



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Kaabong District

(Vote Code: 559)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	19%
Education Minimum Conditions	15%
Health Minimum Conditions	30%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	50%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	35%
Educational Performance Measures	43%
Health Performance Measures	35%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	43%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	4%

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>There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s) as per design/profile</p> <p>Q4 FY2019/20 Budget Performance Report</p> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg 60 Latrine constructed in Naryamaoi P/S in Kathile South Subcounty Ugx 53,333,000 Completed</li> <li>Pg 61 4 unit staff house constructed at Toroi Primary School in Loyoro S/C Ugx 28,372,000 Completed</li> </ul> <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg 87 Administration Block constructed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters. Completed</li> </ul>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not Applicable. Assessment system for LLG is in the process of development.</p>	0
2	<p>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 DLG completed 75% (i.e. 6 out of 8) DDEG Projects planned for the FY2019/20.</p> <p>Workings</p> <p><math>6/8 * 100 = 75\%</math></p> <p>Source:</p> <p>DDEG Projects in the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20</p>	0

## Education

- Pg 28 Building Construction - Construction Expenses in Lokwakaramoe village Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 28 Building Construction – Latrines in Naryamaoi village Ugx 30,000,000
- Pg 29 Building Construction -Staff Houses in Toroi village Ugx 80,000,000

## Planning

- Pg 48 Building Construction – Offices in Kathile South Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 48 Building Construction -Latrines in Kakamar Sub county Headquarters Ugx 15,000,000
- Pg 48 Building Construction – Offices in Kakamar sub county Headquarters Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 48 Construction Services – Energy Installations in Kathile South Sub county Headquarters Ugx 25,000,000
- Pg 48 Construction Services – Energy Installations Kakamar Sub county Headquarters Ugx 25,000,000

Status of DDEG Projects implemented in FY2019/20 in the Annual Performance Report FY2019/20

## Education

- Pg 60 Classrooms constructed at Lokwakaramoi II P/S in Kamion Sub County Ugx 175,407,000 Completed
- Pg 60 Latrine constructed in Naryamaoi P/S in Kathile South Subcounty Ugx 53,333,000 Completed
- Pg 61 4-unit staff house constructed at Toroi Primary School in Loyoro S/C Ugx 28,372,000 Completed

## Planning

- Pg 87 Administration Block constructed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters Completed
- Pg 87 latrine constructed in Kakamar Subcounty Headquarters Completed
- Pg 87 Building Construction – Offices in Kakamar sub county Headquarters Ugx 80,000,000 Cancelled

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

- Pg 87 Construction Services – Energy Installations in Kakamar Sub county Headquarters supplied but not installed.
- Pg 87 Solar power supplied and installed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters

The DLG in FY2019/20 budgeted and spent DDEG funds on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementation guidelines.

Source:

DDEG Projects in the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20

Finance

- Pg 11 Payment of balance of money safe at HQ Ugx 2,500,000

Education

- Pg 28 Building Construction - Construction Expenses in Lokwakaramoe village Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 28 Building Construction – Latrines in Naryamaoi village Ugx 30,000,000
- Pg 29 Building Construction -Staff Houses in Toroi village Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 29 Furniture and Fixtures – Desks in Tank Hill Village Ugx 10,000,000

Planning

- Pg 47 Monitoring, Supervision and Appraisal - General Works at the District HQ Ugx 10,000,000
- Pg 48 Building Construction – Offices in Kathile South Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 48 Building Construction -Latrines in Kakamar Sub county Headquarters Ugx 15,000,000
- Pg 48 Building Construction – Offices in Kakamar sub county Headquarters Ugx 80,000,000
- Pg 48 Construction Services – Energy Installations in Kathile South Sub county Headquarters Ugx 25,000,000
- Pg 48 Construction Services – Energy Installations Kakamar Sub county Headquarters Ugx 25,000,000
- Pg 48 ICT - Cameras- District Headquarters

Ugx 2,500,000

Status of DDEG Projects implemented in  
FY2019/20 in the Annual Performance Report  
FY2019/20

#### Finance

- Pg 41 Payment of balance of money safe at HQ paid Ugx 833,000

#### Education

- Pg 60 Classrooms constructed at Lokwakaramoi II P/S in Kamion Sub County Ugx 175,407,000 Changed to Kaabong School of Nursing and Midwifery.
- Pg 60 Latrine constructed in Naryamaoi P/S in Kathile South Subcounty Ugx 53,333,000 Completed
- Pg 61 4 unit staff house constructed at Toroi Primary School in Loyoro S/C Ugx 28,372,000 Completed
- Pg 61 Wooden desks supplied to Komukuny Girls Primary School

#### Planning

- Pg 87 Monitoring, Supervision and Appraisal - General Works at the District HQ Ugx 000
- Pg 87 Administration Block constructed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters Completed
- Pg 87 latrine constructed in Kakamar Subcounty Headquarters
- Pg 87 Solar power supplied and installed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters Ugx 0000
- Pg 87 ICT - Cameras- District Headquarters Ugx 1,411,000

3

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

From the procurement plan for the previous FY dated 25/06/2020, stamped received by the PPDA on 01/07/2020, three projects executed using DDEG were sampled;

1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003.LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 80,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 80,000,000. **Variation was 0%.**

2. Construction of 2-Stance Latrine at Kakamar Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009. LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 15,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 14,890,000. **Variation was -0.73%.**

3. Construction of Kathile South Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002. LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 80,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 78,261,000. **Variation was -2.17%.**

Variations were within +/-20% for all the projects.

2

#### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

Accuracy of reported  
information

Maximum 4 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

There was accuracy of information in staffing lists as obtained from the HRM division and what was found in the LLGS.

The three Sub counties visited for example (Kakamar Sub county, Kabong Town council and Lodiko Sub county) information received from the HRM division on staffing matched with what was found in the LLGs.

2

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>The DLG provided information on infrastructure constructed using DDEG in annual budget performance report FY2019/20 and this information reflected the status of the infrastructure on ground.</p> <p>Annual Budget Performance Report FY2019/20</p> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 60 Latrine constructed in Naryamaoi P/S in Kathile South Subcounty Ugx 53,333,000 Completed</li> <li>• Pg 61 4 unit staff house constructed at Toroi Primary School in Loyoro S/C Ugx 28,372,000 Completed</li> </ul> <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 87 Administration Block constructed in Kathile South Subcounty Headquarters Completed</li> </ul>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>N/A. The assessment system for LLG has not yet been introduced</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no performance improvement plans for any of the LLGs for the current FY because this is the first time LLGs are being assessed</p>	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable; this is the first the LLG is being assessed	0
---	---	--	---	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	Kabong District Local Government consolidated and submitted the staffing requirement for the coming FY to MoPS on 14th September 2020, received on 24th September 2020 (Ref ARC 6/293/05)	2
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the District conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance for the period of July –December 2019 as per guidelines by MPS	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:  HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous  FY: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that in the FY 2019/20, all HODs were appraised as follows  1. The Ag Chief Finance Officer - was appraised on 26/6/2020  2. The Ag. District planner was appraised on 10/7/2020  3. The Ag. District Engineer – Akorio Majembe Ibrahim was appraised 15 July 2020  4. The Ag. District Natural Resources Officer- was appraised on 13/7/2020  5. The District Production Officer Eladu Fredrick was appraised on 15th July 2020  6. The District Community Development was appraised on 1/7/2020  7. The Ag. DEO was appraised on 17/7/2020  8. The DHO was appraised on 15th July 2020	1

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of an established and functional rewards and sanctions committee. For instance, the committee met on 30th March 2020, handled cases of abscondment of duty, and mismanagement of NUSAF III project vehicle. The committee made recommendations for the individuals including release of interdiction for some staff members	1
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	The grievance redress desk committee was established and appointed on (6/7/2020) but has not handled any cases so far since there are no cases reported yet.	1
8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	In the FY 2019/2020, the recruitment of March 2019 for 44 staff who were appointed in April 2019 and accessed the payroll in May 2019. The recruitment of June 2020 was for a total of 11 staff and these were appointed in June 2020 and they accessed the payroll in July 2020.	1
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	There was no evidence that 2 personnel who retired in the FY 2019/2020, accessed the payroll within the specified period as follows;  1. Lobolia David (000000000858766) retired in September 2019 and has not yet accessed the pension payroll because of the names on National ID not matching with the file names  2. Loyolo John George (0000000003424842) retired in December 2019 and accessed the payroll in June 2020	0

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

10	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 DLG transferred DDEG for FY2019/20 to LLGs in full as per allocation in the approved budget.  Page 54-72 LG Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20  DDEG Budget to LLGs  • Lolelia SC                      Ugx 31,141,000  • Kalapata SC                      Ugx 45,075,000	2
----	--	--	---	---

- Kathile SC Ugx 43,808,000
- Kaabong West SC Ugx 46,088,000
- Sidok SC Ugx 23,287,000
- Lodiko SC Ugx 26,580,000
- Kamion SC Ugx 25,820,000
- Kathile South SC Ugx 31,647,000
- Lotim SC Ugx 42,035,000
- Kakamar SC Ugx 30,381,000
- Loyoro SC Ugx 18,980,000
- Kaabong East SC Ugx 35,448,000

Releases made to LLGs (Source: Bank Statements).

	Per Quarter	Total
• Lolelia SC SC 31,140,606	Ugx 10,380,202	Ugx 31,140,606
• Kalapata SC 45,074,709	Ugx 15,024,903	Ugx 45,074,709
• Kathile SC 43,807,974	Ugx 14,602,658	Ugx 43,807,974
• Kaabong West SC 46,088,100	Ugx 15,362,700	Ugx 46,088,100
• Sidok SC 23,286,840	Ugx 7,762,280	Ugx 23,286,840
• Lodiko SC 26,580,357	Ugx 8,860,119	Ugx 26,580,357
• Kamion SC 25,820,133	Ugx 8,606,711	Ugx 25,820,133
• Kathile South SC 31,647,303	Ugx 10,549,101	Ugx 31,647,303
• Lotim SC 42,034,542	Ugx 14,011,514	Ugx 42,034,542
• Kakamar SC 30,830,565	Ugx 10,126,855	Ugx 30,830,565
• Loyoro SC 18,979,935	Ugx 6,326,645	Ugx 18,979,935
• Kaabong East SC 35,447,513	Ugx 11,815,838	Ugx 35,447,513

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):	The DLG did not make timely warranting of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for FY2019/20	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>Warrants created for DDEG transfers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 12 August 2019.</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 on the 24 October 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 24 January 2020</li> </ul> <p>PS/ST communication of expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 9 July 2019</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 on the 2 October 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 8 January 2020</li> </ul>	
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	There was no evidence of invoicing and communication from CAO made on the release of funds to the LLGs within the 5 working days in the FY 19/20, only declaration of funds to the LC III chairpersons was seen in the sub counties.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	The DLG did not provide evidence that the District supervised or mentored all LLGs at least quarterly	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Supervision and Mentoring Reports for Q3 and Q4 FY2019/20.</p> <p>CR/207/11: 20 May 2020 Supervision and Monitoring Report on construction works and supply of solar power</p> <p>DDEG Q3 Monitoring for FY2019/20 on the 22 May 2020</p> <p>PAF Monitoring Report for Q3 FY2019/20 conducted on the 24 March 2020</p> <p>DDEG Q4 Monitoring Report FY2019/20 conducted on the 24-26 June 2020</p> <p>Q4 PAF Monitoring Report for Sub Counties conducted on the 15 June 2020</p>	

11	Routine oversight and monitoring  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:	The DLG did not provide evidence of the discussions of monitoring reports in the TPC in each quarter in FY2019/20 for corrective actions and follow up. The DLG presented minutes of 1 meeting discussing monitoring visits. i.e.	0
		Score 2 or else score 0	DTPC Meeting held on the 28 May 2020 Min03/05/DTPC- Presenting monitoring reports for DDEG and PAF Q3 FY2019/20	

**Investment Management**

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:	The DLG did not maintain up to-date of land, vehicles and other assets as recommended on page 167-8 of the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual, 2007 during the time of assessment.	0
		Score 2 or else score 0		
		<b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b>		

