara Daniel Gasper) was off for his annual leave, Enrolled Nurse (Santa Franca) was for duty leave and a porter (Apio Flossy Akello)

was off for her maternity leave on the day of assessment.

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

1. Lokwanga Bismark; Clinical Officer was present on duty on 5th December 2023.
2. Aturo Florence Nursing Officer was present on duty on 5th December 2023.
3. Auma Rose Vicky Health Information Assistant was present on duty on 5th December 2023.

*(Nyakwae HCIII staff attendance book 5th December 2023).*

**Alererk HCIII:** 10 out of 14 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Nadunga Doreen Charlotte (Clinical Officer) was on study leave, Apio Grace Babra (Enrolled Midwife) was for her maternity leave, Acero Christine (Health Information Assistant ) and Acheng Rose Stella (Nursing Officer) were for annual leave on the day of assessment.

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

1. Owiny Depaul Obin; Senior Clinical Officer was present on duty on 5th December 2023.
2. Omara Jimmy Livesy; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 5th December 202.
3. Adie Martha; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 5th December 202.

*(Alererk HCIII staff attendance book 5th December 2023).*

Though monthly attendance analysis for health personnel were not seen for 3 health facilities, the evidence in the staff attendance books indicated that the staff in the 3 health facilities were working where they were deployed.

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

The displayed lists of staff at Orwamuge HCIII, Nyakwae HCIII and Alererk HCIII Noticeboards had a total of 18, 11 and 14 staff respectively. (Orwamuge HCIII, Nyakwae HCIII and Alererk HCIII Noticeboards). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 .

2



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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

The LG conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY although most were conducted beyond the deadline. For instance;

1. Otema Dick Benard- Incharge- Pupukamuya HC II was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Kithacho Abraham, SAS
2. Chemonges Victor - In-Charge Gangming HC II was appraised on 29th June by Akomerach Pamela, SAS
3. Oryono Robert- In-charge Alerere HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Kintu Moses, SAS
4. Ityakorit Richard- In-charge Opopong HC II was appraised on 20th June 2023 by Ogol Michael, SAS
5. Atoo Annet Faith- In-charge Oreta HC II was appraised on 11th July by Kithacho Abraham, SAS
6. Omara Carl Peters - In-charge Arembwol HC II was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Onyanga Moses, SAS
7. Achuda Simon- Incharge Koya HC II was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Kintu Moses, SAS
8. Mwoko Denis- In-charge Kiru HC II was appraised on 17th August 2023 by Ocheru Aldous, SAS
9. Lokwang Bismark- in-charge Nyakwae HC III was appraised on 7th July 2023 by Kithacho Abraham, SAS
10. Akemo Betty- In-charge Kanu Health Center II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Onyngo Moses, SAS

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

1. Okello Moses- Enrolled Nurse at Awach HC II was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Obim Benson- In-charge
2. Omara Florence- Nursing Officer at Abim Hospital was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Aketch Rose Betty- Senior Nursing Officer
3. Amone Ogwang- Clinical Officer at Abim Hospital was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Aketch Rose Betty- Senior Nursing Officer
4. Amuge Racheal- Enrolled Nurse at Atunga HC II was appraised on 29th of June 2023 by Atoo Florence- Senior Nursing Officer
5. Akia Doreen Mary- Midwife at Gangmin HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Chemonges Victor, in-charge
6. Obim Benson - Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Opio Boniface, SAS
7. Adong Lucy- Nursing Officer at Abim Hospital was appraised on 3rd November 2023 by Aketch Rose Betty
8. Amua Emilian- Enrolled Nurse at Oramuge HC III was appraised on 27th June 2023 by Owana Daniel- in-charge
9. Okello Santos- Enrolled nurse at Adea HC II was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Acheng Santina- In-charge
10. Ogale Everline Modo- Enrolled Midwife at Oreta HC II was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Atoo Annet Faith

Most of the appraisals were done beyond the deadline.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports which included; managerial skills, nursing procedures, bachelor in nursing course, community surveillance, and management of emergency medical conditions.

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.<br><br>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | b) Evidence that the LG:<br>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0 | There was evidence that the LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level. these included;<br><br>1. Child nutrition and PHC activities on 12th - 30th June 2023,<br>2. Infection prevention and control on 16th -25th January 2023<br>3. Management of Acute Malnutrition on 5th - 22nd June 2023 | 1 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.<br><br>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0  | There was evidence from the training reports and attendance registers that the LG documented training activities in the training database.  | 1 |

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.<br><br>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0 | There was a letter from CAO to MOH dated 25 September 2023, confirming the list of health facilities to receive PHC.it indicated 21b Health facilities to benefit from PHC  | 2 |
| 9 | N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.<br><br>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure | 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.           | A review of the approved budget showed that on page 54 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 55,765,000 and on (page 31) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 748,189,000.<br><br>As per the computation $55,765,000 / 748,189,000 \times 100 = 7\%$ . | 0 |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p>  | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 8th August, 2022 after 30 days.</li> <li>2. 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 19th October, 2022 after 16 days.</li> <li>3. 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 12th January, 2023 after 10 days.</li> <li>4. 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 25th April, 2023 after 14 days.</li> </ol>  |   |
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities was not within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter;</p>  | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 12nd July 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 14th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 16th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds was released on 11st April 2023 and the communication was made on 10th April 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> |   |
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>  | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>  |   |   |   |

|    |   |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>                                   | <p>There was evidence that Abim DHT conducted Quarterly performance review meetings.</p> <p>The dates of the meetings were as follow:</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting took place on 4th October 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 Meeting took place on 12th January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting took place on 3rd April ,2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting took place on 24th August, 2023</p> <p>Some of the implemented actions were :</p> <p>Mentoring of staff on active TB Case finding. This was one of the action points raised in quarter 3 performance review. This was implemented by the DHT conducting a training on active case finding on TB. This training took place on 6th -9th May,2023 and 23 staff attended.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs.</p> <p>For example, the Quarter 1 Performance review meeting held on 4th October 2022 involved:</p> <p><b>Facility in-charges</b></p> <p>Chemonges Victor I/C Gingming HCII.</p> <p>Onye Robert I/C Wilele HCII.</p> <p>Awol Vic I/C Arembora HCII.</p> <p><b>DHT</b></p> <p>Buteraba Mathieus Ag DHO</p> <p>Olee David T.B focl person</p> <p><b>Other departments</b></p> <p>Mwaka Isaak DWO</p> <p><b>Development partners</b></p> <p>Abito Vivia from CUAMM</p> <p>Akillo Emmanue from ANNECA</p>   | 1 |

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>  | <p>There was no HCIV in Abim District, but there was a General Hospital called Abim Hospital.</p> <p>There was evidence that Abim District was supervised Abim Hospital at least every quarter in FY 2022/23. The dates on which the supervisions were done were shown below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 support supervision was done on 26th September 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 14th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 23rd March 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 27th June 2023</p> <p>Some of the findings in Abim Hospital quarter 3 Supervision was heavy infestation of the hospital stores with Rodents.</p> | <b>1</b> |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul> | <p>There was no subdistrict in Abim District , However the district carried out an integrated support supervision to all lower Health centres.</p> <p>This took place on 2nd -7th March 2023 and covered 15 Health facilities.</p> <p>Another integrated support supervision took place 12th -18th June 2023 and covered 17 Health facilities (Integrated Support supervision Reports dated 10th March 2023 and 20th June 2023)</p>  | <b>1</b> |

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the district used results/ reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions:

A support supervision on Orwamuge HC III On 3rd December 2022 identified the disorganized state of the medical store and recommended the health center to have a store focal person. The supervision team recommended assigning a focal person to be in charge store as the district plans recruitment. This recommendation implemented by the health facility temporarily appointing a person a store focal person and was mentored on electronic ordering system and store management. (Progress Report 5th June 2023).

The quarter 2 support supervision done in Awach HCII identified challenges in filling OPD registers and Knowledge gap in ANC care especially in viral load testing.

