



LGMSD 2021/22

Bukwo District

(Vote Code: 567)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 75% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 70% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 80% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 75% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 41% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 54% |
| Health Performance Measures | 24% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 49% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 6% |

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|--|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 | <p>Projects implemented using DDEG funding were in place , functional and utilized as per the purpose for instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of Council hall and DEC offices finishing phase as indicated on page 72 of APR Renovation of schools in the District as per APR Extension of GFS tap stands, the extensions were completed as per APR <p>Afield visit at District Council Hall by the team proved that the construction was complete but it lacked water supply.</p> | 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"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 | <p>Awaiting results of LLGs Assessment</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"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 | <p>All DDEG projects implemented in FY 2021/2022 were completed by 100% as evidenced from the APR Page 39 and 47 in line with AWP.</p> <p>The projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of Council Hall and DEC offices finishing phase was completed and in use as per APR, Protection of water springs, Supply of tree seedlings, renovation of schools in the District, Supply of cross topper ship and the Extension of GFS tap stands All projects were reported to have been completed at 100% in the APR of 2021/2022. | 3 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0. | The LG budgeted for shs 853,700,562 and spent Ugx 213,000,000 under DDEG as per implementation guidelines as follows: Shs. 326,417,001 was released and spent at LLGs level and Ug. Shs. 527283561 at the HLG level Some of the implemented DDEG project at the HLG was for the Completion of council Hall and DEC offices finishing phase at the cost of 65m Also some of the expenditures for LLGs included the renovation of schools in the various LLGs i.e. rehabilitation of Kapngokur Primary School at the cost of Ugx 80,337,000 among others | 2 |
| 3 | Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0 | The variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows; Completion of council hall and DEC offices finishing phase budgeted at UGX 70,000,000, actual contract price was UGX 39,747,400, Variation = 39.747,400 - 70,000,000=-30,252,600,% variation = -43% | 0 |

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 | The staff list for LLGs was not availed to the PAT for verification. | 0 |
| 4 | Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0 | Projects supervision reports for all DDEG projects were not availed to the assessment team | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG consolidated and submitted staffing requirement for the financial year 2022/2023 on 20th May 2022 which was beyond the stipulated timeframe of 30th September.</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the district had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as guided by the Ministry of Public Service for the previous financial year. Reports for all months were on file; July 2021, August 2021, September 2021, October 2021, November 2021, December 2021, January 2022, February 2022, March 2022, April 2022, May 2022 and June 2022.</p> | 2 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Evidence showed that not all Heads of Department were appraised by the time of assessment. The following were among those appraised by CAO (Mr. Ogwang Robert Charles).</p> <p>Andrew Bukose the CFO was appraised on 15th July 2022), Kityo B Franklin, a District Production Officer was appraised on 05th July 2022, Kissa Irene Toskin a Principal Human Resource Officer was appraised on 5th July 2021 and Sokuton Fred Twalla (DEO) was appraised on 5th June 2022 by CAO (Ogwang Robert Charles</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had established a reward and sanction committee as provided for in the guidelines: The committee was composed of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Limo Moses the (Chairperson); 2- Yeko Teddy (Secretary); 3- Sokuton Fred Twalla (Member); 4- Kitiyo Franklin (Member) 5- Batya David Alinyo (Member). <p>There was evidence that the LG implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines for instance, they held a meeting on 23rd July 2021 under minute RSC/03/2020 where they discussed hearings of disciplinary cases, for instance, Ms. Cheruto Priscilla (Assistant Town Clerk) was charged with abandonment of duty, gross insubordination of his supervisor.</p> | 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 | There was no evidence availed during assessment | 0 |
| 8 | Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0 | a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1. | It was evident that less than 100% of the staff recruited during FY 2021/22 had accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. For instance Chebet Rachael was appointed on 11th February 2022 as parish chief for Suam Sub county and accessed payroll in May 2022; Cherotine Winnie was appointed on 11th February 2022 as Parish Chief for Bukwo Sub county and accessed payroll in May ,2022. | 0 |
| 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. | Evidence showed that less than 100% of staff that retired during the FY 2021/22 accessed the pension payroll later than two months after retirement. For instance, Mr. Kwemoy Francis (Education Assistant) retired on 26th January 2022 and accessed payroll in May 2022 likewise Mr. Tiyoy Martin Cherop Headteacher retired on 2nd February 2022 and accessed payroll in May 2022. | 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 LG transferred DDEG to the LLGs for FY 2021/2022 in accordance with the budget as follows: for instance. 1st qtr transferred was done on 27th August, 2021 of Ug. shs.108,805,667 2nd Qrt was effected on 25th November, 2021 of Ug. shs.108,805,667 and the 3rd Qrt transfer was affected on 20th January, 2022 of Ug. shs. 108,805,667 The total DDEG transfer to LLGs was Ug. shs 326,417,001 | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 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 approved warranting report printed off IFMS did not capture the date of release by the MoFPED. The LG was therefore not able to determine the timeliness verification of DDEG transfers. | 0 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure | Score: 2 or else score 0 | | |
| 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: | The LG communicated and invoiced all DDEG to the LLGs for FY 2021/2022 as follows | 0 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure | Score 2 or else score 0 | 1st qtr transferred was communicated on 27th August, 2021 of shs.108,805,667 | |
| | | | 2nd Qrt was communicated on 25th November, 2021 of shs.108,805,667 and the | |
| | | | 3rd Qrt transfer was communicated on 20th January, 2022 of shs. 108,805,667 | |
| | | | Communication evidence was not on file at the time of assessment. However, PAT could not ascertain the dates of actual release from the IFMS system | |
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines: | The LG supervised/mentored all the LLGS as per the reports compiled by DCAO and submitted to CAO as follows: | 2 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | Score 2 or else score 0 | 1st Qrt supervision report on 6th Sept., 2021, | |
| | | | 2nd Qrt on 11th Nov., 22021, | |
| | | | 3rd Qrt on 3rd April, 2022 and | |
| | | | 4th Qrt on 6th June, 2022. Some of the issues handled included: | |
| | | | 1. Sensitized LLGs on widening the tax base | |
| | | | 2. Collection of local service tax | |
| | | | 3. Immunization of cattle and dogs | |
| | | | 4. Absenteeism and late reporting by parish chiefs | |
| | | | 5. Preparation of weekly and monthly returns. | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up: Score 2 or else score 0 | Supervision and monitoring were undertaken and reports were compiled by DCAO. The reports were presented the TPC for discussion. For example in their meeting held on 23rd March 2022 under Min. 6-/03/2022 TPC observed that: 1. The LLG monitoring and supervision reports were not impressive, 2. The Sub-counties were doing very badly as some chiefs were usually absent from duty, 3. Local revenue collections was still a problem. To address the problems TPC proposed that a lasting solution should be found to support LLGs to perform. | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0 | The District had up-dated manual asset registers for Transport Equipment, ICT, Land, Building, Production and Furniture. The last entries in the registers were made in the months of June and August, 2022. Each category had specific details recorded. For example the motorcycle register had: Date of acquisition, registration number, engine number, chassis number, year of manufacture, user name, section, location. | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets: Score 1 or else 0 | The LG had a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 which was compiled on 15th Sept, 2022 and submitted to the Accountant General, MoFPED. It was signed by six Board members. The Board observed that the store accommodation was adequate and the items were stored in an efficient manner and there were no excessive or obsolete stocks. For these reason boarding off were not recommended. | 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>A committee of eight members was appointed by CAO on 15th Nov., 2018, including: ACO's Office, CDO, D/Eng., DEO, Production Officer, Natural Resources Officer, Forestry Officer, and DHO. Regarding functionality of the committee, there were only two sets of the committee meetings held on 10th Nov., 2021 and 23rd March, 2022 signed by the Secretary DPPC. However, there was no evidence that copies of the minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as required.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The District did not conduct desk appraisal for all the projects in the budget to establish whether they were derived from DDP and were eligible for expenditure as required.</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 District conducted field appraisal of the projects by the the following officers: Senior Planner, CDO, D/Engineer, and Environmental Officer on 12thOct 2021 and 6th Feb., 2022. Their reports indicated that the project technical feasibility, acceptability and customized designs were okay. For this reason the committee recommended implementation but with strict adherence to the designs.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>For FY 2022/2023, the LG developed project profiles for the 40 projects in the AWP which was compiled by the Senior Planner. They indicated among others the estimated project costs. The following were examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply of agricultural materials at estimated project cost of shs.266,679,000 (on page 42 of the AWO), 2. Supply of 8 motorcycles at shs.64,000,000 (on page 111 of the AWP) 3. Supply of 2 laptops at shs.8,000,000 (on page 13 of the AWP). <p>In their meeting of 22nd Sept, 2022 under Minute 6-4/09/2022 the TPC discussed the project profiles and gave a go ahead for implementation. However, there was no record that the TPC held a sitting in the FY under review to discuss the projects.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not conduct desk appraisal for the implemented projects. Thus no desk appraisal report</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>No DDEG Projects incorporated in the financial year 2022/2023, according to the consolidated procurement plan signed and approved by (E Lorwor Jose Jimmy Walamoe) dated 28th /Oct/2022</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>No DDEG Projects incorporated in the current financial year 2022/2023</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 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 | The LG, did not avail evidence that the LG had properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was evidence to show the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG, with no major or minor cracks, painting and tiling works completed. However, the DE did not provide the technical design and drawings for the sampled Council hall. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0 | No evidence of any supervision reports from the sampled projects was provided by the DE. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0 | From the sampled Project, evidence that payments were initiated within specified times frames as per the contract as below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of Council Hall and DEC offices finishing phase by Kortek General Agencies Limited initiated with an interim certificate on 15th June 2022 • Requisition from the contractor was not provided • DE verified on 15th June 2022 • CAO verified on 15th June 2022 • Date of actual payment-payment voucher was not provided | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0 | Evidence from the sampled projects indicated the LG lacked a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. The construction of a Council Hall at the DLG procurement file did not have an approved evaluation report by the contracts committee. The file under procurement reference number BUKW567/WRKS/20-21/00011 had contracts committee minutes BUKWMINCC5/04/03/2021-2022 approved on 4th/March/2022,a works contract signed on 1st/April/2022 | 0 |
|----|--|---|--|----------|