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:	The DLG prepared a board of survey report for year ended 30 June 2020 on the 24 September 2020 that was used for providing information and recommendations on whether to maintain, scrap or boarded off assets.	1
		Score 1 or else 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>The DLG during the FY2019/20 had a Physical Planning Committee constituting 9 members that held 4 meetings in the year. However, the DLG did not submit any of the minutes of the 4 meetings to Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development</p>	0
			<p>Meetings Held</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 15 October 2019</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 on the 18 March 2020</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 8 May 2020</li> <li>• Q4 FY2019/20 on the 20 June 2020</li> </ul> <p>Members appointed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr Lukyamu Thomas Communications Officer</li> <li>2. Mr Akorio Ibrahim Ag District Engibneer</li> <li>3. Mr Ojok Jimmy Ayen DCDO</li> <li>4. Mr Lokong John Robert Ag District Agricultural Officer</li> <li>5. Dr Nalibe Sharif DHO</li> <li>6. Mr Lomongin Emmanuel Ag. DNRO</li> <li>7. Mr Lokwang Albine Ag DWO</li> <li>8. Madam Sangar Santina Ag DEO</li> <li>9. Mr Lokol Adelio District Physical Planner</li> </ol>	
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>The DLG did not provide desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source</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>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 were appraised for technical feasibility, Environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects.</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>The DLG did not provide evidence that project profiles with costing for project investments in FY2020/21 were developed for discussion 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>There was no evidence that Kaabong DLG Screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:Environment and social screening was only done for projects under Water and Education.The Health constructions were not screened.</p>	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>In the LG approved Procurement Plan for 2020/2021 prepared by the PDU on 15/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 21/10/2020, all projects to be implemented using DDEG were incorporated. These included; Construction of Phase I of Council Chambers budgeted at UGX 375,000,000, Landscaping of District HQ budgeted at UGX 12,500,000 and Procurement of a Laptop and 3 Printers budgeted at UGX 8,500,000.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	For the three projects that were sampled, they were approved by the contracts committee as follows;  1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003 at a final contract value of UGX 80,000,000, was approved under Min.04/JAN/DCC/2019-2020 held on 13-14/01/20 before commencement of works on 31/01/2020.  2. Construction of 2-Stance Latrine at Kakamar Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009 at a final contract value of UGX 14,890,000, was approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 held on 11/01/20 before commencement of works on 04/03/2020.  3. Construction of Kathile South Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002 at a final contract value of UGX 78,261,900, was approved under Min.04/JAN/DCC/2019-2020 held on 13-14/01/20 before commencement of works on 04/03/2020.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	For the three projects sampled for the FY 2019/2020, there was no evidence of the proper establishment of PIT.  All that was provided was a letter from the CAO dated 24/04/2020 designating SAS as Contract Manager, and evidence from the Contract signed on 04/03/2020 where the Planner and District Engineer were designated as Project Manager and Technical Supervisor respectively for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009,  letter from the CAO dated 17/02/2020 designating the Principle as the Contract Manager and evidence from the contract signed on 31/01/2020 designating the DEO as Project Manager and District Engineer as Technical Supervisor for project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003 and  letter from the CAO dated 10/01/2020 designating the SAS as the Contract Manager and evidence from contract signed on 04/03/2020 designating the District Planner and District Engineer as Project Manager and Technical Supervisor respectively for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002.  <b>All other members of the PIT for all projects were not designated.</b>	0

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

d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:

Score 1 or else score 0

The three sampled projects implemented using DDEG all followed the technical designs as follows;

1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003. Structure was built as per technical designs. Windows and doors were provided as per the schedule. Roofing works, internal and external works were all as per the requirements of the designs and BOQs. Rain water harvesting tank was in place connected to the gutters and there were no signs of defects on both the tank foundation and the structure. Ramps with handrails, Lightening arrestors were also provided as per the designs and the BOQs.

2. Construction of 2-Stance Latrine at Kakamar Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009. The 2 Stances and urinal were built to dimension as per the designs. Water tank on foundation connected to gutters on the roof was built as per design. Two steel doors for the stances were also provided as per the drawings and BOQs. Roofing and external finishes were also conforming to the design.

3. Construction of Kathile South Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002. Structure was built as per technical designs. Windows and doors were provided as per the schedule. Roofing works, internal and external works were all as per the requirements of the designs and BOQs. Solar panels and Lightening arrestor were also installed on the roof as per requirements of the BOQs. There were no visible defects on structure at the time of assessment.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were records of supervision reports on executed sampled projects from the District Engineer to the CAO. These reports were issued before certification verifying works executed by the contractors and stamped by the District Engineer on 07/04/2020, 11/05/2020 &amp; 10/06/2020 for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003, 16/06/2020 for the project Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009 and on 23/04/2020, 26/05/2020 &amp; 23/06/2020 for the project Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002.</p>	0
			<p><b>There was however no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO carried out site visits prior to verification and certification of the works.</b> The Environment Officer only participated in certification of the works by signing on the interim payment certificates on 08/04/2020, 19/05/2020 &amp; 10/06/2020 for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003, 16/06/2020 for the project Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009 and on 28/04/2020, 28/05/2020 &amp; 23/06/2020 for the project Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002.</p>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For the three projects that were sampled, recommendations for payment and interim payment certificates were issued as follows;</p> <p>1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003, Interim payment Certificate No.1 was issued on 07/04/2020 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 07/04/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 08/04/2020.</p> <p>Interim payment Certificate No.2 was issued on 13/05/20 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 11/05/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 19/05/2020.</p> <p>Interim payment Certificate No.3 was issued on 10/06/20 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 10/06/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 10/06/2020. Project Completion date was 28/06/2020.</p> <p>2. Construction of 2-Stance Latrine at Kakamar Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00009, Interim payment Certificate No.1 was</p>	0

issued on 16/06/2020 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 16/06/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 17/06/2020. Project Completion date was 28/06/2020.

3. Construction of Kathile South Sub County HQ. Ref. Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00002, Interim payment Certificate No.1 was issued on 23/04/2020 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 23/04/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 28/04/2020.

Interim payment Certificate No.2 was issued on 26/05/20 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 26/05/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 28/05/2020.

Interim payment Certificate No.3 was issued on 23/06/20 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 23/06/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate. Environment officer only signed on certificate on 23/06/2020. Project Completion date was 28/06/2020.

**From these findings, all payments were initiated within specified timeframes but the Environment Officer and CDO were not involved in the verification and certification of the works.**

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	In the Procurement Plan for FY 2020/2021 dated 15/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 21/10/2020, two projects to be executed by the DLG were sampled. Procurement files for the projects sampled contained the following;  1. Construction Phase I of Council Chambers at District HQ .Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/20-21/00001 – Evaluation Report signed by the evaluation committee on 18/08/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.04/AUG/DCC/2020-2021 (B) held on 26/08/2020. There was no successful bidder, job was deferred for Re-advertisement and hence no works contract available in the file.  2. Landscaping of District HQ. Ref.Kaab559/SRVS/20-21/00007 – Evaluation Report signed by the evaluation committee on 18/08/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.04/AUG/DCC/2020-2021 (B) held on 26/08/2020. Contract was awarded but contract signature was awaiting commencement of duty of the new CAO.	1
----	--	---	--	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.  Score: 2 or else score 0	Mr. Lolem Paul was assigned on duty as Grievance Desk Officer by the CAO on 06/07/2020 by the Chief Administrative Officer. The Grievance Redress Committee was not yet established by the time of this assessment.	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	Kaabong DLG has no 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.	0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	Kaabong DLG had not publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	The DLG integrated Environment, Social and Climate change interventions in the DDP FY2015/16-2019/20, AWP's and budget estimates of FY2020/21.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure		Environment, Social and Climate change interventions for FY2020/21 in the DDP FY2015/16-2019/20	
			Page 107 Agro-forestry demonstration, Supplies of tree seedlings, Supplies of tree Nursery equipment	
			AWP	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 87 50000 Establishment of nursery beds and distribution of seedlings Seedlings produced at the headquarters and distributed to 13 LLGs</li> </ul>	
			Environment, Social and Climate change interventions for LG Budget Estimates FY2020/21	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 43 Cultivated Assets - Seedlings Ugx 225,691,000</li> </ul>	
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management	The DLG provided evidence that the District disseminated enhanced DDEG guidelines to LLGs during DTPC where SAS were in attendance.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0	Evidence	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting of the DTPC held on the 29 October 2019. Min 3/Oct/2019: Guidance on new DDEG Guidelines</li> </ul>	

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	The Environment Officer only prepared and costed the ESMPs under water projects, however the BOQs and bid documents for water projects did not cost the Water ESMPs. The ESMP for all other projects were not prepared and costed by the Environment Officer hence making the ESMPs in the BOQs invalid.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There was no way to verify projects that had additional costing of impact from climate change since screening and preparation of ESMPs was not done.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	The environmental officer and CDO did not conduct support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and neither did they provide monthly reports	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no 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:	0

**Financial management**

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG maintained up to-date bank reconciliations up to the time of assessment.</p> <p>Sampled three different bank accounts &amp; three months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bank reconciliation for Kaabong Dist Works Stanbic Bank A/c No. 9030005779056 for June 2020 prepared on the 7 July 2020. Cash book balance Ugx 64,436,165 and bank balance Ugx 119,622,275</li> <li>• Bank reconciliation for Kaabong General Fund Stanbic Bank A/c No. 9030005822482 for October 2020 prepared on the 24 November 2020. Cash book balance Ugx 126,833,184 and bank balance Ugx 128,353,192</li> <li>• Bank reconciliation for Kaabong District Health Stanbic Bank A/c No. 9030005779064 for November 2019 prepared on the 9 December 2019. Cash book balance Ugx 28,004,220 and bank balance Ugx 28,196,220</li> </ul>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>DLG produced 4 internal audit reports for FY2019/20 as set out in section 90 of LG Act CAP 243 as amended and section 48 of PFMA 2015.</p> <p>Internal Audit reports were addressed to Hon Speaker and copied to DPAC and CAO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 31 October 2019 with 3 issues</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 30 January 2020 with 3 issues</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 15 April 2020</li> <li>• Q4 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 30 July 2020</li> </ul>	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 DLG did not provide evidence that the District provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of all internal audit findings for FY2019/20 at the time of assessment.</p>	0
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>DLG PAC reviewed and made recommendations on audit findings in internal audit reports for FY2019/20.</p> <p>Report of meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting held on the 8 September 2019 discussing Q1 report</li> <li>• Meeting held on the 13 October 2019 discussing Q2 report</li> <li>• Meeting held on the 27 January 2020 discussing Q3 report</li> </ul> <p>Members Present</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Losike Anjella Nayer Chairperson</li> <li>2. Aryono Alfred Logwee</li> <li>3. Ignatius Loyola Rinyamoe</li> <li>4. Lopeyok Albert</li> <li>5. Lochiyo Michael</li> </ol>	1

**Local Revenues**

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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.

The DLG collected 75 % of local revenue budgeted for the FY2019/20 which is outside the +/-10% budget realisation threshold provided.

Workings:

Collection Ratio= Total local revenue collected/budget\*100=

$65,514,053/87,179,000*100=75.15\%$

Source:

Page 1 LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2019/20

Budgeted Local Revenue for FY2019/20 was Ugx 87,179,000

Page 20-1 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20

Taxes collected for FY 2019/20 was Ugx 65,514,053

Non-Taxes collected for FY 2019/20 was Ugx 0

Total Local Revenue collected in the FY2019/20 was Ugx 65,514,053+ Ugx 0= Ugx 65,514,053

19 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) 0

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

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

- If more than 10 %: score 2.
- If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.
- If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

The DLG decreased OSR in FY2019/20 by 89% compared to FY2018/19

Workings:

Decrease in OSR= (Total OSR FY2019/20- Total OSR FY2018/19)/ Total OSR FY2018/19)

= (Ugx 65,514,053- Ugx 619,732,349)/Ugx 619,732,349 \*100= (89.43) %

Source:

Page 20-1 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20

Taxes FY 2019/20 was Ugx 65,514,053

FY 2018/19 was Ugx 122,251,385

Non-Taxes FY 2019/20 was Ugx 0

FY 2018/19 was Ugx 497,480,964

Total OSR collected in FY 2019/20= Ugx 65,514,053 + Ugx 0 = Ugx 65,514,053

Total OSR collected in FY 2018/19= Ugx 122,251,385 + Ugx 497,480,964 = Ugx 619,732,349

20 Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency 0

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

The DLG did not provide evidence that the District remitted the 65% local revenues (i.e. LST) collected on behalf of LLG as stipulated in Section 85 of the LG Act CAP 243.

**Transparency and Accountability**

21 LG shares information with citizens 0

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0

On the procurement notice board at the old PDU Office, there was no evidence that all awarded contracts and Procurement Plan had been publicized. All that was on the board at the time of assessment was an advertisement under selective bidding that was running from 26/11/2020 to 07/12/2020.