Progress report dated 20th June 2023, by Ouga Isaac on support supervision, indicated there was mentorship done in correction of these gaps.

In Kanu HCII, the support supervision had identified having un updated vaccine control books and no protocol posters displayed.

This was implemented by conducting Mentorship to Staff by DHT(progress report on Support supervision 20th June 2023)

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>   | <p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence to show that Abim District LG provided Support to all facilities in management of Medicine and health supplies as shown on the incidences below:</p> <p>A report by Dr. Tino Solome MMS focal person dated 7th July,2023 showed that there were 4 quarterly Medicine management supervisions done in the District in the FY 2022/23 and they took place on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 supervision took place on 17th July -26th September 2022 and it covered 14 Health facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 2 supervision took place on 16th October-14th December 2022 and covered 10 Health facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 3 supervision took place on 15 January -23rd 2023 and covered 21 Health facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 4 Supervision took place 24 may - 30th June 2023 and it covered 18 Health facilities.</p> <p>Examples of the findings in Quarter 2 MMS supervision were inadequate storage space in Orwamuge HCIII, no electronic ordering devices on site, no data bundle for online ordering.</p> <p>T.B dispensing logbook and register were not up to date.</p> | 1 |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>                | <p>A review of the performance report showed that DHO was UGX 55,765,000. A review of the report shows that Ugx 16,958,990 was spent on Health promotion on page 31 of the approved budget.</p> <p>Expressed as a % = <math>16,958.990 / 55,765,000 \times 100 = 30\%</math>.</p>   | 2 |



|    |  |   |   |          |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0 | <p>There was evidence to show that DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.</p> <p>There was Community sensitization on Malaria Prevention and control on 18th August 2022 in Nyakwae Subcounty it covered 5 villages.</p> <p>There was Community Health education on Child Health Nutrition. And family planning. This was done on 12th -30 June 2023 in Rwamuge subcounty</p> | <b>1</b> |
|    | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure   |   |   |          |

|    |  |   |   |          |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0 | <p>There was evidence to show that DHT did a follow up on Health promotion and disease prevention.</p> <p>With support from CUAM, there was a refresher training for VHTs to empower them to conduct malaria sensitization, testing and treatment. This followed the Malaria control Campaign launched by DHT in Nyakwae Subcounty on 18th August 2022.</p> <p>Health Education on Malaria was started at entry points of all Health facilities, targeting caregivers, pregnant mothers, lactating mothers. (A follow up report on Health promotion dated 20th June 2023)</p> | <b>1</b> |
|    | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure   |   |   |          |

**Investment Management**

|    |   |   |   |          |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 12 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines. | a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence to show that Abim District had an updated Assets register. This register included equipment for each Health facility.</p> <p>There were medical equipment like BP machines weigh scales, Nursing equipment, laboratory equipment.</p> <p>Sterilization equipment like Autoclaves.</p> <p>It also included the Physical infrastructure for example Wards, staff houses, Placenta pit, incinerator. etc</p> | <b>1</b> |
|    | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure  |   |   |          |

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> | <p>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>No evidence of desk appraisal was provided since health department didn't implement any development project in the previous FY.</p>   | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>  | <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>  |  |   |
| 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>- No evidence of field appraisal was provided since health department didn't implement any development project in the previous FY.</p>  | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>  |   |  |   |
| 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>Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction however, monitoring using the checklist was never adhered to. Below are the projects that were implemented in the health sector;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of the District Health Office block prepared on 26th June, 2022</li> <li>2. Drilling and construction of borehole at Kanu HCII prepared on 19th January, 2023</li> </ol> | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>  |   |  |   |
| 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>There was evidence that the LG health department did timely by April 30 for the current FY, submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU, for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan which was approved on 6th September, 2023, this was done on 28th April, 2023 . The projects planned for implementation were; Construction of DHO's office at Ugx 118 M and Maternity ward at Wilela HCII at Ugx 96 M.</p>   | 1 |
|    | <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>   |   |  |   |

|    |  |  |  |          |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY. It was for construction of maternity ward at Wilela HCII, it was done on the 16th August, 2023.</p> | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The Contracts Committee sitting on 21st December, 2022 approved the award of the contracts in minute 04/DCC/21/12/20222, for renovation of cold chain room at Abim hospital.</p>  | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>  | <p>There was no evidence to show that the LG properly established the project implementation team for all health infrastructure project.</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 health infrastructure upgrade implemented in the district during the year under review.</p>  | <b>1</b> |

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>  | <p>There were no records for clerk of works that were seen during the assessment, since there was no health facility upgrade implemented in the district during the year under review.</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>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 record that the LG held monthly site meetings by the project site committee since there was health facility upgrade undertaken in the district during the year under review.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>  | <p>There was no health facility upgrade undertaken in the district in the year under review.</p>   | 1 |

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0 | No evidence of payment vouchers were on file the LG didn't implement any development project under health funded by the sector development fund. | <b>0</b> |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

|    |   |  |  |          |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0 | There was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file for health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The procurement files reviewed was;<br><br>Project: Renovation of cold chain room at Abim hospital<br><br>Procurement ref: Abim801/wrks/2022-2023/00017 had the following documents therein;<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed works contract dated 13th January, 2023 with Ms. Korinyang and Sons Enterprises</li> <li>• Evaluation report dated 19th -20th December, 2022</li> <li>• Contracts Committee minutes dated 21st December, 2022</li> <li>• PP1 form, call for bids, issue and receipt of bids, award and acceptance letters, among documents on file.</li> </ul> | <b>1</b> |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

|    |  |  |  |          |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework<br><br>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0 | Projects implemented in the health sector in the previous FY did not have any grievances registered throughout the implementation cycle. | <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>There was evidence of guidelines on medical waste management that were availed such as the National Micro Planning Handbook for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in Healthcare Facilities (HCFs) in Uganda June, 2022 and the Infectious Prevention and Control (IPC)-WASH. These guidelines were used in the training of health workers as a component of the dissemination approach. For example, there was a “Training of health workers on IPC-WASH at Hursey Hotel, Soroti District held from 16th-21st January and 20th-25th February 2023” and an “Activity report dated 22nd November, 2022 following on-job mentorship of health workers on medical waste management”.</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 District had a functional system for medical waste management such as incinerators and placenta pits for health centre IV and the regional referral hospital, coded bins for all health units for segregating medical waste, and waste pits for burning non-wet generated waste.</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>There was evidence availed on records of training titled “Training of health workers on the Infectious prevention and Control ( IPC)-WASH at Hursey Hotel, Soroti District held from 16th-21st January and 20th-25th February 2023” and an “Activity report dated 22nd November, 2022 following on-job mentorship of health workers on medical waste management”.</p>   | 1 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>A costed ESMP for the drilling and construction of borehole at Kanu HCII was integrated into the BoQ with a total cost of at UGX. 39,842,700 and Bill 1.31 for environment mitigation costed at 50,000.</p>   | 2 |

|    |  |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>                              | <p>There was no proof of land ownership for the health sector projects, since no records were availed at the time of assessment.</p>  | 0 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>  | <p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provide monthly reports the construction of DHO's Office block on 18th July, 2023.</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>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>There were no certification files availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether Environment Officer and CDO signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects.</p> | 0 |

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Score    |
|--|---|--|---|----------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |  |   |          |
| 1  | <p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>  | <p>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Abim DLG in the previous FY was 61%</p>  | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | <p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> | <p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Abim DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 98%</p>               | <b>2</b> |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>              | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>   | <p>The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current FY was 46% as for the results viewed in the OPAMs.</p> | <b>0</b> |



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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 70% were:-

Drilling of 1 borehole installed with a hand pump and rehabilitation of 2 boreholes in Alerek sub-county with a safe water coverage of 67%, drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump and rehabilitation of 1 borehole in Awach sub-county with a safe water coverage of 33%, rehabilitation of 1 boreholes and drilling of 1 borehole installed with hand pump in Lotukei S/C with a safe water coverage of 64%.