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence of the appointment letter of the grievance designated person Mr. Siwa Ben Sakajja the principal community development officer appointed by the letter dated 1st July, 2021 signed by the Ag D/CAO and the grievance designated person was the chairperson of the GRC at the LG. The Ag D/CAO further appointed the GRC on 1st July, 2021 whose members were; <input type="checkbox"/> Dr. Sabitti Edward- DHO <input type="checkbox"/> Sokuton Fred Twalla- DEO <input type="checkbox"/> Cheptegei Joel -Ag District Engineer <input type="checkbox"/> Kipruto Jonah Chewere -Senior labour officer <input type="checkbox"/> Sikor Stephen Mella- DNRO <input type="checkbox"/> Kissa Irene Toskin - PHRO | 2 |
| 14 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0 | The LG had a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log which was open on 4th April, 2022 with clear information and reference for onward action at the time of assessment There were public display stands for grievances. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 14 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0 | The LG had public display where grievance redress mechanisms have been posted or so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress at the district administrative main block notice board at the time of assessment | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0 | A review of the DDP, AWP, and the Budget for FY 2022/2023 indicated that environment, social and climate change interventions were integrated. Environmental issues appeared on page 28 of the DDP and page 15 in AWP. Social issues on page 6 of the DDP and page 15 of AWP. While Climate changes issues were on page 16 and 15 of AWP. The three items were allocated a sum of shs.542, 609,000 on the Budget. | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0 | In their meeting organized by PAS, the Senior Planner, and the Principal Planner and attended by LLGs officers on 5th May 2022, DDEG, Grants, Budget and implementation guidelines were disseminated to all as per the distribution list attached to a District payment voucher of the same date seen by the assessment team. | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | (For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0 | The LG did not have a project financed by DDEG other than health, education, water and irrigation in the previous FY 2021/22 by the time of assessment. | 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 were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change at the LG. | 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 | The LG had no proof of ownership, access, and availability of land without any encumbrances at for all the project implemented in the previous FY the time of assessment, such as Construction of a council hall at the district headquarters in Bukwo own council Construction of the administration office block at Chepkwasta sub-county headquarters Construction of 9 shallow water wells at sub-counties such as Riwo town council, Kapterewa, Bukwo. | 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 | There was no evidence that the Environment officer and DCDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of all the projects under health, education and micro-scale irrigation at the LG in the previous FY, the LG only conducted the monitoring of projects under the water sector for instance; Monitoring of the 9 shallow water wells at the LG was carried in the months of May,2022 and June, 2022 with recommendations such as restoration of the dry well dug pit areas and backfilling with earth materials prepared and approved by the Environment officer and DCDO 28th May,2022 and 29th June, 2022 | 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 were no monitoring reports for all the projects under education, health and micro-scale irrigation for the previous FY. There were no signed E&S compliance certificates for all the projects at the LG for the previous FY and payment records the environment officer and the DCDO had signed some of the payment for the water projects at the LG for instance The interim payment of the extension of gravity flow scheme from Sosho - Kapsess by Kortek general Agencies Ltd contract REF NO. BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00002 was made on 23rd June,2022 and the payment invoice was signed on 24th June, 2022 by the environment officer and the DCDO. | 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 LG which was on IFMS made its bank reconciliations as at the closure of FY 202/2022 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bukwo DLG Enterprises Fund Recovery at shs.49,450, 2. Bukwo ACDP a/c at shs.5,800, 3. Bukwo District General Fund at shs.52,119,580. However, for the current FY 2022/2023, the District was not up to date. The District made a request dated 25th Oct., 2022 to the Accountant General for the user rights for the new IFMS vote but MoFPED had not responded as by this assessment date. | 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>The District produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022 and submitted them to the District Chairman by Principal Internal Auditor. Production and submissions were made as follows:</p> <p>1st Qrt report on 22nd Oct., 2021, 2nd Qrt on 28th Jan., 2022,</p> <p>3rd Qrt on 21st April, 2022 and 4th Qrt on 22nd July 2022.</p> | 2 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>It was explained to the assessment team that by the time of this assessment, the process of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2021/2022 had not been completed. For this matter there was no information to be provided to the Council.</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>The submissions of internal audit reports to the District Chairman were accordingly copied to the Accounting Officer and the LG PAC as noted in 17 (a) above. During FY 2021/2022, LG PAC held two meetings to review the internal audit reports on 22nd March, 2022 for 3rd Qrt report and on 26th July to discuss 4th Qrt report. However, there was no evidence of discussion of 1st and 2nd quarter reports.</p> | 0 |