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>The DLG provided evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications for 2019 were published on the noticeboard</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLG published on the general noticeboard dated 26 June 2020 results of the LGPA assessment 2019, comparison with LGPA assessment 2018, implications of the performance, reasons for poor performance and corrective actions</li> </ul> <p>Meeting of the DTPC held on the 16 July 2020 with Senior Assistant Secretaries from the Sub Counties in attendance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Min.2/July/2020 Communications from Chairperson i.e. Assessment results</li> <li>• Min.4/July/2020 Presentation of LGPA Results FY2018/19</li> </ul>	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 DLG provided feedback on status of activity implementation for FY2019/20</p> <p>Meeting of DTPC where SAS were in attendance</p> <p>Meeting held on the 2 November 2019 Min5/NOV/2019- Progress of Departmental implementation of Q2 activities</p> <p>Budget Conference for FY2020/21 on 19 October 2019 where presentations were made of status of implementation of activities</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence at the time of assessment that DLG made public information on tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures of appeal.</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

The DLG did not provide evidence of IGG report which includes list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence that the PLE pass rate improved by 8.7% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below.</p> <p>2018 (DIV 1: 17, DIV 2: 547, DIV 3 : 333, TOTAL PASS 897, TOTAL CANDATES 1259).</p> <p>2019 (DIV 1: 47 DIV 2: 669, DIV3: 356, TOTAL PASS 1072, TOTAL CANDATES 1342).</p> <p>Therefore, the calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>897/1259 \times 100 = 71.2\%</math> while</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>1072/1342 \times 100 = 79.9\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>79.9\% - 71.2\% = 8.7\%</math> Improvement.</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the UCE pass rate had declined by 22.4% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2018 ( DIV 1: 00, DIV 2: 08, DIV 3: 16, TOTAL PASS 24, TOTAL CANDATES 42)</p> <p>2019 ( DIV 1: 02, DIV 2: 09, DIV3: 15, TOTAL PASS 26, TOTAL CANDATES 75)</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>24/42 \times 100 = 57.1\%</math> While</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was: <math>26/75 \times 100 = 34.7\%</math>.</p> <p>Therefore <math>34.7\% - 57.1\% = -22.4\%</math> Decline.</p>	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>N/A. Assessments for LLG has not yet commenced.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 2 points</p>				
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG budgeted and allocated the education development grant on eligible activities in FY2019/20.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			<p>Budget Estimates FY2019/20</p> <p>Page 30 Building Construction - Latrines at Locherep Village in Sidok Ugx 62,312,000</p> <p>Page 30 Building Construction -Schools at Locherep Village in Sidok Ugx 110,000,000</p> <p>Budget Performance Report</p> <p>Page 63 classrooms under construction at Sidok SEED Secondary School in Sidok Subcounty</p>	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG had 1 investment project, review of request for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the CDO and Environment Officer did not sign the interim payment certificates before the LG made payments to Contractors</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 19,450,000 by M/s Rock Motel Ltd for construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with 2 bathing shelters in Lokwakaramoe HC 11 was made on the 18 June 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 18 June 2020. Payment certificate No 1 was prepared by DE and signed by DHO on the 22 June 2020. Payment was made on the 30 June 2020 Receipt Nos. 001,002 &amp; 003.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

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>Three projects executed in the FY 2019/2020 under Education by the DLG were sampled;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003.LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 80,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 80,000,000. <b>Variation was 0%.</b></li> <li>2. Construction of a 5 Stance Latrine at Naryamaoi P/S. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00010.LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 30,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 29,855,100. <b>Variation was -0.48%.</b></li> <li>3. Construction of 4 Unit Staff House at Toroi P/S. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00004.LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 80,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 78,379,500. <b>Variation was -2.03%.</b></li> </ol> <p>Variations were within +/-20% for all the projects.</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>There was no SEED SS project in Kaabong DLG in the FY 2019/2020.</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>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 structure provides for a total of 576 teachers, and the LG has a total of 355 staff which makes a 62% filling.</p>	0

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

The LG education department maintained a consolidated schools asset register as of FY 2019/20 that captured the number of classrooms, number of latrines, number of desks and teacher accommodation.

However:

There was no evidence to show the percentage of schools that met the prescribed minimum standards from the previous two FYs because only evidence provided was for FY 2019/20 as there was no evidence provided for FY 2018/19 at the time of assessment.

### 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

As per teachers list and the sampled school's deployment was done with some variation between School lists (SL) and physical variation (PV).

For example

Pajar P/S had 12 teachers.( including head teacher deputy and teachers)

Kachikol P/S had 09 teachers.( including head teacher deputy)

Lodiko P/S had 09 teachers including the head teacher and deputy.

Also the schools sampled for visiting to verify deployment as seen below; (Key: - SL- Staff List, and PV- Physical verification of deployment on ground)

Pajar P/S - SL- 12, PV-12.

Kachikol P/S SL- 09, PV- 09.

Lodiko P/S SL- 09, PV-08.

As observed from the 3 sampled schools, it was noted that teachers as indicated on the DEO's deployment list were not the same teachers indicated on school staff lists.

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2019/20 that indicated infrastructure and equipment was in place. However all the 3 sampled UPE schools had no evidence of an asset register hence was not able to verify asset equipment and infrastructure at school level.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>Pajar P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 08 classrooms, 18 latrine stances, 90 desks and 06 teacher houses while the school asset register was not in place at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Kachikol P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 08 classrooms, 10 latrines, 86 desks and 04 teacher houses while the school asset register wasn't observed at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Lodiko P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 07 classrooms, 07 latrines, 144 desks and 06 teacher houses while the school asset register was not in place at the time of assessment.</p>	0
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>Out of 32 primary schools,32 (100%) primary schools submitted Annual School Reports and budgets covering only a reconciled cash flow statements, budget and expenditure. However were non-compliant to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p> <p>The 3 sampled UPE schools that included Pajar P/S, Kachikol P/S and Lodiko P/S a review of their annual budget reports were not compliant with MOEs budgeting guidelines.</p>	0

6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:  • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0	There was no evidence to show the schools that were supported to implement SIPs from the DEOs office.  Also verification from the 3 sampled UPE schools only 2 schools that included Pajar P/S and Kachikol P/S had SIPs in place.	0
---	---	---	--	---

6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:  • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0	There was evidence that LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year.  For Example:  The list of 32 UPE primary schools captured in Kaabong DLG Performance contract FY 2019/20 was consistent with the number of schools 32 in excel data sheet OTIMS for FY 2019/20.	4
---	---	---	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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:  Score 4 or else, score: 0	The LG Education department Kaabong DLG budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school or a teacher per school in all the 32 Government aided primary schools as per the staff list for the FY 2020/21. The total wage bill provision for teachers was UGX2, 850,936,000 as per the Approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2020/21. The budget covers salaries for 326 primary teachers in the 32 primary schools as per approved education work plan and budget FY2020/2021.	4
---	---	--	---	---

7

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,

Score 3 else score: 0

The list of primary school teachers FY 2020/2021, obtained from the DEO's office revealed that a total of 326 teachers were deployed in 32 UPE schools in FY 2020/2021

Verification in the 3 sampled UPE schools revealed that the deployment of teachers was in line with sector guideline and staffing norms as seen below:

Pajar P/S in Kaabong Town council number of teachers deployed was 12 and the number of teachers on the staff list was 12 for FY 2020/21.

Kachikol P/S in Kaabong West Sub county number of teachers on deployment list was 09 and number of teachers on staff list was 09 for FY 2020/21.

Lodiko P/S in Lodiko Sub county number of teachers on deployment list was 09 and number of teachers on staff list was 08for FY 2020/21.

Therefore the teachers were deployed as per sector guideline.

3

7

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,

score: 1 else, score: 0

There was evidence that the teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or School noticeboard.

The list of teachers deployed were found displayed on the Head Teachers notice board as indicated in the 3 sampled UPE schools below:

12 teachers were deployed in Pajar primary school in Kaabong Town council 10 males and 08 females.

Kachikol Primary School in Kaabong West Sub- county 09 teachers was deployed 07 males and 02 females.

Lodiko Primary School in Lodiko Sub- county 08 teachers were deployed 07 males and 01 female.

1

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that the head teachers were appraised accordingly. The sampled 10 files indicated so as follows;

1. Sire Celestin of Komukuny Boys PS appraised on 29/11/2019

2. Atyang Jacqueline of Kachikol PS (19/7/2020)

3. Nyangan Christine of Morukori Ps appraised on 19/7/2020

4. Adongo Hardline Dorothy of Kakamar PS appraised on 6/12/2019

5. Akoth Anjella of Narube PS appraised on 3/12/2019

6. Musobo Rashid Arapmaric of Kalapata PS was appraised on 16/7/2020

7. Ilukorl Kizito of Lomunyen PS was appraised on 11/12/2019

8. Napeyok Lucy of Iomusian PS was appraised on 16/7/2020

9. Loiki Simon Lowot of Lokanayona PS was appraised on 3/2/2020

10. Okello John Pusalem of Kopoth PS 7/1/2020

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG has one Secondary school Kaabong SS, and there was evidence that the Head teacher (Outa Yokosaphat) was appraised on 28/11/2019

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The education staff has the acting DEO, and a Senior Education Officer who were both appraised on 17th July 2020 against their performance plans</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at school and LG level. Evidence of a training plan was not in place as it was noted from the HR that DDEG sent to Kaabong DLG wasn't enough.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

**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>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 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. Done through a letter to Derrick Namusi the principal economist on 25/09/2019 as well as in response to planning statistics required for generation of LG indicative planning figures (1PFs) for FY 2019/2020 on 26/8/2019 to the CAO Kaabong District under circular no EPD 192/335/01.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

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

The DLG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines (i.e. minimum of Ugx 29,428,000)

#### Minimum Monitoring

Fixed Rate LG Allocations Ugx  
4,500,000

Plus Ugx 100,000 X 48 Schools Ugx  
4,800,000

Total Monitoring Ugx  
9,300,000

#### Minimum Inspection

Fixed Rate LG Allocation Ugx  
4,000,000

Plus Ugx 336,000 X 48 Schools Ugx  
16,128,000

Total Inspection Ugx  
20,128,000

Total Minimum Monitoring and Inspection  
Ugx 29,428,000

Allocated in Budget Estimates FY2019/20

#### Budget Estimates FY2019/20

Page 31 Monitoring and Supervision of  
Primary and Secondary Education Ugx  
79,068,000

Page 31 Monitoring and Supervision  
Secondary Education Ugx 26,300,000

Total Monitoring and Supervision of Primary  
and Secondary Education Ugx 105,368,000

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The DLG created warrants for Quarter three releases for all funds including school capitation grants on the 24 January 2020, more than 5 days after PS/ST communicated (i.e. 8 January 2020) the Q3 FY2019/20 expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.</p>	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.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence of communicating capitation releases to schools in the 3 quarters FY2019/20</p> <p>Sampled Schools</p> <p>Pajar PS- Kaabong Town Council</p> <p>Kachikol PS- Kaabong West SC</p> <p>Lodiko PS Lodiko SC</p> <p>No circulars were sent out</p> <p>Warrant &amp; Invoicing</p> <p>Q1 FY2019/20 Invoice date 25 Aug 2019 Warrant 12 Aug 19</p> <p>Q3 FY2019/20. Invoice date 30 January 2020. Warrant 24 January 2020</p> <p>Q4 FY201920. Invoice date 24 April 2020. Warrant</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> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department held meetings for planning inspection for Term II and Term III 2019/20 that was held in the DEOs office on 04/10/2019 and the minutes were in place.</p> <p>Inspection plan meeting for Term II that was held on 01/072019 in the DIS office, under min; 04/KDED/2019 allocation of schools to Associate Assessors. The planning meeting was attended by DEO, DIS, SEO, AAs and CCTs.</p> <p>Term III Inspection plan meeting that was held on 01/07/2019 in the DIS office under Min.5.06.19 going through the tools and 08 people attended that included DEO, DIS, SEO, CCTs and Associate Assessors.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:

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

There was evidence that the number of school inspected and monitored included both government and community schools. The total number of 44 schools were inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO monitoring report as it was observed on the inspection and monitoring reports as indicated below:

Term II out of 44 schools 44(90.9%) schools both Government aided and community schools were inspected and monitored on 02/07/2019 and 12/07/ 2019 and report produced by the DIS on 13/06/2019.

Term III out of 44 schools 40(90.9%) schools both Government aided and community schools were inspected and monitored on 10/10/2019 to 24/10/ 2019 and report produced by the DIS (not dated).

Thus, the number of schools inspected/monitored were  $44 \times 3 = 132$

$$88/132 \times 100 = 66.7\%$$

Thus below 80% Minimum standard.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up.

There was evidence of departmental meetings that were held in the DEOs office to discuss the inspection feedback for follow up and minutes were on file.

However there was no evidence of inspection feedback in all the 3 sampled schools as the DIS revealed that inspection feedbacks were disseminated during head teachers meeting but there was no evidence provided to confirm this.

From the 3 sampled schools there was no evidence of inspection feedback reports as indicated below:

Pajar primary school in Kaabong Town council was inspected but had no inspection follow up reports.

Kachikol primary school in Kaabong West Sub-county was inspected though inspection feedback report was not in place.

Lodiko primary school in Lodiko Sub-county was inspected but there was no evidence of inspection feedback reports.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the LG Education department had submitted 2 school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) during FY 2019/20 as shown below:

Inspection Report for Term III 2019 quarter I FY 2019/20 was submitted and acknowledged by Kirenda Winnie for Commissioner Basic Education Standards Directorate of Education Standards on 15/01/2020 (stamped)

Inspection Report for Term I 2020 quarter 3 FY 2019/20 was submitted and acknowledged by Kirenda Winnie for Commissioner Basic Education Standards Directorate of Education Standards on 30/06/2020 (stamped)

However it was observed during school visits that the 3 sampled UPE schools had no evidence of inspection reports.