The projects that were implemented during the year under review as captured in pages 6, 7 and 8 of the annual budget performance report 2022/2023 were:-

Drilling of 5 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, rehabilitation of 8 boreholes, and drilling of 2 production wells.

The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 7 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 16 in number.

The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was  $7/16 * 100\% = 44\%$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

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

1). Drilling and installation of 5 boreholes in various Lower Local Governments:

Engineer's estimate = UGX  
113,320,558

Contract Sum = UGX 119,678,600

Variance = UGX -6,537,942

Percentage variance =  
 $(6,537,942)/113,320,558 \times 100\% = -5.8\%$ .

2). Drilling of 1 production wells in Kanu village in Abim sub-county.

Engineers estimate = UGX  
47,000,000

Contract price = UGX 39,842,700

Variation = UGX 7,157,300

Percentage variation =  
 $7,157,300/47,000,000 \times 100\% = 15\%$ .

3). Rehabilitation of 8 boreholes in the various LLGs:

Engineers estimate = UGX  
54,469,136

Contract price = UGX 58,968,512

Variation = UGX 4,499,376

Percentage variance =  
 $4,499,376/54,469,136 \times 100\% = 8.3\%$ .

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>   | <p>Projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 as captured in pages 6, 7, and 8 of the annual budget performance report included the following:-</p> <p>Drilling of 5 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps in various Sub-Counties, drilling of 2 production wells in Abim and Morulem sub-counties, rehabilitation of 8 boreholes in various LLGs and construction of a five stance VIP latrine in Nyakwae market in Nyakwae sub-county. The total number of projects implemented were 16 and all of them were completed and were functional. Therefore, the percentage of the completed projects as per the annual report was:</p> <p><math>16/16*100\% = 100\%</math>.</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>         | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>   | <p>There was a decrease in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 76% and FY 2022/2023 was 61% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage decrease was <math>61\% - 76\% = -15\%</math></p>   | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>         | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul> | <p>There was an increase in the percentage of water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 80% and 98% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage increase therefore was <math>98\% - 80\% = 18\%</math></p>   | 2 |

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY (2022/2023) as captured in pages 6, 7, and 8 of the annual budget performance report 2022/2023, where the following facilities below were sampled from;

1). Drilling of deep borehole in Aywe East village/cell in Kiru T/C, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 87750 and completed on 10th May, 2023.

2). Drilling of a deep borehole in Adagkolo village in Awach sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 87751 and completed on 16th May, 2023.

3). Drilling of deep borehole in Alebtong village in Orwamuge T/C, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 87749 and completed on 26th April, 2023.

These projects were completed as per the plan,

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

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:

In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 17th October, 2022, on page 6, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments in summary table and in the annex there was form4 with all the status of all the water facilities per sub-county.

For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 17th January, 2023 on page 4; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties of the District and there was also form 4 attached for submission.

While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 17th July, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on page 5. This was submitted together with form 1 and 4 on the same date.

Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 14th September, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 7 together with form 4 and they were all submitted on the same date.

Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 14th September, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form4 which had summaries of the status of all the water facilities per sub-county

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p> | <p>The copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment, the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 46%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the least performing LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

### Human Resource Management and Development

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p> | <p>The DWO had budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician at Ugx 53,000,000/=.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p> | <p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer at Ugx 180,000,000/=.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p> | <p>The HR department and the DWO did not provide any appraisals for the water staff at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p> | <p>The HR department and the DWO did not provide any appraisals for the water staff at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

## Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO allocated 30% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 70%.

The water stressed sub-counties were;

Alerek S/C with safe water coverage of 67% was allocated rehabilitation of 1 borehole, Lotukei S/C with a safe water coverage of 64% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 1 borehole, Awach S/C with safe water coverage of 33% was allocated drilling of 1 borehole and rehabilitation of 1 borehole, Magamaga S/C with a safe water coverage of 65% was allocated rehabilitation of 1 borehole.

The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 150,943,891

The total annual development budget for Kaabong DWO for the current FY was UGX 510,356,882

Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =  
 $150,943,891/510,356,882*100\% = 30\%$

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 6 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

In this file there was a letter dated 3rd October, 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs and Town Clerks, of the following sub-counties and Town Councils Kiru, Abim, Lotukei, Nyakwae Alerek, Awach and Opopongo.

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

The DWO also made a presentation during the district budget conference which was held on 25th October, 2023 in slides number 3, 4 and 5 in his presentation where the allocations were summarized.



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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

The DWO presented 4 sets of the quarterly monitoring reports together with quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 17th October, 2022, it was noted that there was a summary table in the report which showed that 381 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the monitoring report dated 17th January, 2023, a total of 394 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 28th May, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 400.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 27th July, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 398.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was =  $381 + 394 + 400 + 398 = 1,573/4 = 394$ .

Abim DLG had a total of 419 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was  $394/419 * 100\% = 94\%$

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the DWO did not conduct the DWSCC meetings quarterly; the DWO presented only three sets of meeting minutes implying that there were no meetings conducted in 1 of the quarters.

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 9  | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>   | <p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 63%.</p>  | 2 |
|    | <p></p>   | <p></p>  | <p>This was seen in a letter dated 3rd October, 2023 which detailed the allocation of projects including the resources to the various LLGs among which was Alerek sub-county with a safe water coverage of 67%, Awach sub-county with a safe water coverage of 33%, Lotukei sub-county with a safe water coverage of 64%, and Magamaga sub-county with a safe water coverage of 58%.</p>   |   |
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Abim DLG water sector was UGX 65,073,923. The DWO allocated UGX 32,935,145 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was <math>32,935,145 / 65,073,923 * 100\% = 51\%</math>.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>   | 3 |
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>   | <p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&amp;M. The DWO presented a training report dated 17th March, 2023. The training period spanned from 8th to 14th March, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&amp;M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills and O&amp;M action planning among others. Under O&amp;M emphasis was put on identification of faults, preventive maintenance and minor and major repairs</p> <p>The trainers were; Ouga Isaac ADWO in charge mobilization, Ocen Reinhard Okello the BMT.</p> | 3 |

## Investment Management

|    |  |   |   |          |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>  | <p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were included in the register as they were detailed in form 1 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 14th September, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base.</p> | <b>4</b> |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p> | <p>No evidence of desk appraisal forms for current FY 2022/2023 water projects were availed at the time of assessment.</p>  | <b>0</b> |

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>  | <p>All the budgeted investments for the current FY had completed application forms from the beneficiary communities as per the records reviewed from a file of community application forms presented by the DWO to the assessor. Some of the sampled community applications included:</p>   | 2 |
|    |  |  | <p>1). Application from Kololo East village in Awach S/C, the application was date 14th June, 2022, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 20th September, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LCI, Okello Denis, together with the following community members representing the rest of the community: Atai Betty, Ademun Irene, and Etagu Lawrence</p>                 |   |
|    |  |  | <p>2). Application from Aridai South village in Lotukei S/C, the application was dated 5th April, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI, Ariko Faustino Kabokson with the following community members on behalf of the entire community; Ochen John Obuin, Anyero Rose, and Akech Janet.</p>  |   |
|    |  |  | <p>The DWO cleared it for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on the 20th September, 2023.</p>   |   |
|    |  |  | <p>3).Application from Ngoropan village in Opopongo S/C, this application was dated 19th September, 2022 and was endorsed by the LCI, Mr. Opule Joseph together with the following community members Adeke Emmima, Aboot Jesca, and Isina Hellen Rose on behalf of the entire community. This application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 20th September, 2023 by the District Water Officer.</p> |   |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p> | <p>No evidence of filed appraisal forms for current FY 2022/2023 water projects were availed at the time of assessment.</p>   | 0 |