Local Revenues

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 18 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The approved District budget for FY 2021/2022 indicated local revenue budgeted shs.374,939,000 as noted on page 13. The actual collection during the same period was shs.157, 463,974 as noted on page 33 of the Draft Financial Statements. This gives a collection ratio of 41.9% (- 58.1) obtained as follows: $(157,463,974/374,939,00) \times 100$. The explanation was an over estimation for non-tax revenue.</p> | 0 |
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. | <p>Actual collection of OSR for FY 2020/2021 was shs.100,105,288 as noted on page 16 of the audited financial statements. While Collections for FY 2021/2022 was shs,157,463,974 as noted on page 33 of the Draft Financial Statements.</p> <p>There was therefore an increase of shs.57,358,686 a ratio of 57.29% well over the 10% provided in the Assessment Manual for a score. The increase was attributed to a much more rigorous collection procedures like engaging local leaders in revenue mobilization.</p> | 2 |
| 20 | <p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p> | <p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>A report on remission of local revenue indicated the budgeted shs.42,204,000 to be collected by all Sub-counties FY 2021/2022 but of this shs.14,343,000 was collected and there was no evidence of mandatory remittances to LLGs for the FY 2021/2022.</p> | 0 |

Transparency and Accountability

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>A copy of the annual procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 had been pulled down the notice board by the time of this assessment. However the very copy was available on a box file which was produced for assessment purposes. It was endorsed by CAO on 27th July, 2022. The contracts awarded and the amounts were also available and the following are examples: 1. Construction of a staff house at Brim HC III awarded to Kortek General Agencies Ltd at shs.180,248,760, 2. Construction of a staff house at Chepkwasta HC III awarded to Trinity Technical Serviced Ltd at shs.180,000,000, 3. Upgrading and extension Bukwo Gravity low Scheme awarded to Kortek General Agencies Ltd. at shs.221,400,000.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Although the assessment results for FY 2020/2021 had been pulled down the notice board, that every copy was on file No.CR/200/2Sub-county Administration implying that the results had been up. It indicated the results (scores) of the District for example: Crosscutting measures 15, Education 20, Health measures 25, Water and Environment 9. However, the PAT did not find the evidences posted at the notice board as required by the Assessment Manual.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Requisitions for funds for radio programmes were made by PDM Focal Point Person on 18th Oct, 2021 and 13th Dec, 2021 and approved by CAO as evidence by the radio talk show conducted on Sabinu Radio and Radio 9 respectively. The purpose of the talk show was to educate the public on the on-going Parish Development Model in the country. However, there was no evidence in form of a report for the implemented activity.</p> | 0 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The approved charging policy in force that was developed in FY 2018/2019 was available and used in FY 2022/2023. On the side of the collection procedures and procedures for appeal, there was no evidence provided.</p> | 0 |
| 22 | <p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no specific IGG report including list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption was prepared. The quarterly internal audit reports submitted to IGG did not contain administrative actions taken.</p> | 1 |

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 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"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>PLE: Results for School year 2020 (23rd/July 2021)</p> <p>Total No of Candidates :3441</p> <p>Division (1) = 16</p> <p>Division (2) = 529</p> <p>Division (3) = 681</p> <p>Division (4) = 781</p> <p>Division (U) = 1396</p> <p>Absentees = 38</p> <p>Total Pass rate = $(16+529+681) \times 100 = 36.03\%$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3441-38)</p> <p>PLE: Results for School year 2019</p> <p>Total No of Candidates = 2350</p> <p>Division (1) = 30</p> <p>Division (2) = 678</p> <p>Division (3) = 634</p> <p>Division (4) = 533</p> <p>Division (U) = 461</p> <p>Absentees = 14</p> <p>Total pass rate = $(30+678+634) \times 100 = 57.45\%$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2350-14)</p> <p>The LG registered a decline in PLE pass rate $(57.45\% - 36.03\%) = 21.42\%$.</p> | 0 |

1

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

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

The LG UCE Results for 2020 (Results
dated 7th July 2021)

Total No of Candidates = 750

Division (1) = 7

Division (2) = 49

Division (3) = 123

Division (4) = 408

Division (7) = 0

Division (9) =162

Absentee = 1

Total pass rate = $(7+49+123) \times 100 =$
23.9%

(750-1)

UCE Results for 2019

Total No. of candidates = 719

Division (1) = 5

Division (2) = 33

Division (4) 362

Division (7) = 26

Division (9)=187

Absentees = 3

Total pass rate = $(5+33+362) \times 100)$
= 55.87%

(719-3)

The LG registered a decline in
performance i.e.

$(55.87-23.9) = 32.0\%$

0

2

Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

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

LLGs were assessed for the first in FY
2022/2023 hence no base data for
comparison

0

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0 | The LG received the ESDG of Ug shs 1,547,534,243 as evidenced from the annual performance report and of which shs 226,575,400 was utilized as follows:. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply of lightening arrestor's shs. 77,644,600 2. Renovation of 2 classroom block Shs 80,337,000 e.g . Chepkwasta P/S page 70 of APR. 3. Emergency rehabilitation of 2 classroom blocks shs 40,000,000 as per page 76 of APR. 4. Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrines in various P/S Shs. 117,300,000 e.g. Kamunchan P/S page 72 of the APR 5. Monitoring of projects shs. 45,000,000 6. Conducted Environment Impact Assessment shs. 5,000,000 7. Retention on Classroom construction shs. 8,562,000 8. Retention on a seed school shs 20,194,000 | |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | 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>The three(3) sampled projects implemented in the previous year were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply of lightening arrestor's for all P/S in the DEO , CFO and DE certified payment on 6th June 2022 2. Renovation of 2 classroom block at Chepkwasta P/S and the District DEO , CFO and DE certified payment on 8th June 2022 3. Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrines at Kamunchan P/S, the District DEO , CFO and DE certified payment on 7th May 2022 <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO did not certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors.</p> | 0 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0 | From the sampled projects, the variations in the contract price were as below; | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrines at Kamunchan P/S, the contract price was shs. 25,380,000 as per contract signed on 1st April 2022 and the engineer's estimates were of shs 30,072,800. | |
| | | | This represented as follows; 30,072,800 - 25,380,000= 4,692,800 constituting +18.5% | |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY | The LG never had a Seed School Project implemented the previous FY. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines | The LG recruited teachers as per MoES staffing guidelines for instance. The teacher's staff ceiling was at 681 and out of which 502 were recruited representing 74% as evidenced from the current staff list of teachers dated June 2022. | 1 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines, | The LG had a total of 49 Primary Schools and which 12 schools did not meet the basic requirements and minimum standards as set out in the DES guidelines representing 75.5%. | 3 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | The 12 schools that did not meet the required DES standards included: Brimokps, Kabokwo, Kaptomologonps, Yemitekps, Cheboips, Muimet, Kapngokin, Chepkukmi, Chemukore, St. Peters Kapkware, Tartar , St Paul Kapseneton Primary School on areas of adequate classroom blocks. | |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>From the sampled three (3) primary schools, it was evidenced that the LG had accurately reported on teachers deployment for instance,</p> <p>At Bukwo P/S had 11 teachers in place according to the teachers register and the same Number was indicated on staff list example Ms. Nambozo Jane was indicated as H/M and Chebet Justus as a teacher were deployed at this school among others.</p> <p>At Cheboi P/S, The staff list indicated 10 teachers and the same number were verified from the school teachers register. Among the teachers found on both documents included Limo Nicholas and Cherop Gertrude among others.</p> <p>At Swam P/S, the staff list indicated a total of 15 teachers and the same number was verified from the teachers register at the school. Among the staff indicated in both documents included, Chemutai Priscilla and Seluk Emmy were deployed at this school among others.</p> | 2 |
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>The LG had school assets register with accurate data on infrastructure as evidenced from the sampled three (3) primary schools below;</p> <p>At Bukwo P/S had 13 classroom, 18 latrines, 136 desks and 4 teachers houses.</p> <p>At Cheboi P/S, the assets register indicated 4 classrooms, 2 latrines, 72 desks, 4 teachers houses.</p> <p>At Swam P/S, the assets had 14 classroom, 25 acres of land, 5 latrines, 234 desks and 2 staff houses</p> | 2 |