Pajar primary school in Kaabong Town council and Kachikol primary school in Kaabong West Sub county had no evidence provided to see days when these schools were inspected and no inspection reports were left behind.

Lodiko primary school in Lodiko Sub-county was inspected by DIS on 4/12/2019 and 09/07/2019, CCT on 17/11/2019 and DEO on 19/07/2019 in FY 2019/20 though there was no evidence of inspection reports.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

Meeting of Social Services Committee held meetings in FY2019/20 to discuss service delivery issues in education sector.

- On the 17 and 22 April 2020- Recommendations of Social Services Committee to scrutinize draft budget FY2020/21
- o Follow up on land issues for Sidok Seed Primary School and construction of 5 stance pit latrine
- o Construction of a 2-stance lined pit latrine for teachers at Narube PS and Lomodoch PS
- On the 26 February 2020. Minute03/Feb/2020
- o Education should have own car to ease monitoring education programmes
- o Need to fence Kotome PS land to avoid land encroachers
- o Discussions on Scholarships
- On the 25 November 2019
- o Consult UNICEF on the need for more support for ECD centres in the District
- o Councillors to mobilize all school going children to increase enrolment
- Minutes of Social Services Committee meeting of 19 August 2019. Minutes04/08/2019
- o Resolve issue of land of the Nurses school
- o Replacement of teachers leaving the District

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0

There was no evidence to show that education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of an Up-to-date LG Assets register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards at.</p> <p>Review in all the three schools sampled that included PajarP/S, Kachikol P/S and Lodiko P/S, there was no evidence of an up-to-asset registers.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The DLG did not provide desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the sector was derived from the LG Development Plan and desk appraised by DTPC/MTPC eligible under sector or funding source grant guidelines.</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>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 were appraised for environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the LG approved Procurement Plan for 2020/2021 prepared by the PDU on 15/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 21/10/2020, there were no SEED SS Projects incorporated. There were no SEED SS Projects planned in Kaabong DLG for FY 2020/2021.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, *score: 1, else score: 0*

The three sampled projects executed under Education by the DLG during FY 2019/2020 were approved by the contracts committee as follows;

1. Construction of Dormitory at Nursing School. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003 at a final contract value of UGX 80,000,000, was approved under Min.04/JAN/DCC/2019-2020 held on 13-14/01/2020 before commencement of works on 31/01/2020.

2. Construction of a 5 Stance Latrine at Naryamaoi P/S. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00010 at a final contract value of UGX 29,855,100, was approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 held on 11/02/2020 before commencement of works on 04/03/2020.

3. Construction of 4 Unit Staff House at Toroi P/S. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00004 at a final contract value of UGX 78,379,500 was approved under Min.04/JAN/DCC/2019-2020 held on 13-14/01/2020 before commencement of works on 31/01/2020.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of proper establishment of PIT for school infrastructure projects executed in the last FY.</p> <p>All that was provided was a letter from the CAO dated 17/01/2020 designating SAS as Contract Manager, and evidence from the Contract signed on 31/01/2020 where the DEO and District Engineer were designated as Project Manager and Technical Supervisor respectively for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00004,</p> <p>letter from the CAO dated 17/02/2020 designating the Principle as the Contract Manager and evidence from the contract signed on 31/01/2020 designating the DEO as Project Manager and District Engineer as Technical Supervisor for project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00003 and</p> <p>evidence from contract signed on 04/03/2020 designating the DEO and District Engineer as Project Manager and Technical Supervisor respectively for the project Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00010.</p> <p><b>All other members of the PIT for all projects were not designated.</b></p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no SEED SS project in Kaabong DLG in the FY 2019/2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no SEED SS project in Kaabong DLG in the FY 2019/2020.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

There was no evidence that joint technical supervision meetings were held for infrastructure projects executed.

All that was availed were routine monitoring reports from the Acting Engineering Officer and DEO to CAO that included all projects executed under the Education Department. These were dated 25/05/2020 and 08/06/2020 and an overall monitoring report for payment dated 13/10/2020 that included recommendations for payment for all projects issued on their respective dates.

**In all these reports, only the Engineer was involved in supervision and reporting. There was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO participated in supervision.**

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>A sample of 3 requests for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the payments to the Contractors were made within recommended time frames i.e.</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 15,358,000 by M/s Fauza Agencies for construction of Kaabong Nursing School was made on the 20 April 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 4 May 2020. Payment certificate No 2 was prepared by the DE and signed by DEO on the 13 May 2020. Payment was made 28 days (i.e. 18 May 2020, Receipt No 188) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 24,750,000 by M/s Fauza Agencies for construction of a dormitory at Kaabong Nursing School was made on the 26 May 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 8 June 2020 Payment certificate No 3 was prepared by the DE and signed by DEO on the 10 June 2020. Payment was made 22 days (i.e. 18 June 2020 Receipt No 189) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 21,020,000 by M/s Rwataris Traders for construction of 2 sets of five stance latrine at the seed school in Sidok Sub County was made on the 15 June 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 19 June 2020 Payment certificate No 01 was prepared by the DE and DEO on the 22 June 2020. Payment was made 11 days (i.e. 26 June 2020 Receipt No 391) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Education Department through the DEO submitted User Department Procurement Plan on 14/04/2020. This was received by the PDU on 14/04/2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was no SEED SS project in Kaabong DLG in the FY 2019/2020.</p>	1

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of education guidelines incorporating E&amp;S requirements in school by Environment Officer. And the education guidelines were not in place.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>Kaabong had no in place a costed ESMP and this was neither incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of proof of land ownership for only one project for the seed school. Evidence for ownership of other projects was not presented at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>Voluntary customary land agreement between Kosomongin clan and Sidok subcounty for Sidok seed secondary school. Signed on 4th May 2020</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that 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</p>	0

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

There was no evidence that the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>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 OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) for the FY before could not be provided by the biostatistician at the District because they were misplaced and could not be traced during the assessment period. In addition to that, the DHIMS was down and could not be accessed by the end of the assessment. Therefore the comparison could not be done for purposes of ascertaining whether there was an increased/decreased utilization of health care services.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>N/A. Assessments of LLG has not yet commenced</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</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>From District Reports on RBF Facility Assessment for the last quarter of the Financial Year, Kalapata scored 86.3%, Lokolia HC III scored 91.1% and Kathile HC III scored 88.1%. The average score these 3 health facilities was 88.5%.</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>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>The DLG budget and spent health development grant in FY2019/20 on eligible activities i.e.</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2019/20</p> <p>Page 24 Building Construction - Construction Expenses at Morulem HCII Ugx 7,000,000</p> <p>Page 24 Building Construction - Latrines at Lokwakaramoe HCII Ugx 19,750,000</p> <p>Page 24 Building Construction - Staff Houses at Timu HCII Ugx 7,000,000</p> <p>Annual Budget Performance Report FY2019/20</p> <p>Page 58 Two stance lined pit latrine at constructed in Lokwakaramoe HC II; Retention for the construction of a staff house at Timu HC II and OPD at Morulem HC II paid Ugx 29,750,000</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>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 DLG had 1 investment project, review of request for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the CDO and Environment Officer did not sign the interim payment certificates before the LG made payments to Contractors</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 19,450,000 by M/s Rock Motel Ltd for construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with 2 bathing shelters in Lokwakaramoe HC 11 was made on the 18 June 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 18 June 2020. Payment certificate No 1 was prepared by DE and signed by DHO on the 22 June 2020. Payment was made on the 30 June 2020 Receipt Nos. 001,002 &amp; 003.</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>Only one project was executed under health for FY 2019/2020.This was;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2 Stances Latrine at Lokwakaramoi Health Centre II. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00014.LG Engineer's estimates was UGX 20,000,000 against a Final contract value was UGX 19,450,000.</li> </ul> <p><b>Variation was -2.75%</b> which was within +/-20%.</p>	2

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was no project of upgrading a HCII to HC III for FY 2019/2020 in Kaabong DLG.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	There are 5 HC III each expected to have a total of 19 health workers according to the structure (total of 95 health workers). The staffing in the LG stands at 51 which makes a 54% filling.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was no project of upgrading a HCII to HC III for FY 2019/2020 in Kaabong DLG.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The staff list provided by the Human Resources Office and staff lists at Kalapata HC III, Lokolia HCIII and Kathile HCIII for the previous FY were not matching. For instance, at Lokolia HC III, Alelo Christine (enrolled Midwife), Lotyang David Ikoli (Health Information Assistant), Naberei Lilly Frances (Nursing officer) and Olinga Andrew (Enrolled Nurse) were not working at this health facility and were not on the staff list of the same. At Kathile HC III, Achan Yolanda Kotol (Nursing officer) Ajok Susan Mary (enrolled Nurse) and Atim Teddy (Enrolled Midwife), were not working at this health facility.</li> </ul> <p>At Kalapata HC III, Logwee John (Porter) Angom Dorcus (enrolled nurse) Nakong Kerine (Enrolled Midwife) and Nakng Molly Alany (Nursing assistant) were not on the staff list of the health facility. It was discovered that those cadres were transferred to other health facilities. Therefore the information on positions of health workers filled was inaccurate. The Human resources office did not update its staff after effecting transfers in the three health facilities.</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to DHO, there was no upgraded or constructed health facilities for the previous FY.</li> </ul>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health Facility annual work plans and budgets for the previous FY were prepared as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector though they were not submitted by March 31st.</li> <li>• The 3 sampled health facility submissions indicated that Kalapata HC III submitted its workplan and budget on 8th/sept/2019, Lokolia HC III submitted the same on 31st/May/2019 and Kathile HC III submitted its workplan and budget on 6th/Aug/2019. Because the work plans and budget were prepared as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector, the district does score.</li> </ul>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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 no evidence that 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. Because the DHO could not provide the same during the assessment period.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no evidence that Health facilities had developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.</li> <li>• There was no single implementation report availed to the assessor by end of day 2 of the assessment activity. On further probing, the DHO said the implementation reports were misplaced and could not be traced at that time.</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Health Facility HMIS monthly Reports for the previous FY for the following health facilities were submitted late as follows; Kathile HC III, submitted the monthly reports October 2019 on 8th/11/2019, monthly report for July 2019 was submitted on 8th/8/2019. Kalapata HC III submitted the monthly report for January on 18th/2/2020 and Lokolia HC III, submitted its 3rd quarter report on 9/4/2020. Therefore there was untimely submission of HMIS monthly and quarterly reports.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>From the 3 sampled Health Facility record of submissions of RBF invoices, Kathile HC III, submitted on 28th/7/2020, Kalapata HC III and Lokolia HC III submitted on 28th/7/2020. These were all late submissions given the fact that submissions are supposed to be made on 15th of the month following end of the quarter.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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>• DHMT submissions of facility RBF invoices to MoH could not be traced. The RBF focal person was not available to provide more information by the end of day 2 of assessment though the DHO informed the assessor that submissions were made by email and by the RBF focal person who could not be reached by phone. However, the DHO confessed that they have always submitted late.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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 DLG did not provide evidence that the Health Department submitted timely quarterly budget performance reports for FY2019/20 to the planner for consolidation.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the DHO, Pakangala HC II, Lodiko HC II and Usake HC II were the weakest performing health facilities. The assessment reports for these 3 health facilities could not be traced by the DHO, but while reviewing quarter 4 narrative report, the assessor discovered that those 3 health facilities were being mentioned as the weakest performing health facilities though the scores were not reflected. However, there was no Evidence that the LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for these weak performing facilities.</li> </ul>	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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no evidence that the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for these weakest performing facilities.</li> </ul>	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>From both the approved budget and performance contract the LG budgeted for 2,762,708,196= for 229 health workers, received a total of 2,674,803,480= for 225 health workers. 87,904,716= for 4 health workers was taken back to the treasury because 1 health worker died, and 3 health workers transferred services to other Districts.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the LG Performance contract, the approved staff number for the health department was 458(100%). From the a summary of the staffing norm obtained from the DHO,It was further establish that the positions substantively filled were 299 (50.0%).</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessor reviewed the deployment list for FY 2020/2021 obtained from DHO and compared it with the attendance roster at the sampled health facilities. The findings were as follows;</li> <li>• At Lokolia HC III, Alelo Christine (enrolled Midwife), Lotyang David Ikoli (Health Information Assistant), Naberei Lilly Frances (Nursing officer) and Olinga Andrew (Enrolled Nurse) were not working at this health facility.</li> <li>• At Kathile HC III, Achan Yolanda Kotal (Nursing officer) Ajok Susan Mary (enrolled Nurse) and Atim Teddy (Enrolled Midwife), were not working at this health facility.</li> <li>• At Kalapata HC III, Logwee John (Porter) Angom Dorcus (enrolled nurse) Nakong Kerine (Enrolled Midwife) and Nakong Molly Alany (Nursing assistant) were not working at this health facility.</li> <li>• It was further discovered that the other health workers working at other health facilities but within the District. Therefore the list from DHO needed to have been updated.</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the notice boards of the sapled health facilities of Kalapata HC III, Kathile HC III and Lokolia HC III, there was no circular from the DHO to health facility in charges regarding deployment of staff.</li> <li>• Therefore there was no evidence that the LG had publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards.</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