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>                                    | <p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p> | <p>Screening of all the water infrastructure projects for the current FY for environmental and social risks/impacts was not done in spite of the fact that the projects were approved in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24. Below were the projects that should have been screened;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phase one Construction of Kanu, Abim Subcounty County, Water supply system under Conditional Grant -Development 187-o/w Rural Water &amp; Sanitation Sub-grant at UGX. 22,783,000</li> <li>2. Phase one Construction of Kanu, Abim Subcounty County, Water supply system under Conditional Grant -Development 186-o/w Piped Water Sub-grant at UGX. 177,423,000</li> <li>3. LCII: Abuk Ward, Abuk Town Council County, Drilling and Construction of five boreholes under Conditional Grant -Development 187-o/w Rural Water &amp; Sanitation Sub-grant at UGX. 13,320,000</li> </ol> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence that the planned water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan, which was signed by the CAO, Alex Felix Majeme, on 6th September, 2023. The investments included Drilling and construction of 5 boreholes at Ugx 125M, Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes at Ugx 75M and Construction of Kanu piped water system phase one at Ugx 200M.</p>  | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction</p> <p>Score 2:</p>   | <p>There was evidence to show that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure, for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. This was done in the sitting of 19th -20th September, 2023 where they approved the contracts for rehabilitation of boreholes within the district in minute 04/Dec/09/2022.</p>   | 2 |

|    |  |  |  |          |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>   | <p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines.</p>   | <b>0</b> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>   | <p>The water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example the boreholes in Alebtong village of Orwamuge T/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron was 2400mm wide x 3300mm long with a ramp attached to either side, the ramp is 1:20 sloping concrete. A 400mm high concrete mould is fixed next to the pump handle to facilitate for a person with disabilities sit on and pump water at ease, this was in line with the design that was obtained from the DWO.</p> | <b>2</b> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>  | <p>There were reports dated 13th January, 2023, 30th March, 2023 and 16th June, 2023 by the District water officer. Which showed that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects.</p>  | <b>2</b> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p> <p>.</p> | <p>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.</p>   | <b>0</b> |

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

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

Project: Borehole drilling and construction of 5 boreholes

Procurement ref; Abim/wrks/2022-2023/00003 had these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 27th October, 2022 with Ms. Icon Projects Limited

- Evaluation report dated 2nd -9th September, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 19th -20th September, 2022

- PP1 form, call for bids, issue of and receipt of bids, offer and acceptance letters among the documents on file.

Project: Rehabilitation of 8 boreholes

Procurement ref: Abim801/wrks/2022-2023/00004, with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 27th October, 2022 with Rejime Contractors Limited

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 19th -20th September, 2022

- Evaluation minutes dated 2nd -9th September, 2022

## Environment and Social Requirements

Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

*Maximum 3 points this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee handled complaints arising out of the water sector projects for example, a complaint recorded on 21st January, 2023 of a borehole malfunction at Oryeotyene primary school and the matter was handled on 25th January, 2023 and repair parts were provided by the District Water Office.

|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 14 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>            | <p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>There was no record availed at the time of assessment as evidence of disseminated guidelines on Water source &amp; catchment protection and Natural resource management to CDOs. And the only availed guidelines were outdated for example, the District Water and Sanitation Conditional Grant budgeting and Implementation guideline and the National Framework for operation and maintenance of rural water infrastructure in Uganda, December, 2019.</p>   | <b>0</b> |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>   | <p>Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities were prepared and implemented for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling and construction of borehole at Kanu HCII prepared on 19th January, 2023</li> <li>• Drilling and construction of borehole at Aywee south prepared on 18th January, 2023</li> <li>• Drilling and construction of borehole at Bandaka prepared on 17th January, 2023</li> <li>• Drilling and construction of borehole at Aleptong village, Morulem sub-county prepared on 16th January, 2023</li> <li>• Drilling and construction of borehole at Ayeye Kanyakure prepared on 12th January, 2023.</li> </ul> <p>And an ESMP for Borehole drilling prepared on 20th January, 2023, as well as a District water and sanitation sector annual work plan and budget for FY 2022/23.</p> | <b>3</b> |



|    |  |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>                     | <p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <p>1). Land agreement signed on 11th November, 2022 between Lopio Nachede and the community of Bandaka village of Camkok S/C. This agreement was signed by Ayugi Christine the LCI on behalf of the community together with Ocap Peter, Okidi Oscar, and Arapmoe Daniel.</p> <p>2). Land agreement signed on 8th November, 2022 between Alobo Silvia and Awilli Aneya with the community of Adagkolo village of Awach S/C, and was signed by Okello Alfred Anik the LCI with Okello Peter Mogai, Aoyom Vicky, and Akullo Anneta on behalf of the community.</p> <p>3). Land agreement signed on 7th November, 2022 between Erumu Kokas Okonya and the community of Alebtong village/cell of Orwamuge T/C, it was also signed by Buna John Miem the LCI with Acola Betty, Atyeno Teddy on behalf of the community.</p> | 3 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>No evidence of environment and social safeguards for water projects were availed at the time of assessment.</p>  | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>  | <p>The CDO and Environment Officer monitored all water sector projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports for example, a monitoring report dated 22nd January, 2023 for all water points was availed.</p>  | 2 |

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements  | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Score |
|--|--|--|---|-------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |  |  |   |       |
| 1  | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>   | <p>The LG did not present data on irrigated land for the last two financial years, disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>No MOUs were presented for the three (3) UgFIT Demo sites that are still under establishment in a host farmer (Kanu Parish, Abim Sub-county, 2.5 acres), Lotuke Seed Secondary School (Achangali Parish, Lotukei Sub-county, 2 acres), and Morulem Girls' Secondary School (Arema Parish, Morulem Town-Council, 1.5 acres), signed between Abim DLG and the host institutions.</p> <p>The MSI focal person verbally mentioned 20 acres under a small irrigation scheme established by the Ministry of Water, namely; Puno and Akado Small-scale Irrigation Schemes.</p> | 0     |
| 1  | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul> | <p>Due to the absence of irrigation data provided by the Local Government, calculating the percentage increase in acreage of newly irrigated land from FY 2021/2022 to FY 2022/2023 was not possible.</p>   | 0     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>       | <p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>  | <p>The average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 73% as per the OPAMS.</p>   | 4     |

Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

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

There was no evidence that the development component of the micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. The budget performance report presented was prepared in the financial year 2023/2024 by the DPMO- Dr. Ogwang Owello Jino, dated 18th August 2023, which deviated from the correct reporting period, which should not exceed 30th June of each financial year.

- The above-mentioned report revealed that;
  1. Awareness raising events at the district level, 7,534,000 was used to facilitate TPC awareness creation activities and 4,549,000 was used on awareness raising for the district councilors
  2. Awareness-raising events at the Lower Local Government (LLG), 11,986,514 were used.
  3. Awareness raising events for farmers, 9,964,000 was used.
  4. For a farmer-to-farmer learning visit, 13,455,000 was used.
  5. Field day with farmers at the demonstration sites, 10,402,000 was used
  6. Expression of interest (EOIs), 7,728,000 was used.
  7. For events to connect farmers to input dealers, 14,356,000 were used.
  8. An event to connect farmers to financial institutions, 5,415,037 was used.
  9. Irrigation demonstrations, 51,785,963 were planned and a contract agreement was signed by Abim DLG and Arki Timers Ltd on 31st March 2023 but supplies and installations were not done by the end of FY 2022/2023. The funds were taken back to the central treasury.

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

There was no evidence that was provided and the CFO noted that the LG was under the implementation stage 2 of micro scale irrigation.