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

From the sampled three (3) primary schools, it was evidenced that the some registered Primary Schools compiled their annual budgets as per guidelines from MoES and had dully submitted them to the DEO and were signed by the Head teachers and SMC Chairpersons as follows:

At Bukwo P/S the annual budget of shs 23,574,000 was prepared and submitted to the DEO on 2nd July 2021. It contained relevant highlights of schools performance, a reconciled cash flow statement, annual budget and expenditure report as well as an asset register as annex 1. it was signed by Ms. Nambozo Jane the H/Teacher and Laigiya Idewa Betty the C/Person SMC.

At Cheboi P/S, the annual budget of shs. 18,381,463 was prepared and submitted to DEO on 10th January 2022. It was endorsed by the H/Teacher Challengat Olive and signed by the C/Person SMC Mr. Soyekwo Ben. It contained relevant highlights of schools performance, a reconciled cash flow statement, annual budget and expenditure report as well as an asset register

However, at Suam P/S, the annual budget of shs. 13,767,469 was prepared and submitted to DEO. The date of submission was not indicated and the budget was not signed by both the H/Teacher and the Chairperson SMC as required by the guidelines

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

From the reviewed inspection report for term 3 dated 28th August 2021 prepared by DIS Mr. Kotti Francis, it was evidenced that school were supported in preparation of their respective SIPs.

From the sampled three (3) P/Schools, only Bukwo P/S failed to avail evidence to the assessment team while the other two schools i.e. Suam and Cheboi P/S prepared SIPs and implemented activities which included; was planting of trees and designing of school compound which were implemented by both school.