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

There was evidence that DHO conducted annual performance appraisal of all health facility in charges against the agreed performance plans. Out of the 27 health facilities, 10 were sampled as follows;

1. Nalibe James of Lokeri HCII was appraised 16/7/2020
2. Etit Josephine of Kakamar HC II was appraised 14/7/2020
3. Opio Kennedy Munu of Ksmion KC II was appraised on 20/7/2020
4. Adokorac Scovia of Lotim HC II was appraised on 7/8/2020
5. Opio Emmanuel of Usake HC II was appraised on 17/7/2020
6. Loduku Robert of Amacharikol HC II was appraised on 27/7/2020
7. Okidi Daniel of Morulem HC II was appraised on 13/7/2020
8. Locham Isaac of Lokanayona HC II was appraised on 13/7/2020
9. Adongo Sarah of Morukori HC II was appraised on 13/7/2020
10. Lopeyo Pope Paul of Loyoyo HCIII was appraised on 14/10/2020

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that In charges conducted annual performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans.</p> <p>From the files of 10 health workers files sampled, it was evident that appraisals were carried out for the previous financial year as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achom Ana Loy an Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 30/6/2020</li> <li>2. Koryang Max Mark a nursing assistant was appraised on 17/7/2020</li> <li>3. Atim Teddy an enrolled nurse was appraised on 14/7/2020</li> <li>4. Akol Margaret a porter was appraised on 10/7/2020</li> <li>5. Ariko Mario a porter was appraised on 20/7/2020</li> <li>6. Alelo Christine an enrolled midwife was appraised on 20/7/2020</li> <li>7. Adungo Paul a nursing assistant was appraised on 20/7/2020</li> <li>8. Napech Mary an enrolled Nurse was appraised on 8/7/2020</li> <li>9. Among Christine an enrolled Mdwife was appraised on 3/7/2020</li> <li>10. Lokwang Peter a nursing assistant was appraised 3/7/2020</li> </ol>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was though no evidence that any corrective action was taken based on the appraisal reports</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development). But not in accordance to the training plans at District level because the LG had no resources to implement its training plan. The trainings were funded by partners Such as UNICEF and Jhiengo.</li> </ul>	1

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG had documented training activities by filing training reports. For instance, the following reports were filed;</p> <p>HMIS training report (training supported by Jhiego), a training conducted from 12th 13th/5/2020 and attended by 23 health workers.</p> <p>Training report on facility quality care assessment program by MoH with support from UNICEF held from 2nd-6th/February/2020.</p> <p>And a report on training of comprehensive HIV/AIDS care from 27th-31st/Jan/2020.</p>	1
---	--	---	--	---

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>• According to DHO, there were no errors in the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) in the previous FY. Therefore it was not necessary for CAO to write to the MoH.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG allocated funds to Health Management and Supervision, however the District did not provide breakdown of these funds to ascertain allocations made towards monitoring service delivery.</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2019/20</p> <p>Page 22 NGO Basic Healthcare Services (LLS) Ugx 0</p> <p>Page 22 Basic Healthcare Services (HCIV-HCII-LLS) Ugx 223,742,000</p> <p>Primary Healthcare Non-Wage Recurrent Grant-Ugx 223,742,000</p> <p>Page 23 Health Management and Supervision Ugx 3,502,890,000</p>	0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0

The DLG did not make timely warranting of direct grant transfers to health facilities.

PS/ST communication of expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 9 July 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 2 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 8 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20 on the 28 April 2020

Warrants created all NWR Grants

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 12 August 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 24 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 24 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20 on the 17 April 2020

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The DLG did not provide evidence of communication of fund releases to the health facilities in the FY2019/20 at the time of assessment.

Releases for the all Quarters FY2019/20 as per Cost Centre List (sample of 3 HCs)

	Q1 FY2019/20	Q2 FY2019/20	Q3 FY2019/20	Q4 FY2019/20
KACHOLO HC III	Ugx 4,550,714	Ugx 4,550,993	Ugx 4,550,162	Ugx 4,550,668
KAMION HC II	Ugx 1,506,903	Ugx 1,506,995	Ugx 1,506,720	Ugx 1,506,887
LOKANAYONA HC II	Ugx 1,506,903	Ugx 1,506,720	Ugx 1,506,995	Ugx 1,506,887

Dates when sampled Health Centres bank accounts were credited

	Q1 FY2019/20	Q2 FY2019/20	Q3 FY2019/20	Q4 FY2019/20
KACHOLO HC III	13 Aug 19	2 Nov 19	31 Jan	

20 29 April 20

KAMION HC II 13 Aug  
19 2 Nov 19 31 Jan  
20 29 April 20

LOKANAYONA HC II 13 Aug  
19 2 Nov 19 31 Jan  
20 29 April 20

Warrant & Invoicing

Q1 FY2019/20 Invoice date 25 Aug 2019 Warrant 12 Aug 19

Q2 FY2019/20 Invoice date 23 October 2019 Warrant 24 Oct 19

Q3 FY2019/20. Invoice date 30 January 2020. Warrant 24 January 2020

Q4 FY2019/20. Invoice date 24 April 2020. Warrant 17 April 2020

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the LG 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 MoFPED.

However, 1st quarter releases for FY 2020/2021, were on the notice board though one could not ascertain whether they were publicized within the mandatory 5 working days.

0

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

• After reviewing Minutes of Quarterly review meetings (minutes of all the 4 quarters) dated 26th/9/2019, 17th/12/2019, 12th/3/2020 and 24th/6/2020, and the 4 DHMT quarterly performance reports, it was realized that routinely monitored and provided hands on support supervision to health facilities as was emphasized in all quarterly review meetings.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the Minutes of DHMT quarterly performance review meetings reviewed held on 26th/9/2019, 17th/12/2019, 12th/3/2020 and 24th/6/2020, there was no evidence that the LG quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments. This was partly because the attendance lists were not availed to the assessor by the DHO. The DHO said that they attendance lists were misplaced. Therefore it was hard to know who was in attendance and who was absent in those meetings.</li> </ul>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kaabong District has no single HC IV. However, it has a general Hospital. There was no single evidence that the LG supervised the General hospital at least once every quarter in the previous FY. There was also no single support supervision report or minutes in regard to the same availed to the assessor. The DHO said that the support supervision reports for the hospital were not available because they did not document the support supervision activities for the hospital.</li> </ul>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HSD for Kaabong district is hosted by Kaabong general Hospital since the district has no HC IV.</li> <li>• From the HSD supervision and monitoring reports for the previous FY; HSD in 1st and 2nd quarter, support supervised only 6 out of the 27 health facilities in the district. In 3rd quarter, HSD support supervised only 18 health facilities and in 4th quarter, the HSD only support supervised 19 health facilities out of the 27.</li> <li>• There was no evidence that feedback was given from LG health department to HSDs during the last FY.</li> </ul>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no 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.</li> </ul>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In all the 4 quarterly support supervision reports for management of medicines and health supplies reviewed, there was no evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY. Documents titled Support supervision reports for management of medicines and health supplies had content of medicine stock assessment.</li> </ul>	0
	Maximum 7 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	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	Review of the Overview of Workplan Revenues and Expenditures by Source for Health Department in the Budget Estimates FY2019/20 (page 20-24) did not show allocations made towards Health Promotion and Prevention Activities.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly progress report for the first quarter indicate that mentorship of staff on how to use their data to determine their daily health education talk was done.</li> <li>• In the 2nd quarter, focus on health promotion was on prevention of malaria which was causing high mortalities.</li> <li>• In the 3rd quarter, , distribution of IEC materials on covid-19 and maternal health was done and mobilization of communities on covid-19 outbreak.</li> <li>• In 4th quarter, the focus of health promotion was on educating the population on covid-19 and training of health workers, VHTs and LC 1s chairpersons and radio talk shows on covid-19.</li> </ul>	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>• It was evident in the DHT minutes that follow up actions on health promotion and disease promotion was taken. In the DHT minutes of a meeting held on 16th/Apr/2020, follow up on actions was minute 04/04/2020 and specifically it was on observation of Covid-19 SOPs by staff and communities. In another meeting held on 17th/10/2019, under minute 04/10/2019, follow up on nutrition and family support is documented.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

### Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>• There was no evidence provided to prove that the LG had an updated health facilities Asset register. The DHO confirmed that the health facilities asset register was not in place. on further probing, the DHO said they only had an inventory.</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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);  (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and  (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence that desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the Health Sector were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source</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>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the Health Sector was field appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability; and had their designs customized to suit site conditions</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kaabong DLG did not carry out screening for environmental and social risks for all health facility investments.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health Department through the DHO submitted the User Department Procurement Plan on 29/04/2020.This was received by the PDU on 29/04/2020.</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>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>For FY 2020/2021, Health Department had only one project incorporated in the procurement plan. Health Department submitted LGPP Form 1 through the DHO with the project, Renovation of a Staff House at Nariamaoe Health Centre on 02/07/2020.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Only one project was executed under health for FY 2019/2020. This was approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p> <p>Construction of 2 Stances Latrine at Lokwakaramoi Health Centre II. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00014 at a final contract value of UGX 19,450,000, was approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 (6) dated 11/02/2020 before commencement of works on 04/03/2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>For the projects executed under Health for the FY 2019/2020, there was no evidence of proper establishment of PIT. All that was availed was evidence from the work contract signed on 04/03/2020 where the DHO and District Engineer were listed as Contract Manager and Technical Supervisor respectively. <b>All other members of PIT were not designated.</b></p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>For the FY 2019/2020, there was no project of upgrading HC II to HC III in Kaabong DLG.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records of daily reports from the Clerk of Works consolidated as weekly reports to the District Engineer and copied to the DHO.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>There were no records of site meetings. No minutes were available.</p> <p>All that was provided was provided was PAF monitoring report for 3rd Quarter signed by all stakeholders which included the project of Construction of 2 Stances Latrine at Lokwakaramoi Health Centre II.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>For the FY 2019/2020, there was no project of upgrading HC II to HC III in Kaabong DLG.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG had 1 investment project, review of request of payments to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the DHO made timely recommendations for payments to Contractors for project investments in the sector.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Request for payment of Ugx 19,450,000 by M/s Rock Motel Ltd for construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with 2 bathing shelters in Lokwakaramoe HC 11 was made on the 18 June 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 18 June 2020 on the same day the request for payment was made by the contractor. Payment certificate No 1 was prepared by DE and signed by DHO on the 22 June 2020. Payment was made on the 30 June 2020 Receipt Nos. 001,002 &amp; 003.</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For the project executed under health the previous FY, there were complete procurement files as per PPDA guidelines as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2 Stances Latrine at Lokwakaramoi Health Centre II. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00014 had the Evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 28/01/2020, Work contract signed on 14/03/2020 and Contract decision minutes for Min.04 /FEB/DCC/2019-2020 dated 11/02/20</li> </ul>	1
----	--	---	---	---

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kaabong DLG has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kaabong DLG disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to sampled health facilities</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Of the sampled three Health facilities; Kalapata HCIII had a placenta pit, Lokolia HCIII had an incinerator and Kathalie HCIII had a placenta pit.The funds for waste management is financed by the PHC budget and management of medical waste is done by the support staff( cleaners)</p>	2

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that Kaabong LG conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management as per the sampled three facilities.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There was no evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous. Health infrastructures were not screened by the EO and CDO	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	The Environment officer , Physical planner and DHO could not present documentation of land acquisition status for Health infrastructures at the time of the assessment.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There was no evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	The Environment and Social Certification forms were not 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	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	The MWE MIS database does not show records on the water sources functionality for the current FY 20/21. However, according to the same Ministry MIS database for the previous FY 19/20, the percentage of functional sources stood at 81%; Kaabong district has 13 sub-counties and each had a functionality rate as follows;  o Kaabong East sub-county at 82%, o Kaabong Town Council at 59%, o Kaabong West sub-county at 69%, o Kakamar sub-county at 89% o Kalapata sub county at 80% o Kamion sub county at 77% o Kathile sub county at 80% o Kathile South sub county at 94% o Lodiko sub county at 94% o Lolelia sub county at 79% o Lotim sub county at 82% o Loyoro sub county at 75% o Sidok sub county at 78%	1

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 facilities with functional Water and Sanitation Committees is 94% according to the Ministry MIS for the previous FY 19/20 i.e. 383 of 406 sources managed by WSCs have Water and Sanitation Committees that are functional.</p> <p>For example; from one of the sampled sources at Lokido Sub County, Lomuria village, source number: DWD 69845, it comprised of 9 members, 5 women and 4 men and each household contributes 1,000 UGX per month per household.</p> <p>At the time of visit, the fees had not been requested for any O&amp;M work</p>	2
2	<p>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.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Not applicable. Assessment system for LLG is yet to be developed.</p>	0
2	<p>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>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The safe water coverage for Kaabong district stands at 85%. The district has 13 sub counties as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kaabong sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kaabong TC with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kaabong West sub-county with safe water coverage at 65%,</li> <li>o Kakamar sub-county with safe water coverage at 69%</li> <li>o Kalapata sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kamion sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kathile sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kathile South sub-county with safe</li> </ul>	1

water coverage at 95%

- o Lodiko sub-county with safe water coverage at 70%,
- o Lolelia sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,
- o Lotim sub-county with safe water coverage at 55%,
- o Loyoro sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%
- o Sidok sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%

According to the annual Work plan/ budget approved and stamped by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Water and Environment on 5th August 2019 for the FY 2019/20, the total grant planned by Kaabong District Water Office was 316,210,451 UGX for FY 2019/20 and five projects were planned and budgeted for under rural water development (254,516,193 UGX).