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines | Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0                 | Variations in the contract price for the demonstration sites were not within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates and was calculated as follows.<br><br>SAE costed figure = UGX 51,000,000.<br><br>The contractor's costed figure = UGX 204,168,084 ( Bills of Quantities for the three demo sites). however, a contract agreement that was signed by Abim DLG and Arki Timers Ltd on 31st March 2023 was for Shs.51,000,000.<br><br>Percentage Contract Variation = ((Contractor's Costed Figure - SAE Costed Figure)/SAE Costed Figure)X100<br><br>Percentage Contract Variation = ((204,168,084- 51,000,000)/51,000,000)X100<br><br>Percentage Variation ≈ 300.31%<br><br>The percentage variation in the contract price was approximately 300.31% which was out of the range of +/-20% of the Agricultural Engineer's estimates. | 0 |
|   | Maximum score 6   |  |  |   |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines | d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY | The actual instalation completion status of the micro-scale equipment equipment was was 0% by the end of the financial year 2022/2023.<br><br>A contract agreement of Shs.51,000,000) was signed between Abim DLG and M/s Arki Timers Ltd on 31st March 2023 but no implementation was done with in that financial year and funds for implementation were returned to the MoFPED.  | 0 |
|   | Maximum score 6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>                 |  |   |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  | The LG staff structure provided for 36 and the LG had deployed 12 extension workers at the time of assessment hence 33% of the position were filled.   | 0 |
|   | Maximum score 6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>                   |  |   |

|   |  |  |   |          |
|---|--|--|---|----------|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul> | <p>No record of Micro-scale irrigation inventory was found. The demonstration sites were not finished, and their assessment for compliance with standards was not possible.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|---|--|--|---|----------|

|   |  |   |   |          |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul> | <p>None of the irrigation demonstration sites were completed by the end of the financial year 2022/2023. Functionality evaluation was not done.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|---|--|---|---|----------|

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

|   |  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence from the staff list and attendance registers seen in the LLGs sampled that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed as below;</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

1. Apora Samuel Grace, Agriculture Officer, was working in Morulem Sub County.
2. Angeo Lucy, Animal Husbandry Officer, was working in Abim Sub County.
3. Lotoduk Kennedy, a Veterinary Officer, was working in Abim Town Council.
4. Obin Kizito Kaguta, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, was working in Morulem Sub County.
5. Obura Jimmy Patrick, Agriculture Officer, was working in Abim Town Council.
6. Ogale Secondina, Assistant Agriculture Officer, was working in Abim Sub County.

|   |  |   |  |          |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>By the end of the financial year 2022/2023, the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation equipment had not been implemented as planned. Therefore, this indicator could not be assessed.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|---|--|---|--|----------|

Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans

Maximum score 6

a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0

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

Quarterly progress reports, compiled by the AO and endorsed by the CAO, were submitted on the following dates: Q1 (not reported as no activities were conducted since funds had not been allocated until the end of Q1), Q2 (19th January 2023), Q3 (05th May 2023), and Q4 (05th July 2023). It should be noted that the report for Q4 was submitted beyond the acceptable reporting period, and planned activities for Quarter One were carried out in the subsequent quarters.

Q4 report indicated that farmer registrations for expressing interest totaled 118 out of which 114 were successful and 4 were unsuccessful EOI applicants. The total number of prepared farm visits was 65, out of which 35 visits were conducted. Additionally, 983 attendees were reported to have attended the awareness-raising events.

Q3 report indicated that a total of 12 awareness-raising events were prepared, and a total of 852 attendees were recorded, of which 51.7% were female and 48.3% were male.

Q2 report indicated that at the end of this reporting period, all seven officers who attended online training (Irritrack users training) had completed modules one (1) through 5a.

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>                                 | <p>An up-to-date Local Government (LLG) information entry was made into the Management Information System (MIS). For example, MIS reports displayed 118 Expressions of Interest (EOI) compared to 112 applicants in the MIS database, with 65 of them undergoing prepared farm visits. Out of these, 35 farm visits were conducted. Additionally, workshops and seminars aimed at raising awareness among farmers recorded a total participation of 983 individuals.</p> <p>During the assessment, the District Agricultural Officer (DAO) accessed his Irri Track application. The assessor then cross-verified the data on farm visits by comparing it with the information output in the MIS database. A negligible difference of four (6) applicants was found.</p>   | 1 |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The Local Government (LG) did not prepare quarterly reports utilizing information compiled from Local Level Governments (LLGs) in the Management Information System (MIS).</p> <p>Only three (3) quarterly progress reports, compiled by the AO and endorsed by the CAO, were submitted. A knowledge gap was identified in the use of reporting templates, which lacked essential information, including proper budget performance reports. The reporting dates were as follows:</p> <p>Q1 (not reported as no activities were conducted since funds had not been allocated until the end of Q1).</p> <p>Q2 (19th January 2023).</p> <p>Q3 (05th May 2023).</p> <p>Q4 (05th July 2023).</p> <p>It should be noted that the report for Q4 was submitted beyond the acceptable reporting period, and planned activities for Quarter One were carried out in the subsequent quarters.</p> | 0 |

|   |   |  |   |          |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 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:<br>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that the LG had developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the lowest performing LLGs (e.g Alerek, Awach and Lotuke ) at the time of assessment. | <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 | There was no evidence that the LG had Implemented Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest-performing LLGs since the LG had not developed the PIP. The Head of Production at Abim LG informed the assessment that Abim was in its first year of MSI program implementation. | <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:<br>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | The LG had budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms at Ugx 633,733,000/= | <b>1</b> |
|   | Maximum score 6   |   |  |          |

|   |   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of assessment, the LG had deployed extension workers as per guidelines and these included;</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aketch Lilly Rose Assistant Agriculture Officer</li> <li>2. Ogwang Jimmy Olum Agriculture Officer</li> <li>3. Angeo Lucy Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</li> <li>4. Abura Samuel Grace Veterinary Officer</li> <li>5. Okwi Charles Eva Agriculture Officer</li> <li>6. Ogale Secondina Assistant Agriculture Officer</li> <li>7. Lotoduk Kennedy Veterinary Officer</li> </ol> | <b>1</b> |
|   | Maximum score 6   |   |   |          |



|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that extension workers are actively working in the Local Level Governments (LLGs) to which they are deployed. For instance, from the sampled LLGs, it was found that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apora Samuel Grace, Agriculture Officer, was working in Morulem Sub County.</li> <li>2. Angeo Lucy, Animal Husbandry Officer, was working in Abim Sub County.</li> <li>3. Lotoduk Kennedy, a Veterinary Officer, was working in Abim Town Council.</li> <li>4. Obin Kizito Kaguta, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, was working in Morulem Sub County.</li> <li>5. Obura Jimmy Patrick, Agriculture Officer, was working in Abim Town Council.</li> <li>6. Ogale Secondina, Assistant Agriculture Officer, was working in Abim Sub County.</li> </ol> | 2 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The extension workers' deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board as was seen in the 3 LLGs visited (Abim Sub County, Morulem Sub County and Abim Town Council).</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p> | <p>The District Production Coordinator had conducted performance appraisals for extension workers as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aketch Lilly Rose Assistant Agriculture Officer was appraised on 9th August 2023 by Kintu Moses SAS. The appraisal after June 30th 2023 the stipulated deadline.</li> <li>2. Ogwang Jimmy Olum Agriculture Officer was appraised on 14th July 2023 by Opio Boniface Ag.SAS. The appraisal after June 30th 2023 the stipulated deadline.</li> <li>3. Angeo Lucy Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 30st June 2023 by Onyango Moses, ACAA</li> <li>4. Abura Samuel Grace Veterinary Officer was appraised on 11th June 2023 by Kithacho Abraham, SAS</li> <li>5. Okwi Charles Eva Agriculture Officer was appraised on 6th July 2023 Akumu Joshua SAS. The appraisal after June 30th 2023 the stipulated deadline.</li> <li>6. Ogale Secondina Assistant Agriculture Officer was appraised on 3rd July 2023 by Akomerach Pamela, SAS. The appraisal after June 30th 2023 the stipulated deadline.</li> <li>7. Lotoduk Kennedy Veterinary Officer was appraised on 5th July 2023 by Akomerach Pamela SAS. The appraisal after June 30th 2023 the stipulated deadline.</li> </ol> <p>Some of the appraisals were carried out past the set deadline hence non compliance to the established policy which attracted a zero score.</p> | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>  | <p>The LG had taken corrective actions from the appraisals which included; project planning and management, and basic computing</p>  | 1 |

|   |   |   |  |          |
|---|---|---|--|----------|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers | b) Evidence that:<br>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | The HR department did not provide evidence that training activities were conducted in accordance with the training plan at district level. | <b>0</b> |
|   | Maximum score 4   |   |  |          |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers | ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0                                    | There was no evidence provided by the HR department that training activities were documented in the training database.                     | <b>0</b> |
|   | Maximum score 4   |   |  |          |