That was $\frac{2}{3} \times 100 = 66.7\%$

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | <p>From the MIS report dated 29th October 2022, it was established that 47 out of 49 Primary School hand collected and compiled EMIS returns forms for previous FY. The two school that did not comply included; Chekwir and Tuyobei P/Schools.</p> <p>That means = $47/49 \times 100 = 95.9\%$ complied</p> <p>The non-compliance of the two schools was attributed to failure to open up EMIS Account/ logins.</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that Bukwo district budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>A total of 521 staff was budgeted for under Primary school Education and Ugx 4,552,855,608 as wage bill analysis report for FY 2021/22.</p> | 4 |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines for the current FY 2022/23 for instance, the staff list obtained from the DEO's office dated 20th January 2022 and the three(3) schools sampled;</p> <p>Bukwo P/S had a total of 11 teachers on DEO's teachers list and the same number was verified at school and among the teachers listed included Nambozo Jane the H/Teacher and Godfrey Mutela.</p> <p>At Suam P/S had a total of 15 teachers and the DEO's teachers staff list indicated 15 teachers for instance, Ms Chemutai Priscilla and Mr. Seluk Emmy</p> <p>At Cheboi P/S 10 Teachers were indicated on DEO's staff list and the same number was verified at the school attendance register for teachers for instance Mr. Limo Nicholas and Ms. Cherop Getrude were evidenced on both documents.</p> | 3 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> | <p>From the three (3) sampled and visited P/Schools, the teacher deployment data was disseminated. However, all schools had their deployment list posted on walls within the H/ Teachers office for fear of removal by the community errant's for instance;</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p> | <p>At Bukwo P/S deployment list dated 22/1/2022 indicated 11 teachers with their respective contacts</p> | |
| | | | <p>At Suam the teachers deployment list was also posted on the wall within the H/Teachers office indicating a total of 15 teachers and dated 25th January 2022</p> | |
| | | | <p>At Cheboi P/S the deployment list of 10 Teachers was posted in the Head Teachers office indicating their roles and contacts</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> | <p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> | <p>There was evidence that all primary school head teachers were appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM. For instance, Ms. Yeko Roseline a Head teacher at Amanang P/S was appraised by Sabila Ben a Sub county chief in Bukwo Sub county as indicted in the Headteachers performance agreements 2022</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> | <p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> | <p>Evidence relating to the appraisal of Secondary Schools' Head teachers by DCAO/ Chairperson BoG was not presented for assessment</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence LG Education department staff were appraised during the FY 2021/2022 for instance,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Kamos James Soyekwo a district Sports Officer was appraised for a period of 01/07/2021 to 30th/06/2022 by Sakuton Twala Fred (DEO) as per 30th June 2022. 2. Chemongas Wafula John a Principal Education Officer was appraised by District Education Officer Sokuton Fred Twalla. | 2 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p> | <p>The LG Education department prepared a training plan for the previous FY 2021/22 and was dated 1st July 2021 prepared by the DEO Mr. Sokuton Fred and DIS Mr. Kotti Francis for implementation.</p> <p>The plan included staff capacity gaps at the DLG and at school levels which included; training of SMC on their roles and responsibilities, Training of Senior Women and Senior Men on how to enforce SOP for covid 19, Train H/Teachers on appraisal of their staff, Train the H/Teachers on Environmental management among others. However, the plan did not indicate the source of funds for implementation of these activities</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The DLG did not comply with the PBS reporting guidelines for instance; the last report for school year 2021 report was submitted to vide none referenced letter dated 11th October 2021 and was received at MoES, MoLG and MoFPED on 1st November 2021. The report did not indicate the total enrollment at the time of reporting.</p> | 0 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>A total of Ug. shs 50,357,472 was allocated towards inspection and monitoring functions against the total Departmental budget of for inspection of the same figure mentioned representing 100%</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG submitted warrants for schools capitation grants within 5 days of the last 3 quarters</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. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the DEO communicated or publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 | <p>The department prepared an inspection plan for FY 2021/2022 signed by both the DEO Mr. Sokuton Fred and DIS Mr. Kotti Sawani.</p> <p>A number of meetings were held before conducting inspection for instance; on 9th March 2022, the department held a meeting in preparation for inspection of school for 1st term on SOPs, agreed to distribute Covid 19 SOPs to the Head Teachers among the participants in this meeting were RDC Ms. Soet Esther , CAO Mr. Balaba S, CCT members, staff of Education Departments among others.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 | <p>The school inspection and monitoring report dated 27th April 2022 (term 1) indicated that 47 out of 49 Primary schools were inspected and monitored that term that constituted 96%. The report was prepared by Kusuro Isaac the Ag. District Inspector of Schools.</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Education and Social Service Committee held meetings where they discussed inspection and monitoring reports during the FY 2021/2022 for instance. On 27th July 2022, they discussed the 1st term Inspection and Monitoring report that was presented by the DEO under minute no 22/BDC/05/2022.</p> <p>Issues discussed included that of disciplining actions to be taken on teachers for absenteeism in the following school; Kapkware, St. Peters Primary School among others.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>Only the 3rd term inspection and monitoring report was submitted to DES on 28th August 2021</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the Education and Social Service committee discussed the inspection findings for example, in the meeting held on 27th May 2022 under minute no. 22/BDC/05/2022. The discussed inspection and monitoring findings. However, there was no evidence for discussion of LGPAC reports and performance assessment results</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 11 | <p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0</p> | <p>The education department conducted various activities to mobilize, attract and retain children in schools which included; Radio talk show programs on Radio 9. This was aired on 29th November 2011 and among the topics discussed included that of role of parents in education systems, feeding of children at school, co curriculum activities like music, dance and drama, ball games and athletics. The panelist included, Ms. Mary Yapchsang, RDC, Soyeko Fred the Education officer.</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, score: 2, else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG education department maintained an updated assets register covering school facilities and equipments as per sampled three;</p> <p>In Bukwo P/S, the register included items like 13 classroom , 3 book shelves, 18 latrines, 136 desks and 4 teachers house.</p> <p>At Suam P/S the register included 25 acreage of land, 14 classroom, 5 latrines, 234 desks and 2 staff houses</p> <p>At Cheboi P/S, the register covered 4 classrooms, 2 latrines, 72 desks and 4 units of teachers houses.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, score: 1 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The LG did not conduct desk appraisal for all education sector projects.</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, score 1 else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG did not conduct field appraisal for ascertaining technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and the project customized designs for Education sector projects implemented FY 20212022.</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>Evidence that the LG Education department has budgeted and incorporated sector infrastructure projects in the approved current FY procurement plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of seed school at Kapkoros ss and Riwo ss signed for CAO; E Lorwor Jose Jimmy dated 28th /10/2022 was included in the un paged plan. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>The sampled Contract Committee minutes for approval and clearance by Solicitor General of Kapkoros SSS and Riwo SSS Seed schools were not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 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>The DE did not provide any evidence of the project implementation team for school construction projects</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>No evidence of Seed school infrastructure on ground to verify standard technical designs provided by the MoES for example Kipkoros ss and Riwo ss</p> | 0 |
| 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</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>No evidence of reports from LG Engineer for any school project</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | No evidence of any sector infrastructure project reports and minutes where joint technical supervision was done. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | There was evidence that the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payment made However, one project was not within the specified timeframe as follows: 1. The renovation of 2 classroom block at Chepkwasta P/S by M/s Chemun Holdings Ltd at the cost of shs 31,516,888. The payment request was lodged on 8th June 2022 and actual payment was made on 29th June 2022 as per EFT No 44588386 2. Construction of 5 stane VIP latrine at Kamnchan P/S by M/s Kortek General Agencies Ltd at the contract price of shs 25,380,000. The payment request was lodged on 7th May 2022 and payment effected on 29th June 2022 vide EFT No. 44588478. For this particular project, the payment exceeded one month time frame thus not complying. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | There was no evidence of any departmental submission | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i> | The Seed school projects (Kipkoros ss and Riwo ss) procurement files was not complete as the project was not under the approved projects in the contracts committee minutes for FY 2021/2022 | 0 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG had a log for recording grievance. when the Assessment reviewed the log, it was noted that for the FY under review, there was no grievance recorded under the education sector. The grievance focal point person Mr. Siwa Ben Sakajja informed the assessor that all the implemented project were undertaken on existing school premises and there were no complaints resulting from their implementation at the time of assessment.</p> | 3 |
| 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 that LG disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land for proper siting of schools, 'green' schools and energy and water conservation. However, from the visited schools, a number trees had been planted during the school year 2021 for instance at Suam and Cheboi Primary Schools 500 eucalyptus trees were planted each.</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>There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change at the LG</p> | 2 |
| 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>The LG had no proof of ownership, access, and availability of land without any encumbrances at for all the project implemented in the previous FY the time of assessment, such as</p> <p>Construction of a council hall at the district headquarters in Bukwo</p> <p>Construction of the administration office block at Chepkwasta sub-county headquarters</p> <p>Construction of nine (9) shallow water wells at sub-counties such as Riwo Town Council, Kapterewa, Bukwo</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i> | There was no report on project monitoring and inspection prepared by the CDO and the Environment officer on the implemented projects, | 0 |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i> | E&S certificates for the completed projects were not available to the assessment team at the time of assessment. | 0 |