The annual progress report Quarter 4 of the FY 19/20 signed and stamped by the Central Registry Ministry of Water and Environment on 20th July, 2020, indicated that five projects were implemented in the 8 sub-counties of; Kaabong TC, Kalapata sub-county, Kakamar sub-county, Kathile South sub county, Kamion sub county, Lodiko sub county expect the borehole drilling of Lokkoki borehole in Lotim sub-county.

Of these only the sub counties of Kakamar, Lodiko and Lotim that have safe water coverages below the district average were budgeted for implementation of water projects.

The planned implementations were as follows:

**Rehabilitation** of 10 boreholes but however only 4 boreholes were rehabilitated;

- o 1 borehole in Lodiko sub-county,
- o 1 borehole in Kathile South sub-county
- o 1 borehole in Kathile sub-county
- o 1 borehole in Lotimo sub-county

**Deep borehole drilling** (Hand pumped);

- o 1 borehole in Kakamar sub-county,

- o 1 borehole in Lotimo sub county
- o 1 borehole in Lokido sub-county,
- o 1 borehole in Kathile South sub county.

**Construction of public latrines** in RGCs (2-stance) in Kaabong Town council.

**Construction of latrines;**

- o 1 two-stance latrine Kalapata sub county
- o 1 three-stance latrine in Lotim sub county

**Design of piped water system** (GFS, Borehole, surface) feasibility studies and tender documentation in Kamion sub county.

The total cost for these planned implementations came to a total of 223,250,000 UGX. i.e.

- o 9,750,000 UGX for the rehabilitation of 4 boreholes (Unit cost for rehabilitation per borehole was 975,000 UGX),
- o 96,000,000 UGX for deep borehole drilling of 4 boreholes (unit cost of the borehole 24,000,000 UGX)
- o 23,500,000 UGX for the construction of public latrines in RGCs (unit cost of the latrine 23,500,000 UGX)
- o 34,000,000 UGX for the construction of latrines (unit cost of the latrine 17,000,000 UGX)
- o 60,000,000 UGX for the design of piped water system, feasibility studies and tender documentation.

Therefore, the target for the sub counties with safe water coverage below district average i.e. for Kakamar, Lodiko and Lotim was: 66,950,000 UGX.

Therefore, the percentage that was budgeted for the sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average comes to 30%.

The budgeted water project in the sub county with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY 2019/20 were implemented at 83.3% i.e. with except the borehole drilling in Lotim sub county.



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 five sampled projects implemented  
in Kaabong DLG indicated variations as  
follows:

**Project 1: Drilling of 4 boreholes** in  
Kakamar, Lodiko, Kathile South and  
Lotimo sub counties

Eng.'s Estimate: 96,000,000 UGX

Contract price: 63,685,000 UGX

Variation: -33.66%

Therefore, the variation of the contract  
price for this project is **not within** +/-  
20%

**Project 2: Design of piped water  
system, feasibility studies and tender  
documentation** in Kamion sub county.

Estimate: 60,000,000 UGX

Contract price: 47,506,500 UGX.

Variation: -20.8%

Therefore, the variation of the contract  
price for this project is **not within** +/-  
20%.

**Project 3: Construction of public  
latrine** in Kaabong town council.

Estimate: 23,500,000 UGX

Contract price: 21,116,750 UGX.

Variation: -10.14%

Therefore, the variation of the contract  
price for this project is **within** +/- 20%.

**Project 4: Construction of latrines** in  
Kalapata and Lotim sun counties

Estimate: 34,000,000 UGX

Contract price: 33,569,150 UGX.

Variation: -1.26%

Therefore, the variation of the contract  
price for this project is **within** +/- 20%.

2

Service Delivery  
Performance: Average  
score in the water and  
environment LLGs  
performance  
assessment

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

- d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.
- o If 100% projects completed: score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1
- o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

According to the AWP for the FY 2019/20 and the Annual Budget Performance report of FY 2019/20, 3 of the planned 5 projects (60%) were implemented and completed by end the FY 2019/20. As shown below;

Certificate of completion dated 8th July 2020 issued to Jolly and Joe Medium Enterprises for the construction of two stance lined latrine in Kalapata sub county signed by the Ag. DWO, District Engineer and CAO.

Certificate of completion dated 16th June 2020 issued to Lina Constructors and Supplies Ltd for the construction of 3- stance lined latrine in Lotim sub county signed by the Ag. DWO, District Engineer and CAO.

Certificate of completion dated 8th June 2020 issued to Lokodopei Enterprises for the construction of two stance lined latrine in Kaabong town council signed by the Ag. DWO, District Engineer and CAO.

The Ag. DWO planned to drill 4 boreholes but at the end the FY 2019/20 had drilled 3 boreholes in Kakamar, Lodiko and Kathile sub counties with exception of the borehole in Lotim sub county.

The Ag. DWO planned to rehabilitate 10 boreholes but at the end of the FY 2019/20 had rehabilitated 5 boreholes.

Only 60% of the planned projects were implemented and completed by end the FY 2019/20.

0

3

Achievement of  
Standards: The LG has  
met WSS infrastructure  
facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure*

- a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning
- o If there is an increase: score 2
- o If no increase: score 0.

There was an increase in the percentage of functional water supply points in Kaabong district as indicated by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) MIS reports.

FY 2018/19: 77% of functional water source points was registered (366 No, Sources) and for FY 2019/20: 81% functional water source points was registered (497 No, Sources).

This indicated an increase of 4% of the functional water source points between the two financial years.

2

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).

o If increase is more than 5% score 2

o If increase is between 0-5%, score 1

o If there is no increase : score 0.

There was an decrease in the percentage of functional Water and Sanitation Committees in Kaabong district as indicated by the MIS reports of the MWE.

For the FY 2018/19: 94% of functional water and sanitation committees was registered with 352 in number.

For the FY 2019/20: 92% of functional water and sanitation committees was registered with 383 in number.

This indicated an decrease of 2% for functional water and sanitation committees between the two financial years.

### 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

From the DWO records, WSS projects implemented in FY 2019/20 were accurately reported in the annual quarter 4 progress report as they were implemented.

Water sources in the annual progress report in the different sub counties include;

o Lotim sub-county: Morulem

o Kathile sub-county: Todokonose

o Kathile South sub-county: Nariamaoi and Lois

o Lodiko sub county: Lopeedo and Sakatan

o Kaabong West sub county: Lomusian

o Kakamar sub county: Nokosowan

The progress reports recorded and also the field inspections revealed the water points as follows;

Borehole DWD NO-69846 completed by ICON projects Ltd in FY 19/20 in Lois village Kathile sub-county,

Borehole DWD No- 69847 completed by ICON projects Ltd in FY 19/20 in Nakasowan village in Kakamar sub-county,

Borehole DWD No-69845 completed by ICON Projects Ltd in FY 19/20 Sakatan village Lodiko sub-county.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>Based on evidence from the quarterly reports Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 signed and stamped by the Permanent Secretary MWE on 28th October 2019, 14th January 2020, 20th July 2020 and 20th July 2020 respectively and Form 1 reports filled by the district through the sub county staffs, there was evidence of quarterly information on sub county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water and community involvement in water and sanitation activities.</p>	2
<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO MIS records in the form of MS Excel reports indicated updated records on quarterly basis for new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities. i.e. for the quarter 4 dated 10th July, 2020 signed and stamped by the Permanent Secretary on 20th July 2020, Rural water functionality was at 81%, rural safe water coverage (access) at 85%. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kaabong East sub county functionality was at 82% with safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 9,900</li> <li>o Kaabong TC functionality was at 59% with safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 14,550</li> <li>o Kaabong West sub county functionality was at 69% with a safe water coverage at 65% and a population of 8,700</li> <li>o Kakamar sub county functionality was at 89% with safe coverage at 69% and a population of 5,400</li> <li>o Kalapata sub county functionality was at 80% with safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 16,056</li> <li>o Kamion functionality was at 77% with safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 6,600</li> <li>o Kathile sub county functionality was at 80% with a safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 13,500</li> <li>o Kathile South sub county functionality was at 94% with safe coverage at 95% and a population of 9,500</li> <li>o Lodiko sub county functionality was at 87% with safe water coverage at 70% and a population of 4,500</li> <li>o Lolelia sub county functionality was at</li> </ul>	3
<p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>				

79% with safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 14,400

o Lotim sub county functionality was at 82% with a safe water coverage at 55% and a population of 6,600

o Loyoro sub county functionality was at 75% with safe coverage at 95% and a population of 12,000

o Sidok sub county functionality was at 78% with safe coverage at 95% and a population of 12,000

Upon studying the annual work plan for the current FY 2020/21, it was observed that the DWO used the information gathered from the previous financial year 2019/20 to plan for this FY 2020/21; e.g. some facilities were allocated for the sub-counties with safe water coverages below the district average, e.g. Deep borehole drilling i.e. 1 borehole in Kaabong West sub county and 1 borehole in Lotim sub county, and borehole rehabilitation i.e. 2 boreholes in Lodiko sub county and 1 borehole in Kaabong West sub county.

5

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

*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.*

At the time of assessment, performance of LLGs had not been assessed.

0

## Human Resource Management and Development

6

Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2

The Water Officer budgeted for the water staff under the LG estimates vote 559; these are; the water officer and the borehole technician.

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 DNRO budgeted for the water staff under the LG estimates vote 559. These were the physical planner, the environment office and the land supervisor.</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>There was no evidence that all the DWO staff were appraised for FY 2019/2020.</p> <p>1. The water officer, had no valid appraisal report on file, while</p> <p>2. The borehole technician was appraised on 20/5/2020</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>There was no evidence of a Capacity Needs Assessment report, training plan and a training report for the FY 2019/20.</p>	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the current FY 2020/21 dated 10th July 2020 approved and signed on 20th July 2020 by the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation and Central Registry Ministry of Water and Environment indicated that 5 projects in water development were planned namely;</p> <p><b>Project 1:</b> Deep borehole drilling of 5 boreholes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 1 borehole in Lotim sub county,</li> <li>o 2 boreholes in Kalapata sub county</li> <li>o 1 borehole in Kaabong East sub county and</li> <li>o 1 borehole in Kaabong West sub county.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project 2:</b> Rehabilitation of 15 boreholes;</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

- o 2 boreholes in Lodiko sub county
- o 2 boreholes in Kaabong West sub county
- o 4 boreholes in Kalapata sub county
- o 2 boreholes in Kathile sub county
- o 3 boreholes in Sidok sub county
- o 1 borehole in Kaabong West sub county

**Project 3:** Deep borehole drilling (production well) in Lolelia sub county

**Project 4:** Design of piped water system (GFS, Borehole, surface) feasibility studies and Tender documentation in Lolelia sub county.

**Project 5:** Construction of public latrines in RGCs in Loyoro sub county

All the projects are in the sub-counties with safe water coverage above district average with exception of;

1 borehole rehabilitation in Kaabong West sub county,

2 borehole rehabilitation in Lodiko sub county,

1 deep borehole drilling in Kaabong West sub county and

1 deep borehole drilling in Lotim sub county

which have safe water coverage below the district average.

The sub counties safe water coverages at the beginning of the financial year were as follows:

o Kaabong East sub county functionality was at 82% with safe water coverage at 95%

o Kaabong TC functionality was at 59% with safe water coverage at 95%

o Kaabong West sub county functionality was at 69% with a safe water coverage at 65%

o Kakamar sub county functionality was at 89% with safe coverage at 69%

o Kalapata sub county functionality was at 80% with safe water coverage at 95%

- o Kamion functionality was at 77% with safe water coverage at 95%

- o Kathile sub county functionality was at 80% with a safe water coverage at 95%

- o Kathile South sub county functionality was at 94% with safe coverage at 95%

- o Lodiko sub county functionality was at 87% with safe water coverage at 70%

- o Lolelia sub county functionality was at 79% with safe water coverage at 95%

- o Lotim sub county functionality was at 82% with a safe water coverage at 55%

- o Loyoro sub county functionality was at 75% with safe coverage at 95%

- o Sidok sub county functionality was at 78% with safe coverage at 95%

The annual budget for the current year FY 2020/21 was 294,672,731 UGX that was planned for water development. Project 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 above together have a budget allocation of 181,296,000 UGX according to the District Annual Work Plan.