**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. | a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0  | The LG had appropriately allocated the micro-scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro-scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services<br><br>The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 196,550,093 of which UGX 147,412,570 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 49,137,523 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services. | <b>2</b> |
|   | Maximum score 10   |   |  |          |
| 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. | 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 | LG which was in phase 2 ,100% micro scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;<br><br>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.7,370,628<br><br>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.19,655,009<br><br>30% irrigation demonstrations was Uhs.14,741,257<br><br>15% farmer visits was Uhs 7,370,628<br><br>According to Page 7 Of Sector Grant guidelines.  | <b>2</b> |
|   | Maximum score 10   |   |  |          |

|                         |   |  |   |   |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 9                       | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>                                  | <p>There was no evidence of cofunding planned as per the current budget.</p>  | 0 |
| <p>Maximum score 10</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>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 since the LG were still under implementation stage one.</p>   | 0 |
| <p>Maximum score 10</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>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>   | <p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated information on the use of the farmer co-funding. The following reports were found;</p> <p>Awareness-raising events at the district level, DTPC awareness creation activities, and awareness sessions for district councilors and development partners were conducted on the 22nd and 23rd of December 2022, respectively.</p> <p>Exchange/learning visit for farmers to Amuru DLG dated 24th May 2023.</p> <p>Radio Talk Show: Coordination, Development, and running radio short messages on the UGIFT MSI program implemented between 29th May to 31st May 2023.</p> <p>Farmer registration for EOI and farm visits dated 28th May 2023.</p> <p>Field day with farmers at the demonstration sites dated 13th June 2023.</p> <p>For events to connect farmers to input dealers, dated 22nd June 2023.</p> <p>An event to connect farmers to financial institutions, dated 27th June 2023.</p> | 2 |
| <p>Maximum score 10</p> |   |  |   |   |

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.) | By the end of the financial year 2022/2023, LG had not installed micro-scale irrigation equipment. Therefore monthly monitoring reports by DPO were not available  | 0 |
|    | Maximum score 8  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>  |  |   |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines | b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0   | Abim DLG was in its first year of implementation and has not reached the co-funding stage of MSI projects.   | 0 |
|    | Maximum score 8  |   |  |   |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines | c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0   | There was no evidence that the Local Government (LG) provided hands-on support to the Local Level Government (LLG) extension workers during the implementation of complementary services in the previous financial year. Supervision reports were not on file, and minutes of field meetings were also not documented. | 0 |
|    | Maximum score 8  |   |  |   |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines | d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0   | Abim DLG was in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of establishing farmer field schools.   | 0 |
|    | Maximum score 8  |   |  |   |

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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>There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines, for example, the awareness-raising reports for the LLGs and Town Councils. These reports included;</p> <p>Exchange/learning visit for farmers to Amuru DLG dated 24th May 2023.</p> <p>Radio Talk Show: Coordination, Development, and running radio short messages on the UGIFT MSI program implemented between 29th May to 31st May 2023.</p> <p>Farmer registration for EOI and farm visits dated 28th May 2023.</p> <p>Field day with farmers at the demonstration sites dated 13th June 2023.</p> <p>For events to connect farmers to input dealers, dated 22nd June 2023.</p> <p>An event to connect farmers to financial institutions, dated 27th June 2023.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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>Evidence was presented about the training of staff and political leaders at the District and LLG levels. for example, reports on awareness-raising events at the district level, DTPC awareness creation activities, and awareness sessions for district councilors and development partners were conducted on the 22nd and 23rd of December 2022, respectively.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

**Investment Management**

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of an updated register for micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to the Local Government or host institutions in the previous financial year, 2022/2023 as no installations were carried out.</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>   | <p>There was no evidence that the LG kept an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment. A total of 118 Expressions of Interest (EOI) applicants were reported in the MIS reports by the end of the financial year 2022/2023 compared to 112 EOI applicants verified in the MIS database.</p> | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum score 8</p>   |  | <p>At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms (hard copies) were not filed and successfully enrolled EOI applicants could not be verified in the MIS database.</p>   |   |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</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>The DLG did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that they had conducted farm visits for farmers who submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p>  | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum score 8</p>   |  | <p>Based on MIS data in Q4 (dated 05th July 2023), it was revealed that only 35 actual farm visits, approximately 31.25% of the 112 Expressions of Interest (EOI) applicants had completed farm visits, with 65 prepared farm visits.</p>  |   |
|    |  |  | <p>No minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) were presented, mandating the production department to proceed with the implementation of the program for the approved farmers.</p>  |   |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> | <p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no information found on the LLG noticeboards publicizing eligible farmer approval.</p>  | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum score 8</p>   |  |  |   |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>    | <p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>  | <p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were not for planned and incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY, that was approved on 6th September, 2023 by the CAO, Alex Felix Majeme.</p>  | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum score 18</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>There was evidence to show that the LG did not request for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). They did get quotation from a list of pre-qualified suppliers of the district that was approved by the contracts committee. The quotations were got from these companies; Arki timers limited, Yura technical services and Relief line (U) limited.</p>  | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>   | <p>The bids were received from the following bidders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arki Timers limited at Ugx 83,997,474/=</li> <li>• Yura Technical Services Ugx 52,471,060/=</li> <li>• Relief line (U) limited Ugx 51,000,000/=</li> </ul> <p>The contract was awarded to Arki Timers limited at Ugx 51,000,000/=, whose bid was highest at time receipt of bids. There was no record on file to show how the figure of highest bidder Arki timers turned being the lowest bidder and was awarded the contract.</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>  | <p>There were minutes of the contracts committee that sat on the 24th March, 2023, which awarded the contract for procurement of 3 full sets of Micro scale irrigation equipment and installation to Arki Timers Limited at Ugx 51M.</p>  | 1 |
| 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>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</p> | <p>There was no evidence to show that the LG signed the contract with lowest priced technical responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with the farmer as witness before commencement of installation.</p>   | 0 |



|    |  |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>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   | There was no Micro-scale irrigation equipment installed in the financial year 2022/2023. Therefore no evidence was found or captured.   | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>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 | No technical supervisions were conducted by relevant technical officers on micro-scale irrigation projects, as there were no projects implemented by the end of the financial year 2022/2023. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:<br><br>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0  | No technical supervisions were conducted by relevant technical officers on micro-scale irrigation projects, as there were no projects implemented by the end of the financial year 2022/2023. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>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  | No evidence of the hand-over of the equipment to the host farmer/ institution, as there were no projects implemented by the end of the financial year 2022/2023.                              | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>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                             | No evidence was provided and the CFO noted that the LG was under the implementation stage 2 of micro-scale irrigation.  | 0 |

|    |  |  |  |          |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines | j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0 | There was no evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all the documents required by the PPDA law at the time of assessment. | <b>0</b> |
|    | Maximum score 18   |  |  |          |