**Health
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 | <p>The sampled health facilities registered the following deliveries in FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.</p> <p>Kapkoloswo HC III FY 2020/2021 had 518 and FY 2021/2022 had 553. $[(553-518)/518] \times 100 = 6.8\%$</p> <p>Chekwasta HC III FY 2020/2021 had 292 and FY 2021/2022 had 319</p> <p>$[(319-292)/292] \times 100 = 9.24\%$</p> <p>Kortek HC III FY 2020/2021 had 281 and FY 2021/2022 had 236 $[(236-281)/281] \times 100 = -16.01\%$</p> <p>Average score = 0.01%</p> <p>The increase in deliveries was not more than 20% between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022.</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>Eligible activities in the health sector for FY 2021/2022 are highlighted in Annual Budget Performance Report, which formed the base of the utilization of the health development grant. The following projects will suffice for illustration: Construction of twin staff houses at Mutushit HCII, Construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Kapsarir HCII, OPD block at Chesmat HCII, and Construction of maternity ward at Tulel and Araleml HCII.</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>Payment vouchers were not availed to the team for assessment</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>From the sampled projects Construction of Kwirwot and Amanang H/CII to H/C III in Bukwo</p> <p>Construction of for upgrade of Kwirwot and Amanang H/CII to H/CIII. The Estimated cost = 540,000,000/- and Actual cost = 530,705,000/-. Variation = -1.72%</p> <p>The actual construction cost of UGX 744,875,910/- quoted by the assessor was the bid price and whereas the evaluated and corrected cost was UGX 530,705,000/-. Approval of the evaluated cost of the project was made by the Contracts Committee on 17th March 2022 under MINKWEEN CC6/9/03/2021-20Other sampled projects included:</p> <p>Completion of a staff house at Mutushet HCIII. The Estimated cost = 150,000,000/- and Actual cost = 146,790,000. Variation = -2.14%</p> <p>Completion of construction of Chesimat HCII. The Estimated cost = 60,000,000/- and Actual cost = 64,000,000/-. Variation = -2.14%</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | <p>The Health Centre upgrade from II to III of Amanang and Kwirwot where not implemented to ascertain a percentage of coverage</p> <p>Below 80%</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 | <p>The LG health staffing structure was of 410 of which 252 were filled according to the staff list dated July 2022 and that constituted 61.5%</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 | <p>There was no comparison for the health centre upgrade because the project has not been implemented/executed</p> | 0 |
|---|---|--|--|----------|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>According to the LG Health department staff list for the month dated July 2022, and from the sampled three HC III's. It was noted that the information provided on positions filled was accurate for instance;the following was noted:</p> <p>At Kapkoloswo HC III the facility had three staff who were missing at the current FY Health facility staff list at the DHOs office they included Kiprop Allan, Malinga Ismail, and Kiprop Leonard.</p> <p>The rest of staff in Kwirot HC III and Amananga HC III lists were verified for both DHO's current FY Staff list and at the HC staff attendance register and there was consistence between the DHOs list.</p> | 2 |
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>It was verified that Brim, Mutushet and Chekwsita Health Centre III were upgraded from II and this information was found to be accurate and were in the system. However, Amanang and Kwirwot HC IIIs were functioning as HCIIIs.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & 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"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>From the DHO's office and the visited Health facilities of Amanang, Chekwasita and Kwirwot HC IIIs, there was no evidence that the annual workplans and budget for the previous FY 2021/2022 were prepared as no evidence was adduced to PAT at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>Information of HCs preparing and submitting the annual budgets and performance reports for previous FY 2021/2022 was not availed to PAT at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | <p>From the three (3) sampled health facilities i.e. Kortek HC III, Brim HC III and Chepkwasita HC III, It was noted that the health facilities had not submitted their improvement plans for the FY 2022/2023.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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"> • score 2 or else score 0 | <p>There was no quarterly reports availed to PAT at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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>The evidence on submission of RBF invoices were not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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>The LG submitted quarter one RBF report late on 29th October 2021 instead of 28th October 2021</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>Only quarter three (3) budget performance report was availed and dated 30th April 2022.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG did not develop the health sector performance improvement plan for the weakest Health facilities during the FY 2021/2022.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no performance report availed at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required). | a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0 | The LG had budgeted for only 75% of health workers to the tune of shs 2.9Bilion as per Approved budget estimate page 16 for the FY 2022/2023 | 2 |
| | Maximum 9 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required). | 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 | The LG deployed health workers as follows for a sample of 3 facilities. Kortek HC III (13/19)x100=68.4% Chepkwasta HC III (8/19)x100=42.1% Kapkwolso HC III (11/19)x100=57.9% | 0 |
| | Maximum 9 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required). | b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0 | From the three (3) sampled Health facilities of ; Kortek HCIII, Brim HCIII and Chepkwasita HCIII staff deployed were working in health facilities where they were deployed i.e. At Kortek HC III, all the 13 staff deployed according to the staff list at DHOs office, all were in attendance register Brim HC III, all the 11 staff deployed were in attendance register and corresponded with the staff list at DHO's office Chepkwasita HC III indicated 12 staff on DHO's list and all were verified at the Health facility daily staff | 3 |
| | Maximum 9 points on this performance measure | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The list was displayed on the DHOs and on all the notice board and all had the same date of 25th July 2022.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Evidence showed that only five out of ten health facility In -charges were appraised by DHO during FY 2021/2022. For instance, Yeko Ben enrolled nurse appraised on 30/6/2022, Kapmwangari Fred, enrolled nurse appraised on 30/6/2022, Noibei Albert appraised on 30/6/2022, Kiplagat Gilbert enrolled nurse appraised on 30/6/2022 and Kiprop Dan an enrolled nurse appraised on 1/7/2022.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</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>Evidence showed that only three out of the ten sampled personal files for health workers were appraised by their respective in charges for the FY 2021/2022. Among the appraised included; Chebet Scalet an enrolled midwife appraised on 30th June 2022, Chebet Zakayo Patricia enrolled nurse appraised on 30th June 2022 and Chepkwemoi Immaculate on 30th June 2022.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> | <p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence on the corrective actions taken based on the appraisal reports sampled.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Information not availed at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>No documentation or training report availed to PAT at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|----------|