For the FY 2020/21, the budget allocation to sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average is as follows;

- o Deep borehole drilling of 5 boreholes in Lotim, Kalapata, Kaabong West and Kaabong East sub counties at 120,000,000UGX (unit cost for borehole is 24,000,000 UGX) therefore, target for sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average gives 48,000,000 UGX i.e. excluding the 2 boreholes at Kalapata sub county and 1 borehole at Kaabong East sub county.

- o Deep borehole drilling (production well) in Lolelia sub county at 30,000,000 UGX

- o Construction of public latrines in RGCs in Loyoro sub county at 15,000,000 UGX

- o Design of piped water system (GFS, Borehole, surface) feasibility studies and Tender documentation in Lolelia sub county at 50,000,000 UGX.

- o Rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in Lodiko, Kaabong East, Kaabong West, Kalapata, Kathile and Sidok sub counties at 16,296,000 UGX: (unit cost

for borehole is 1,086,400 UGX); therefore, target for sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average gives a total of 3,259,200 UGX i.e. excluding the 2 boreholes at Kaabong East sub county, 2 boreholes in Kathile sub county, 3 boreholes in Sidok sub county, 4 boreholes in Kalapata sub county

The total allocation therefore of the budget to sub- counties below district safe water coverage is 51,259,200 UGX.

Therefore, the budget allocation for the current FY allocated to sub-counties below the district average coverage is 28.3%.

There was evidence of notices placed on district notice board indicating budget allocations per source for water projects for the current FY 2020/21 in the respective sub counties; i.e.

A notice dated 30th June 2020, indicated budget allocations of the current 2020/21 of the sanitation facilities per source for each sub county.

However, there was no evidence of notices indicating budget allocations per sources for water projects at the sub counties.

From the district Q4 software report dated 13th November 2020, indicated that the advocacy meeting was held on 10th November 2020 at the Kaabong Court Hall and during the sub county advocacy meeting the budget allocations for the FY 2020/21 were discussed.

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.

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

3

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 more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

In the previous FY 2019/20, the district planned rehabilitation of 10 boreholes, construction of public latrines in RGCs, construction of latrines, design of piped water system, feasibility studies and tender documentation and deep drilling of 4 boreholes

Reviewed evidence provided from the list of WSS facilities implemented last FY 2019/20, and monitoring reports for the FY 2019/20 for quarters 2, 3 and quarter 4 indicated that monitoring was carried out for the 5 projects;

Q2 monitoring report dated 30th December 2019 showed that routine monitoring of the functionality of water sources for 13 boreholes and monitoring of Moreleum Barracks borehole in Lotim sub county and Todokonase borehole in Kathile sub county was carried out.

Q3 monitoring report dated 24th March 2020 showed that monitoring of the Kopodth water scheme in Sidok sub county was done.

Q4 monitoring report dated 30th June 2020 showed that monitoring of 3 constructed latrines in Kaabong TC, Kalapata and Lotim sub counties and monitoring of the new drilled boreholes in Kathile South, Kakamar and Lodiko sub counties was done.

Some of challenges identified during Q4 monitoring were; there was low water potential in Saktan and Lois village in Lodiko and Lotim sub counties respectively and tsetse flies infestation in Nakosowan village that disturbed the surveyors during hydrological works.

9

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

Reviewed evidence from the DWSCC meeting minutes records indicated that the DWO held the quarterly DWSCC Meetings as follows:

The evidence provided from DWSCC minutes Q1 and Q3 dated 24th September 2019 and 28th February 2020 prepared and signed by the DWO showed that they met on these dates and key issues on regular monitoring of sanitation and hygiene activities were discussed.

Some of the issues raised included; in quarter one under min5/WASH/09/2019; the DWO should lobby for transport to help run WASH activities and partners to donate transport means, vehicles and motorcycles to help support WASH activities.

However, there was no evidence that the DWO conducted DWSSCC meeting in Q2 and Q4 since there was no evidence of DWSCC minutes in Q2 and Q4.

0

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

Budget allocations for the current FY2020/21 for the LLGs with safe water coverage below district average were publicized on the district notice boards as;

A notice dated 30th June 2020, indicated budget allocations of the current 2020/21 of the sanitation facilities per source for each sub county.

However, there was no evidence of notices at the sub county headquarters.

0

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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:

- If funds were allocated score 3
- If not score 0

The AWP for the previous FY 2019/20 signed and stamped by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Water and Environment on 5th August 2019 indicated 41,892,278 UGX under the NWR.

Of this 41,092,278 UGX (**98%**) was allocated to facilitate community mobilization activities e.g.

- o DWSSCC meetings costed 3,536,000 UGX

- o Mandatory public notices costed 400,000 UGX

- o Support to district costed 5,000,000 UGX

- o Stationary and printing costed 800,000 UGX

- o O &M Vehicles costed 2,500,000 UGX

- o Fuel and lubricants costed 10,800,000 UGX

- o Construction supervision visits costed 2,760,000 UGX

- o Inspection of water points after construction costed 1,069,700 UGX

- o Regular data collection and analysis costed 2,142,000 UGX

- o Planning and advocacy meetings at district costed 3,930,000 UGX

- o Planning and advocacy meetings at sub county level costed 2,729,419 UGX

- o Establishing WUC costed 3,414,000 UGX

- o Post construction support to (WUCs) software steps costed 1,971,159 UGX

- o Follow upon O&M, behavior change and issues costed 840,000 UGX.

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.

From the District Q4 software report dated 24th February 2020, there was evidence that the DWO and CDO trained the WSCs on their roles in O&M of WSS facilities.

From the field inspections, Tikola Joseph the chairman on the WUC in Nakasowan village in Kakamar sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&M and as a committee, they collect 1,000 UGX from each household per month as contribution to O&M but so far have not collected any money.

Lomuria Peter a member on the WUC in Sakatan village Lodiko sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&M and as a committee, they collect 1,000 UGX from each household as contribution to O&M.

Iko Lucia a member on the WUC in Lois village Kathile South sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&M and as a committee, they contribute in 1,000 UGX from each household as contribution to O&M.

### Investment Management

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:

Score 4 or else 0

There was no up to date assets register.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for all WSS projects in FY2019/20 were derived from the LG Development Plan and are eligible for expenditure under the sector guidelines.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>		
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>From the community application files, there was evidence that the beneficiary communities applied for WSS investments for the current FY 2020/21 signed by the community members as e.g.:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kalapata Sub county Kalere village applied for a borehole on 20th November 2020 signed by the LC1 Lokure Inyasio.</li> <li>2. Lotim sub county Nakwanya village applied for a borehole on 10th July 2020 signed by the LC1 Samali Lokol.</li> <li>3. Kaabong East sub county Marulem village applied for a borehole on 7th July 2020 signed by the LC1 Chegem John Bosco.</li> </ol>	
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports for WSS projects in FY2019/20 to determine whether they were technically feasible, environmentally, and socially acceptable and the designs were been customized in case of any technical issues</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The screening for all water projects was done and the ESMPs prepared and costed .However the ESMPs were not incorporated in the BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Screening for construction of 3 stance pit latrine at Lotim p/s was done on 28/04/2020.The ESMP was prepared on 29/04/2020 and costed at UGX: 500,000</p> <p>Screening for construction of 2 stance latrine at Kom girls was done on 29/04/2020.The ESMP was prepared on 29/04/2020 and costed at UGX: 500,000</p> <p>Screening for construction of boreholes at Sakatan and Nakosowen was done on 29/04/2020.The ESMP was prepared on 29/04/2020 and costed at UGX: 500,000</p>	0
<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG approved Procurement Plan for 2020/2021 prepared by the PDU on 15/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 21/10/2020 had the following water infrastructure investments;</p> <p>I) Survey &amp; Drilling of 4 boreholes at selected Sub Counties &amp; 1 Well at Loleila budgeted at UGX 126,000,000 under DWSCG.</p> <p>II) Design of Piped Water System at Loleila RGC budgeted at UGX 50,000,000 under DWSCG.</p>	2
12	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>Three projects were executed under water for the previous FY. These were approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of Six Boreholes at Kakamar, Lotim, Kamion, Kathile South, Loyoro &amp; Lodiko Sub Counties. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00005 approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 on 11/02/2020 before contract signature on 04/03/2020.</li> <li>2. Construction of 3 Stances VIP Latrine at Lotim Sub County.Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00011 approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 on 11/02/2020 before contract signature on 04/03/2020.</li> <li>3. Construction of 2 Stances VIP Latrine at Morulem Health Centre II.Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00012 approved under Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 on 11/02/2020 before contract signature on 04/03/2020.</li> </ol>	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 of establishment of the PIT.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>The technical drawing of the borehole signed and stamped by the DWO on 9th January 2020 were standard with the scale of 1: 1.</p> <p>From the field inspections of the three boreholes in Kathile South, Kakamar and Lodiko sub Counties, it was evidenced that the boreholes were constructed as per the technical designs including the drain, the apron, the spout and the handpump were all seen.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS projects.</p> <p>All that was availed were monthly monitoring reports stating status of the two projects executed under water. These reports were prepared by the DWO and addressed to the CAO on 30/05/2020, 05/06/2020 and finally an inspection report for payment dated 08/07/2020. Only the DWO participated in preparing these reports, <b>there was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO participated in supervising the projects.</b></p>	0

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

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

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

A sample of request for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the DWO made timely payments to Contractors in FY2019/20.

Request for payment of Ugx 58,650,000 was made by M/s Terracon Technical Works (UG) Ltd on the 10 June 2020 for feasibility services and detailed engineering design of piped water supply system at Kamion RGC. The DWO forwarded payment request 9 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 19 June 2020). The DWO signed payment certificate no 1, 9 days after the request for payment was made Contractor (i.e. 19 June 2020)

Request for payment of Ugx 64,280,250 was made by M/s Icon Projects Limited on the 5 June 2020 for siting and drilling of 3 boreholes. The DWO forwarded payment request 17 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 22 June 2020). The DWO signed payment certificate no 1, 17 days after the request for payment was made Contractor (i.e. 22 June 2020)

Request for payment of Ugx 14,674,150 was made by M/s Jolly and Joe Medium Enterprise on the 15 June 2020 for construction of 2 stance of latrine at Morulem HC11. The DWO forwarded payment request 28 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 13 July 2020). The DWO signed payment certificate no 1, 28 days after the request for payment was made Contractor (i.e. 13 July 2020)

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

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

Procurement files for the projects executed in the previous FY were available in the PDU as per PPDA guidelines as follows;

1. Drilling of Six Boreholes at Kakamar, Lotim, Kamion, Kathile South, Loyoro & Lodiko Sub Counties. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00005 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 30/01/2020, a works contract dated 04/03/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 dated on 11/02/2020.

2. Construction of 3 Stances VIP Latrine at Lotim Sub County. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00011 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 28/01/2020, a works contract dated 04/03/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 dated on 11/02/2020.

3. Construction of 2 Stances VIP Latrine at Morulem Health Centre II. Ref.Kaab559/WRKS/19-20/00012 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 28/01/2020, a works contract dated 04/03/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.04/FEB/DCC/2019-2020 dated on 11/02/2020.