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

|    |   |  |   |          |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework | a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0 | There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment on displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas. | <b>0</b> |
|    | Maximum score 6   |  |   |          |

|    |   |  |   |          |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:<br>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0<br>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0<br>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0<br>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | A complaint of dissatisfaction by the leaders of Abim district Local Government recorded on 10th August, 2023 on the 2 projects awarded to Abokalam Mathias by the District Local Government for Green House construction and irrigation scheme at Oima Parish. The district official were concerned the award of the contract to Abokalam Mathias because they were suspicious of his ill intentions of sabotaging the government irrigation projects. | <b>1</b> |
|    | Maximum score 6   |  |   |          |

|    |   |   |   |          |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:<br>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0<br>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0<br>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | A complaint of dissatisfaction by the leaders of Abim district Local Government recorded on 10th August, 2023 on the 2 projects awarded to Abokalam Mathias by the District Local Government for Green House construction and irrigation scheme at Oima Parish. The district official were concerned the award of the contract to Abokalam Mathias because they were suspicious of his ill intentions of sabotaging the government irrigation projects. | <b>1</b> |
|    | Maximum score 6   |   |   |          |

|    |   |  |  |          |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>A complaint of dissatisfaction by the leaders of Abim district Local Government recorded on 10th August, 2023 on the 2 projects awarded to Abokalam Mathias by the District Local Government for Green House construction and irrigation scheme at Oima Parish. The district official were concerned the award of the contract to Abokalam Mathias because they were suspicious of his ill intentions of sabotaging the government irrigation projects.</p> | <b>1</b> |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>A complaint of dissatisfaction by the leaders of Abim district Local Government recorded on 10th August, 2023 on the 2 projects awarded to Abokalam Mathias by the District Local Government for Green House construction and irrigation scheme at Oima Parish. The district official were concerned the award of the contract to Abokalam Mathias because they were suspicious of his ill intentions of sabotaging the government irrigation projects.</p> | <b>1</b> |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

**Environment and Social Requirements**

|    |   |  |  |          |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of the UgIFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program-Improving farmers' livelihood "Technical guidelines, version 3, April 2023". Report dated 27th December, 2022 on awareness raising event held at the District Headquarters through which the content of the Micro-irrigation guidelines were shared.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

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

Screening for Environmental, Social and Climate Change of the irrigation projects was carried out and below were the irrigation sites implemented;

1. Micro scale irrigation at Natete prepared on 16th January 2022

2. Micro scale irrigation at Adagkolo prepared on 16th January 2022

3. Micro scale irrigation at Obangangeo prepared on 11th January, 2023

4. Micro scale irrigation at Kanu East prepared on 11th January, 2023

5. Micro scale irrigation at Kachugu prepared on 10th January, 2023

6. Micro scale irrigation at Ayer North prepared on 11th January, 2023

7. Micro scale irrigation at Ather North prepared on 10th January, 2023

8. Micro scale irrigation at Adwal preparl East prepared on 9th January, 2023

9. Micro scale irrigation at Amwonicek prepared on 18th January, 2023

10. Micro scale irrigation at Angwee East prepared on 18th January, 2023

11. Micro scale irrigation at Atwilo prepared on 10th January, 2023

12. Micro scale irrigation at Anukunam East prepared on 19th January, 2023

13. Micro scale irrigation at Angwee South prepared on 23rd January, 2023

14. Micro scale irrigation at Oyima East prepared on 19th January, 2023

A costed ESMP for the supply of equipment and installation of micro-scale irrigation system at Kanu East was integrated into a total BoQ costed at UGX. 83,997,474 and Bill No. 6.2 under preliminaries costed for environmental protection at UGX. 2,000,000.

|    |  |   |  |          |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br>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 | A monitoring report dated 9th August, 2023 for irrigation sites was availed as proof that micro-scale irrigation projects were monitored for impacts.  | <b>1</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br>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  | Certification forms for or all micro irrigation projects were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the Environmental Officer completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. | <b>0</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br>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   | Certification forms for or all micro irrigation projects were not availed at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the CDO completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.                   | <b>0</b> |

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>  | <b>Definition of compliance</b>   | <b>Compliance justification</b>   | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |   |   |   |              |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0               | The LG HR department did not provide the file for the Chief Finance Officer for review at the time of assessment.               | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0                               | The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Planner nor was there a seconded staff.                                   | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0                          | The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Engineer nor was there a seconded staff.                                  | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | Aceng Jennifer was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 26th May 2021 under Miinute no. ADSC/Min no./01/21. | <b>3</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0         | The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Production Officer nor was there a seconded staff.                        | <b>0</b>     |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0          | Ongwaria Lawrence Karwoth was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer on 26th May 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min No./01/21. | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0      | Owiny Jimmy Opio was substantively appointed as District Commercial Officer on 26th May 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min No./01/21.                     | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.       | Adong Mary Christine was substantively appointed as Senior Procurement Officer on 29th June 2023 under Minute no. ADSC/Min no./02/23                  | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0 | Oryem Moses Geoffrey was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer on 29th June 2023 under Minute no. ADSC/Minute No./02/23.                     | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0                              | Akullo Theopista was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer on 1st November 2016 under Minute No. DSC/Min No ./172/16.           | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0                                  | Aceng Jennifer was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 26th May 2021 under Miinute no. ADSC/Min no./01/21.                       | 2 |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0    | Abim LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Land Management Officer nor was there a seconded staff.                  | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0                                 | Ocheng Santo Oweny was substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 3rd March 2008 under DSC Minute no. 27/2008.           | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0 | Otyang Joel Romwald was substantively appointed as Principal Internal Auditor on 3rd March 2008 under DSC Minute no. 27/2008. | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0    | The LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) nor was there a seconded staff. | 0 |



2

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

The LG had 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries/Town Clerks as below;

1. Ochen Basil was appointed on 11th March 2020 under Minute No. CR/ABM/160.dd12/02/20.
2. Kintu Moses was appointed on 12th May 2014 under Minute No. 70.1/ABM/DSC/2014
3. Achieng Juliet Owilli was appointed on 12th May 2014 under Minute No. 70.2/ABM/DSC/2014
4. Acheru Aldous was appointed on 11th March 2020 under Minute No. CR/ABM/160.DD12/02/20.
5. Okor Andrew Ocheru was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min No./01/21
6. Akamu Joshua was appointed on 12th May 2014 under Minute No. 70.4/ABM/DSC/2014
7. Okori Bradfor Abura was appointed on 11th March 2020 under Minute No. CR/ABM/160.dd 12/02/20
8. Adongo Stella was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min no./01/21

0

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in the LLGs as below:

1. Oketch Charles was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Minute No./01/21
2. Okot George was appointed on 20th June 2012 under DSC Minute no. 14/2012.
3. Amaro Jane Dirox was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No. 01/21
4. Kithacho Abraham was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No./01/21
5. Achiro Gloria was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No./01/21
6. Lokinomoe Joseph was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No./01/21
7. Aballa Milton was appointed on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No./01/21

0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 16 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistants as below;

1. Opi Alfred was appointed on 7th May 202 under Minute No. 27.3/DSC/04/2020.
2. Acheng Sally was appointed on 1st January 2011 under Minute No. DSC Min 39/2010
3. Ochen Clement was appointed on 8th August 2007 under Minute No. 35/2006
4. Oboke Robert was appointed on 3rd March 2008 under Minute No. 27/2008
5. Owilli James Obongo was appointed on 3rd January 2005 under Minute no. 35/2006
6. Nakigude Flavia was appointed on 1st October 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min no./16/21
7. Aketch Beatrice was appointed on 1st February 2011 under Minute No. 41/2011
8. Okongo John Henry was appointed on 20th May 2015 under Minute No. 85/ABM/DSC/2015
9. Ochen John Bosco was appointed on 1st December 2006 under Minute No. 36/2005
10. Otto Samule was appointed on 19th October 2007 under Minute No. 24/2007
11. Acheng Lucy Betty was appointed on 14th September 2008 under Minute No. 36/2005
12. Omara Bruno Decter was appointed on 4th March 2008 under Minute No. 27/2008
13. Achila Kizito was appointed on 21st January 2004 under Minute No. 7/2004
14. Akech Corina was appointed was appointed on 1st October 2021 under Minute No. ADSC/Min No./18/21
15. Okello John Peter was appointed on 12/10/2011 under Minute No. 40/2011
16. Akello Lilly was appointed on 3rd January 2007 under Minute No. 35/2006