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>Information not availed</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 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>From the Annual Budget Performance Report for previous FY 2021/2022, it was noted that all allocations were tagged to purchases of equipment, procurement of medicines, transportation, monitoring of service delivery and management of health services, among others. In the DDP, this information was indicated on Pg.52 of the DDP.</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>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Information not availed for assessment and verification by PAT.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Information not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>Information was not availed to PAT for verification</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The DHMT quarterly meetings were irregular for instance during the FY 2021/2022 only one meeting was held on 27th January 2022</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Only the first quarter performance review meeting was held on 19TH August 2021.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p> | <p>LG supervised 100% of HC IVs as follows;</p> <p>Qtr 1 report was dated 12th October 2021</p> <p>Qtr 2, report dated 13th January 2022</p> <p>Qtr 3, dated 28th April 2022</p> <p>Qtr 4 dated 11th July 2022</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p> | <p>Information was not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided for discussion of discussion of supervision and monitoring reports by the sector standing committee.</p> | 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 | Sparse Medicine support supervision reports(SPARS) dated 1st September may 2021 2020 and 1st march, and31st may 2021 | 1 |
| | 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 | Information not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment | 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 | It was noted that on 15/06/2022 during the 4th quarter, the DHT conducted a radio talk show to create awareness on disease prevention i.e. HIV, TB, Gender-based violence, etc. including raising the sanitation status of the community and there was evidence that the DHT distributed educational materials to the communities on COVID-19 awareness as well as conducting the activity on disease prevention community dialogue meeting with VHTs. | 1 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0 | Information on health promotion was not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment. | 0 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | | |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>No updated register</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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>Information not availed to PAT at the time of assessment</p> <p>as there was no desk appraisal report</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>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>There was no evidence of field appraisal in form of screening for environment and social acceptability for the all the health project at the LG by the time of assessment</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>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment of screening for health investments for environmental and social risks before being approved for construction</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>No evidence was provided on submission letters the from the health department to PDU during assessment period</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>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>The PP1 form was not provided by the procurement unit during assesement period</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>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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of for upgrade of Kwirwot and Amanang H/CII to H/CIII at a cost of 530,705,000/-. Contract committee meeting held approval made on 17th March 2022, Min: MINKWEEN CC6/9/03/2021-22. • Completion of a staff house at Mutushet HCIII. The at a cost of cost = 146,790,000/-. Contract committee meeting held and approval made on 14th March 2022, Min: MINKWEENCC6/9/03/2021-22, • Completion of construction of Chesimat HCII. at a cost of cost = 64,000,000. Contract committee meeting held and approval made on 17th March 2022, Min: MINKWEENCC5/17/03/2021-22, <p>Amongst the health infrastructure projects, Construction of for upgrade of Kwirwot and Amanang H/CII to H/CIII had a cost above the required threshold of UGX 200 million and therefore, it required clearance by the Solicitor General. No evidence of clearance from the Solicitor General before commencement of construction was provided.</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was no evidence of a project implementation team that was appointed by the district LG during assessment period</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>The planned health infrastructure investments of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade of TulelHCII, Aralam HCII , Kapkoros HCII to HC III • Completion of construction for the upgrade of kwirwot HCII and Amanang HCII to HCIII in Bukwo district <p>Were not implemented hence could not justify following MoH standard technical designs</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>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>From the DE office, supervision reports from the clerk of works to the district engineer were not provided during assessment</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>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>Since the selected projects were not executed, no meetings were held, and projects were rolled to the current FY 2022/2023</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>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>Projects works were not executed project carried to the current FY under UGiFT program fundng</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>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 payment records were not availed to PAT for verification.</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>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>Evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for.</p> <p>Upgrade of kwirwot HCII and Amanang HCII to HCIII was as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation report approved by contracts committee dated 7th January 2022 • Works Contract dated on 4th August 2022 • Contracts committee minutes MINKWEENCC6/9/03/2021-2022 | 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 a centralized grievances log at the LG where grievances are recorded, investigated and responded to in the health sector but at the LG at the time of assessment, there were no reported and recorded grievances from the health sector by the time of assessment</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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 the LG had disseminated guidelines on medical/health care waste.</p> <p>All the sampled health facilities had the medical waste segregation charts. The sampled health facilities were;</p> <p>Chepkwasta HCIII, Brim HCIII and Amanaga HCIII</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>The health facilities had functional health care waste bins and placenta pits.</p> <p>There was a company known as Green Label services Ltd contracted by EGPAF with funding from USAID to manage health care waste at Health Centre IV and HCIII that generate higher volumes of waste and there was evidence of waste collection receipts dated 18th February, 2022, 21st January 2022</p> | 2 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence to confirm that the LG had conducted training, no evidence was availed during the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There were no costed ESMPs for all the health projects for the FY 2021/22 and were not incorporated in contract documents and BoQs</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 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 | There was no documentation on land acquisition status for health projects for the FY 2021/22 at the LG by the time of 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 of monthly monitoring and supervision of all health project conducted by the LG by the Environment Officer and CDO to ascertain compliance with ESMP's. | 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 | There was no evidence available to show that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates | 0 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | | |

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|----------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>Percentage of functional rural water sources = 74%.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Water & 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 & 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"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees = 73%.</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>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"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p> | <p>LLGs verification was not done during teh FY 2021/2022</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The percentage of the budgeted water projects implemented in S/C with safe water coverage below the Bukwo DLG average which was 78% were,

Suam S/C at 64.1% received 1 Construction of a Sedimentation tank, Kortek S/C at 63.8%, received 9 tap stands in various parishes, Riwo S/C at 59.7% 1 shallow BH, Bukwo s/c at 68.6% received 2 BHs, Kaptererwo s/c at 59.9% received 3BHs,

Therefore out of the 19 water Point Projects implemented in the FY 2021/2022 ; 16 were Implemented in S/C below the District average

Average

$$= 16/19 * 100 = 84\%$$

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

According to signed contracts obtained from DWO, AWP for FY2021/22 below was the analysis of the 3No. WSS projects planned and executed.

Construction of 09No shallow wells in various sub counties estimated at ugx 86,400,00 but executed at ugx 86,388,984. Variation of +0.0%

Construction of water sedimentation tank in Suam S/C at Tasakya GFS estimated at but completed at 85,184,750, was contracted at 85,184,750. variation of +0.0%

Extension of water to Kapkokoyo parish in Kortek sub county estimated at ugx46,400,000 but contracted at 47,449,200. Variation of = +2.3%

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 | <p>According to LG 4th Quarter progress report dated 09/08/2022, the project completion rates was 99%. This falls in the range 80-99% completion of the scoring guide;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% completion Construction of shallow wells in 5 sub-counties of Kaptererwo, Bukwo, Riwo, Brim and Lwongon. Moreover, 4 number of wells do not have water because they were poorly sited in areas with lower water tables, 2. 99% completion of Extension of water to Sosho P/S in Kapkokoyo Kortek S/C, 3. 99% Intake Rehabilitation and Sedimentation tank construction for Tasakya GFS. Serious challenges were experienced in during the construction of the sedimentation tank at Tasakya GFs; the delays have been related to challenges in the transportation of materials; Obtaining UWA clearance has been very difficult since the project was in the game reserve. | 1 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. | <p>There was no increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/2021 =74%</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2021/2022 = 74%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. | <p>There was significant increase in the % of rural water and sanitation facilities with functional committees.</p> <p>Rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2020/2021 = 72%, Rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2021/2022 = 73%</p> <p>Percentage change =1%</p> | 1 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p> | <p>List of constructed projects on page 5 of the annual performance report for FY 2021/2022</p> <p>1. Siting, drilling and installation of 9Shallow BHs</p> <p>The projects/facilities sampled included;</p> <p>A Shallow BH in Cheywandet village in Riwo T/C funded by the DWSCG completed on 21st/8/2022</p> <p>A Shallow BH in Mulungwa village in Riwo s/c funded by the DWSCG commissioned on 21/08/2022</p> <p>A Tap Stand Point water source in Siron Village Kortek S/C</p> <p>All the facilities were in place. However, the Shallow wells become seasonal as water stops coming during dry seasons.</p> <p>The Tap Stand source had also been blocked by the road construction works and thus needed repair by the road contractors.</p> | 3 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p> | <p>The DWO presented quarter1 report which was submitted on 14th/10/2021 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on pages 8,9 & 13.</p> <p>Similarly quarter 2 report submitted on 13/01/2022 and the functionality information was displayed on pages 6 and 7.</p> <p>Quarter 3 submitted on 11/04/2022 and Quarter 4 report submitted on 12/07/2022 respectively contained information on pages 7, 8, 9 and 12.</p> | 2 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>There was little evidence that the DWO updated the MIS data for instance, the District watsup group data base was submitted in July 2022 to the ministry on 14/09/2022 and signed by Cheptanui Catherine the Ag. CAO.</p> <p>However, the data on new facilities, population size served and their functionality was not updated on quarterly basis as required</p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p> | <p>LLG assessment still under way</p> | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & 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</p> | <p>The District Water Officer had budgeted for Civil Engineer (Water) Assistant Engineering Officer, and Borehole Maintenance Technician as evidenced in the Wage bill analysis report for FY 2021/2022. An IPF totaling to 36,876,000 was approved by Balaba Swaibu (CAO) on 23/9/2021</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p> | <p>The District Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for District Natural Resources Officer, Senior Environment Officer and Forestry Officer as evidenced in the Wage bill analysis report for FY 2021/2022. An IPF totaling to 103,662,000 was approved by Balaba Swaibu (CAO) ON 23/9/2021</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>No evidence was provided during the time of the assessment</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer had identified capacity needs of staff</p> | 0 |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was safe water coverage of the district was estimated at 64% as of FY2022/23. Reviewed annual work plan and budget for FY 2022/2023 dated 05th July 2022 and approved on 31st August 2022 by MoWE, the safe water coverage of the following sub-counties was below the district average; Chepkwasta 63.9%, Chesower 62.6%, Kabei 61.6%, Kamet 63.8%, Kaptererwo 59.9%, Kortek 63.8% and Riwo 59.7%

Below were the planned and budgeted projects for FY2022/2023;• Chapkwasta sub-county; Water - Connection Services was allocated ugx 190,000,000.