## 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

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

*Maximum 3 points this performance measure*

There was no 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:

14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Of the sampled three water sources of Kathile south(Lois borehole) ,Kakamar(Nakasowan borehole) and Lokido (Sakatan)subcounties, none had evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	There was no written evidence to show that WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent .  i.e. there was no evidence of land consent forms provided for the three projects implemented in FY 2019/20.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	Review of payments for investment projects under the water sector in FY2019/20 showed that the Environmental Officer and CDO did not complete and sign E&S Certification forms before payments were made to Contractors.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	There was no evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports:	0

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>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</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>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
2	<p>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 – 69%; score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%; score 0</li> </ul> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>N/A. Assessment of LLG has not yet commenced.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
Maximum score 6				
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	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	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 • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
Maximum score 6				
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 • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	The LG structure has a provision of 47 LLGs, but there was a total of 9 Extension workers shared among the 14 sub counties making a percentage of 19% staffing.  1. Egaru Daniel – A Veterinary officer recruited under Min. No. 102/2015(2) of 6/11/2015  2. Akao Sarah – An Assistant Agricultural Officer recruited under Min. No. 10/2017(b)(7) of 1/4/2017  3. Kamaka Irene – An Assistant Agricultural officer recruited under	0
Maximum score 6				

Min. No. 10/2017(b)1  
of 1/4/2017

4. Awino Moreen – An  
Agricultural officer  
recruited under Min.  
No. 10/2017(a)4 of  
1/4/2017

5. Awili Evaline Akello  
– A Veterinary officer  
recruited under Min.  
No. 102/2015(1) pf  
6/11/2015

6. Akot Hillary Ben –  
An Assistant  
Agricultural Officer  
recruited under Min.  
No. 10/2017(b)4 of  
1/4/2017

7. Akitui Miriam – An  
Assistant Agricultural  
officer recruited under  
Min. No. 10/2017(b)6  
of 1/4/2017

8. Mugume Ronald –  
An Assistant  
Veterinary officer  
recruited under Min.  
No. 10/2017(c) 1 of  
1/4/2017

9. Lokong John Robert  
– An Agriculture  
Officer recruited under  
Min. No. 104/2015(2)  
of 6/11/2015

4  
Achievement of  
standards: The LG has  
met staffing and micro-  
scale irrigation  
standards  
  
Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment  
meets standards as defined by MAAIF  
  
• If 100% score 2 or else score 0

Not applicable  
because the LG does  
not have Micro scale  
irrigation projects at  
the moment

0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable because the LG does not have microscale irrigation projects at the moment.	0
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	According to the staffing list obtained from the HRM division, there was evidence that positions of extension workers filled is accurate in the sub counties visited.	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the LG does not implement Micro scale irrigation	0
---	---	--	---	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that extension workers were working where they are deployed for instance at Kakamar SC, Akitui Mirriam an Assistant Agriculture Officer was confirmed to be working there	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	All LLGs had displayed staff lists on the noticeboards including the extension workers	2
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	No appraisal were conducted in the previous FY for Extension workers	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence of any corrective action taken from the appraisal reports	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	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	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because microscale irrigation is not implemented in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because microscale irrigation is not implemented in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because microscale irrigation is not implemented in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because microscale irrigation is not implemented in the LG</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There were no planned micro-scale projects in Kaabong DLG for the current FY.	0

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>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>Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment</p>	0

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment	0
----	--	--	--	---

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable. Kaabong DLG had no micro scale irrigation at the time of this assessment	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post Senior Agriculture Engineer is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.</p>	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>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>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable. There is no micro scale irrigation in Kaabong DLG.</p>	0
2	<p>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>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable. There is no micro scale irrigation in Kaabong DLG.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The post of Civil Engineer is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from the MWE	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Assistant Water officer for mobilization is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from MWE	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Borehole Maintenance Technician is substantively filled by Abil Hillary Kamol who was recruited under Min 43/KBGDSC/2011 dated 1/5/2011	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	The position of Natural Resources Officer is vacant and the LG has no evidence to show that they requested for secondment from MWE	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Environment Officer is substantively filled by Lomongin Emmanuel under Min. No 64/05/DSC/2015(1) of 1/6/2015	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Forestry officer is vacant and the LG has no evidence to show that they requested for secondment of staff from MWE	0

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that Kaabong DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment;  Screening for Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at Lotim p/s was done on 28/04/2020  Screening for Construction of a borehole at Nakosowan was done on 29/04/2020  Screening for construction of borehole at Sakatan was done on 29/04/2020	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 water projects didnot qualify undergoing an Environment and Social Impact assessment as per the recommendations of the Environment and Social Management plan	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Drilling permit was issued to Icon projects ltd, DP06983/DW/2019,Signed on 23rd July 2019 by Director of Water Development.	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of DHO is substantively filled by Nalibe Sharif who was appointed under Minute 7/KBGDSC/2020 of 20th April 2020	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The post of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing is not substantively filled and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG. Duties were assigned to Alwoch Patience Ojok on 23/6/2017	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector is vacant and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG. The duties were assigned to Ekoom Robert on 6/8/2019	0

1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Senior Health Educator is substantively filled By Anyakun Sandro Lotyang who was appointed under Min 32/KBGDSC/2019(B)(II)(1) of 5/6/2019	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The position of Biostatistician is substantively filled by Simon Ekwee who was appointed under Min No. 10/2007 on 1/11/2007	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Cold Chain Technician is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

1 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

Kaabong did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Health projects.

**0**

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

Maximum score is 30

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

Screening and preparation of ESMPs for Health infrastructure was not done to ascertain whether they qualified for conducting an Environment and Social Impact Assessment.

**0**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of DEO is not substantively filled but duties were assigned to Sangar Santima on 26/6/2019. There was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from the CG</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Inspector of School is substantively filled by Sangar Santina who was appointed on 1/6/2015 under Min. No. 73/05/DSC/2015(1) , however, the Inspector of schools duties are assigned to Sire Celestin who was assigned duties on 31/12/2019</p>	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>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)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</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 was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment for all Education projects ;</p> <p>Screening for 5 stance VIP latrine at Sidok p/s was conducted on 28/04/2020</p> <p>Construction of a dormitory at Nursing school at Kaabong town council was signed on 28/04/2020</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block Sidoko subcounty was done on 28/04/2020</p>	15

2

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

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

While screening for Environment and Social safeguards was done for Education projects,the ESMPs were not prepared to ascertain need for an Environment and Social Impact Assessment.

0

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 district does not have a substantive CFO. The Acting CFO Akol Filister Confort was assigned duties on 1/4/2017 under Min 12/2017(c) j. There was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 post of District Planner is not substantively appointed but duties were assigned to Simon Ekwee on 1/7/2018. No evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer is not substantively filled but duties were assigned to Akolrio Ibrahim on 1/7/2018 and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of DNRO is not substantively filled and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 post of District Production officer is substantively filled by Eladuu Fredrick who was appointed under Min. No 11/KGDSC/2008 DATED 28/2/2008	3

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	The post of District Community Development Officer is substantively filled by Ojok Jimmy Ayen (Min No. 7/KBGDSC/2020 dated 20/4/2020)	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer,  score 3 or else 0	The post of District Commercial Officer is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG. Duties were assigned to Lemu Thomas on 6/8/2019	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	The post of senior Procurement officer is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	The post of procurement officer is substantively filled by Onyango Gerald who was appointed under Min. 19/KBGDSC/2020(2) of 2/6/2020	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The post of PHRO is vacant and there is no evidence that the district requested for secondment of staff from CG	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The post of SEO is vacant and there is no evidence that the district requested for secondment of staff from CG	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of SMLO is vacant and there is no evidence that the district requested for secondment of staff from CG	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The post Senior Accountant is substantively filled by Akol Fillister Comfort who was appointed under Min. 45/2016(ii) of 1/6/2016	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The post of PIA is vacant and there is no evidence that LG requested for secondment of staff from CG	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 PHRO for DSC is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG	0

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,  
score 5 or else 0

Kaabong DLG has a total of 14 functional sub counties including a town council with only 8 substantively recruited SASs while the rest are assigned duties. The following SASs are substantively appointed.

1. Ngeracha Judith recruited under Min. No.8/KGDSC/2008 dated 28/2/2008

2. Lolem Francis recruited under Min. No.8/KGDSC/2008 of 28/2/2008

3. Abutra Catherine Lokiru appointed under Min. No.19/KDGDSCS/2020(1.1.) of 22/6/2020

4. Lopeyok Emmanuel appointed under Min No 26/KBGDSC/2019(2) of 20/3/2019

5. Nakwang Evaline appointed under Min No.64/DSCCKBG/2018(10) of 16/4/2018

6. Nachomin Nancy appointed under Min. No. 19/KBGDSC/2020(2) of 22/6/2020

7. Achalei Kizito Sisto appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2017 (09) dated 16/4/2018

8. Lopeyo Richatf Ilukal appointed under Min. No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018 (06) dated 16/4/2018

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS

score 5 or else 0.

In the 12 sub counties including a Town council, there are only 9 substantively appointed CDOs as follows;

1. Kubal Mathew who was appointed under Min. No. 64/DSC/KBG/2018(35) of 16/4/2018
2. Okuli Marting who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2018(40) of 16/4/2018)
3. Ayoo Agnes Odwar who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2018(41) of 16/4/2018)
4. Aree Francis Almedia who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2018(36) of 16/4/2018
5. Lokong John Bosco who was appointed under Min. No 36/2005 of 14/9/2005)
6. Lotyana Simon Peter who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2018(42) of 16/4/2018
7. Lomer Daniel Longoli who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/KBG/2018(39)
8. Okul Martin who was appointed under Min. No 64/DSC/2018(40) of 16/4/2018
9. Koriang Esther who was appointed under Min. 64/DSC/KBG/2018 (07) dated 16/4/2018

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0.

The District has a total of 14 substantively appointed SAAs and AAs for each LLGs as follows;

1. Adong Rebecca Nangiro who was appointed under Min. No 24/KBGDSC/2019(a)(II)(2) of 5/4/2019
2. Nakiru Sarah Stella appointed under Min. No 32/KBGDSC/2019(B)(III)(1) of 5/4/2019

3. Elungat James Leonard appointed under Min. No 25/KDGDSC/2019(A)(7) of 1/4/2019
  4. Orebo Caesar Okuda appointed under Min. No 25/KBGDSC/2019(a)(8) of 1/4/2019
  5. Adupa Joel appointed under Min. No 42/KBGDSC/2019(3) of 2/5/2019
  6. Lobu Francis appointed under Min. No 16/04/DSC/2015(2) of 5/5/2015
  7. Odong James appointed under Min. No 42/KGBDSC/2019(1) of 2/5/2019)
  8. Lomonyang Simon Adingili appointed under Min. No 24/KBGDSC/2019 (a)(II)(5) OF 5/4/2019
  9. Opio Peter Emmanuel appointed under Min. No 42/KBGDCS/2019(2) of 2/5/2019
  10. Achuda Collins Bolingo appointed under Min. No. 12/KBDSC/2011 of 21/3/2011)
  11. Lomeo John Bruno appointed under Min. No 25/KBGDSC/2019(a)11 of 1/4/2019
  12. Achura Jacinta appointed under Min. No 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(1) of 1/4/2019
  13. Losuk Joshua Lochokio appointed under Min. No 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(4) of 1/4/2019
- Losike John appointed under Min. No 25/KBGDSC/2019(A)(14) of 1/4/2019

## Environment and Social Requirements

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

The DLG only warranted 99% of the budget allocated to the department of Natural Resources.

Working

Release/Warrants\*100=

40,909,438/41,432,000\*100=  
98.74%

Source:

Page 12 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20 received by the OAG (Moroto Regional Branch) on the 31 August 2020)

Natural resources Budget Ugx  
41,432,000

Warrants Ugx  
40,909,438

0

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

The DLG only warranted 8% of the budget allocated to the Community Based Services department.

Working

Release/Warrants\*100=

164,743,178/2,085,066,000\*100=  
7.9%

Source:

Page 12 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20

Community Based Services  
Budget Ugx 2,085,066,000

Warrants  
Ugx 164,743,178

0

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, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The district did not carry out screening for all projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY.</p> <p>Screening was only done for water and Education projects as shown below;</p> <p>Screening for construction of a dormitory at Nursing school at Kaabong town council was done on 28/04/2020</p> <p>Construction of a four unit staff house at Loyoro was signed on 28/04/2020</p> <p>Construction of borehole at Nakosowan was done on 29/04/2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All projects under Health were not screened ; additionally the CDO didnot counter sign on the screening forms</li> </ul>	0
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), score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Without Screening and preparing ESMPs for all projects ,verifying for qualification of an ESIA for the projects was not possible.</p>	0
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kaabong Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)</p>	0

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Audit of financial statements for FY 2019/20 by OAG is still ongoing. Results of the audit will be assessed in January 2021.</p>	0
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Review of responses of the DLG to PS/ST at the District Headquarters showed that the DLG submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General recommendations after the 29 February 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DLG made submissions to the PS/ST on the status of Implementation of issues arising from Internal Audit and Auditor General Reports for year ended 30 June 2019 on the 22 April 2020. (i.e. Received by Registry MoFPED on the 22 April 2020).</li> </ul>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Annual Performance Contract for the DLG for FY 2020/21 was generated in PBS on the 30 June 2020 12:42 1 (Source: budget.go.ug). List of LG submissions provided by MoFPED also showed that the DLG submitted this document on the 30 June 2020, before the 31 August 2020.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>Review of list of LG submissions provided by MoFPED showed that DLG submitted Annual Performance Report FY 2019/20 to MoFPED on the 22 September 2020, after the 31 August 2020.</p>	0

Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

The DLG submitted all the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for FY2019/20 after the 31 August 2020. i.e.

Report submission dated shared by MoFPED and confirmed by reports at the DLG HQs

Q1 BPR FY 2019/20 submitted to MoFPED on the 7 January 2020

Q2 BPR FY 2019/20 submitted to MoFPED on the 31 January 2020

Q3 BPR FY 2019/20 submitted to MoFPED on the 29 April 2020

Q4 BPR FY 2019/20 submitted to MoFPED on the 22 September 2020