## Environment and Social Requirements

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>  | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>  | <p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;</p> <p>Warranted and the amount released by MoFPED was UGX 682,817,410 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14).</p> <p>Released = UGX 682,817,410. As a % = <math>682,817,410 / 682,817,410 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p>   | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>  | <p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>  | <p>The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for community-based service as per the computation below;</p> <p>The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 192,742,119 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 14).</p> <p><math>(UGX 192,742,119 / UGX 192,742,119) \times 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>Therefore, the release was; 100%.</p>                                       | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>   | <p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out by the Environment Officer and CDO for the completion of Awach sub-county Administration block prepared on 11th July, 2022 and the respective costed ESMP prepared on 12th July, 2022.</p>  | 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>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>The project that was implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.</p> | 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. | c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; | A costed ESMPs for the completion of Awach sub-county Administration block was prepared with the total contract award costed at UGX. 50,000,000 whereas, Environment and social mitigation measures costed at 2,500,000. | 4 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

Maximum score is 12

**Financial management and reporting**

|   |  |  |  |    |
|---|--|--|--|----|
| 5 | Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY. | If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10; | Abim DLG audit opinion for FY 2022/2023 was unqualified. | 10 |
|---|--|--|--|----|

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015). | If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g), | LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 24th March 2022. The submission date was after the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

maximum score is 10

score 10 or else 0.

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 7 | Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY | If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY, | The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 11th August 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY. | 4 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Maximum Score 4

score 4 or else 0.

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 8 | Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year<br><br>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,<br><br>score 4 or else 0.                               | The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 4th September 2023 which was not within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.  | 0 |
| 9 | Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year<br><br>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,<br><br>score 4 or else 0. | The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;<br><br>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 29th December, 2022<br><br>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 11st February 2023<br><br>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 7th June, 2023<br><br>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 4th September, 2023<br><br>From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report after the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year. | 0 |

**Education Minimum Conditions**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification  | Score     |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |   |   |   |           |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.   | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0   | The LG had neither substantively appointed a District Education Officer nor was there a seconded staff.   | <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.   | The LG had substantively appointed all District Inspector of schools as below; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Auma Margaret was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Mon No./01/21.</li> <li>2. Olyech Fautine was substantively appointed as Inspector of Schools on 26th May 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Mon No./01/21.</li> </ol> | <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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</li> </ol> | Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening was carried out for the following Education sector Projects; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a kitchen with store at Rogom primary school prepared on 12th July, 2022</li> <li>2. Construction of Magamaga seed secondary school prepared on 20th April, 2023</li> </ol>   | <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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</li> </ol>                             | The projects that were implemented in the Education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.      | <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.<br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><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. | Tino Simon Okongor was substantively appointed as District Health Officer on 4th June 2017 under Minute no. DSC/Min No./07/21.   | <b>10</b>    |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0  | Akello Teresa was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing on 6th January 2015 under Minute no. 13/ABM/DSC/2013 | <b>10</b>    |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.   | Buteraba Mathias was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health on 7th May 2022 under Minute no. 27.1/DSC/04/2020.              | <b>10</b>    |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.  | The LG had neither substantively appointed a Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) nor was there a seconded staff.                                   | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.   | Omara Godfrey was substantively appointed as Senior Health Educator on 3rd March 2022 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No. 04(n32)/22.  | <b>10</b>    |

|   |  |  |  |           |
|---|--|--|--|-----------|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>        | <p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>  | <p>Okech Emmanuel Omugetum was substantively appointed as Biostatistician on 19th October 2007 under Minute no. DSC/Min No. 24/2007.</p>     | <b>10</b> |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>        | <p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>                                | <p>Ocira David was substantively appointed as District Cold Chain Technician on 30th September 2021 under Minute no. ADSC/Min No. 15/21.</p> | <b>10</b> |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p> |  |           |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>                                    |  |           |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>  |  |           |

**Environment and Social Requirements**

|   |  |   |  |           |
|---|--|---|--|-----------|
| 2 | <p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p> | <p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p> | <p>There were no projects budgeted for in the current FY in the health sector.</p> | <b>15</b> |
|---|--|---|--|-----------|



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

Maximum score is 30

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

Since there were no projects budgeted for in the current FY in the health sector therefore no ESIAs could be ascertained.

**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<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | If the LG has recruited;<br><br>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer<br><br><i>score 70 or else 0.</i> | The LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Agriculture Engineer nor was there a seconded staff. | <b>0</b>     |

**Environment and Social Requirements**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> | <p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p> | <p>Screening for Environmental, Social and Climate Change of the irrigation projects was carried out and below were the irrigation sites implemented;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Micro scale irrigation at Natete prepared on 16th January 2022</li> <li>2. Micro scale irrigation at Adagkolo prepared on 16th January 2022</li> <li>3. Micro scale irrigation at Obangangeo prepared on 11th January, 2023</li> <li>4. Micro scale irrigation at Kanu East prepared on 11th January, 2023</li> <li>5. Micro scale irrigation at Kachugu prepared on 10th January, 2023</li> <li>6. Micro scale irrigation at Ayer North prepared on 11th January, 2023</li> <li>7. Micro scale irrigation at Ather North prepared on 10th January, 2023</li> <li>8. Micro scale irrigation at Adwal preparl East prepared on 9th January, 2023</li> <li>9. Micro scale irrigation at Amwonicek prepared on 18th January, 2023</li> <li>10. Micro scale irrigation at Angwee East prepared on 18th January, 2023</li> <li>11. Micro scale irrigation at Atwilo prepared on 10th January, 2023</li> <li>12. Micro scale irrigation at Anukunam East prepared on 19th January, 2023</li> <li>13. Micro scale irrigation at Angwee South prepared on 23rd January, 2023</li> <li>14. Micro scale irrigation at Oyima East prepared on 19th January, 2023</li> </ol> |
|---|--|--|

*Maximum score is 30*

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

| <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.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.  | Phillip Mwaka was appointed as Senior Civil Engineer (Water) on 23rd February 2022 under Minute No. ADSC/Min NO./7/22.           | <b>15</b>    |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.                      | The LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant Water Officer for mobilization nor was there a seconded staff.           | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | The LG had neither substantively appointed an Borehole Maintenance Technician nor was there a seconded staff.                    | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.                                     | The LG had neither substantively appointed a Natural Resources Officer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment. | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.   | Obwor Oliver was substantively appointed as Environment Officer on 29th June 2023 under Minute No. ADSC/Min No./02/23.           | <b>10</b>    |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.  | The LG had neither substantively appointed a Forestry Officer nor was there a seconded staff.                                    | <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:<br>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0. | Environmental Social and Climate Change Screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY was carried out. Below were the projects screened;<br><br>1. Drilling and construction of borehole at Kanu HCII prepared on 19th January, 2023<br><br>2. Drilling and construction of borehole at Aywee south prepared on 18th January, 2023<br><br>3. Drilling and construction of borehole at Bandaka prepared on 17th January, 2023<br><br>4. Drilling and construction of borehole at Aleptong village, Morulem sub-county prepared on 16th January, 2023<br><br>5. Drilling and construction of borehole at Ayeye Kanyakure prepared on 12th January, 2023<br><br>6. Construction of a borehole at Adagkolo village prepared on 11th January, 2023 | 10 |
| 2 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.   | The projects that were implemented in the water sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.  | 10 |

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

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

There was no abstraction permit presented, since the DLG did not have any piped WSS works done; however, the DWO presented a drilling permit for the contractor who drilled the boreholes for the FY in review. The permit details were: permit number was KAM45/DP-00983/2022/RR, it was issued on 24th May, 2022, valid for one year from 1st July, 2022 to 30th June 2023. It was issued to ICON PROJECTS LTD.