Construction of a water Tank In Senendet Sub-county at Ugx 40,000,000

Therefore, of the total budget of Ugx.230,000,000, water connection service in Chapkwasta Subcounty had been allocated to the sub-counties whose current safe water coverage was below that of the district average. Hence 82.6% of the budget was in the sub-counties whose safe water coverage.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs about their allocations per source in the current FY2022/23 to the various S/Cs in a letter dated 5th July 2022 on the district notice board.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the DWO monitored all WSS facilities at least quarterly during the FY 2021/2022, also the list of all WSS facilities in the LG was not availed to the PAT at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 | | |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p> | <p>There was evidence that only 2 meetings were conducted in Bukwo LG instead of the 4 required by the guidelines.</p> | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>The meeting was conducted for the 3rd quarter on 11th /02/2022 with key issues discussed being;</p> | |
| | | | <p>Water user committees registering with Water board as per item No. 06/6.</p> | |
| | | | <p>Another meeting for the 4th Quarter was held on 30th /06/2022 and the key highlights included; item 02/6 emphasizing community sensitization of critical requirements to the new water users.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p> | <p>The District Water Officer publicized budget allocations for the FY 2022/2023 to LLGs on 05/07/2022 as seen on LG notice board.</p> | 2 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>The allocations were as follows,</p> | |
| | | | <p>Upgrade of Bukwo Gfs in Kapsarur, Chepkwatsta UGX 204M and a Construction of a reservoir Tank 7000L at UGX 29.7M in Senendet</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 | <p>The DWO allocated UGX 32,663,160 equivalent to 59.1% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget to mobilization activities out of the total budget of UGX 55,265,160 towards community mobilization activities according to pg. 4 & 5 of the Approved AWP</p> | 3 |
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p> | <p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles as evidenced from the training report on raining of water& Sanitation committees held on 30/06/2022 signed by CDO</p> | 3 |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG had prepared an up to date asset register that showed on the water facilities within the district</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The water department had not conducted a desk appraisal for any of the projects.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p> | <p>The DWO presented a community application file for the FY 2022/2023 with application forms/letters.</p> <p>Some of the application files found in the file included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request of a water funding in Chepkwatsta S/C to upgrade the chemwamat Gravity flow scheme dated 10/10/2022 • Request for an extension of tap stand pipes to increase tap water access in the S/C in Bukwo S/C dated 15/07/22. | 2 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted a field appraisal for the current FY 2022/2023 projects to checked on the technical feasibility, environmental, social acceptability & designs.</p> | 0 |

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2

There were filled environment, social and climate change screening forms for all the WSS projects to be implemented in the previous FY. However the WSS implemented in the previous FY had no costed ESMPs

Screening for the extension gravity flow tap water from Sosho to Kapsess scheme in Kortek sub county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example re vegetation and compaction of loss soils the screening form was prepared and signed by Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May, 2022

Screening for the construction shallow water well borehole at kapkware in Riwo town council. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 12th May, 2022.

Screening for the construction shallow water well borehole at chebiyiny in Kapterewa sub-county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May, 2022.

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that WSS infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG procurement plan that was approved by E Cheptanui Catherine for CAO on 6th June 2022</p> <p>Projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of ten (10) shallow wells by DWSCG • Protection of Water Springs under DDEG • Extension of GFS tap stands under DDEG • Gravity water flow scheme extension to Sosho Primary School | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p> | <p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY were approved by the contacts committee before commencement as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravity water flow scheme extension to Soshso primary school, MinuteNo. BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00008/S • Extension of GFS, 8 tap stands at Suam s/c, Minute No. BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00005/S • Protection of Springs at Chesower. Minute No, BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00006/S <p>Dated 11th May 2022</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p> | <p>The LG had a project implementation team (PIT) For WSS designated by CAO on 31st May 2022 , however, according to the manual, the team was incomplete without the appointment of the project manager, community development officer, and labor officer ;</p> | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limo George Festo (DWO) as Contracts Manager <p>Salim Peter Bera (Ass. Eng. Water Officer) as Contract Supervisor.</p> | |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>There was evidence that the water and public sanitation infrastructures were constructed as per standard designs provided as evidenced from the three (3) visited points;</p> | 2 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>A shallow BH in Cheywandet village in Riwo T/C funded by the DWSCG completed on 21st/8/2022</p> <p>A shallow BH in Mulungwa village in Riwo s/c funded by the DWSCG commissioned on 21/08/2022</p> <p>A tap stand point water source in Siron Village kortek S/C</p> <p>The boreholes were well protected with the , borehole recharge catchment area, the wells had operating hand pump and properly constructed apron 100mm by 100mm as prescribed by the design.</p> | |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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 at the time of assessment that relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects during the FY 2021/2022.</p> | 0 |
| | <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>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p> | <p>From the sampled projects there was evidence that DWO verified works and payments initiated within timeframe as in the contract indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of GFS to Sosho P/s by M/s. Kortek General Agencies Ltd made a requisition for contract payment of 47,449,200 on 16th June 2022 and a payment certificate issued on 24th June 2022 which was reflected on 5th July 2022 under voucher number 44588478 | 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>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:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>The LG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of GFS at Sosho primary School in Bukwo district, Minutes of Contracts committee ref; BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00008/S;Min No;BukwMinCC5/04/03/2021-22 dated 11th May 2022, Works Contract agreement dated 31st May 2022 and an evaluation report dated 9th May 2022.2 | 2 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>LG grievances redress framework Grievance log a grievance handling register was in place. The register indicated date, name of complainant, village, issue, reference no. remarks columns. Its marked Bukwo DLG Grievance register 2022</p> | 3 |
| 14 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines by the LG to the CDOs at the time of assessment</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>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</p> | <p>There was no evidence of costed ESMPs incorporated into the BoQs for all the water projects implemented in the previous FY 2021/22 for example;</p> <p>Screening for the extension gravity flow tap water from Sosho to Kapsess scheme in Kortek sub-county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example re-vegetation and compaction of loose soils the screening form was prepared and signed by the Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May 2022</p> <p>Screening for the construction of shallow water well borehole at kapkware in Riwo town council. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by the Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 12th May 2022.</p> <p>Screening for the construction of shallow water well borehole at chebiyiny in Kapterewa sub-county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by the Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May 2022.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>The LG had no evidence of all the land documents where the water sources were implemented by the time of assessment.</p> | 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 | There was evidence of signed E&S compliance certification forms by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/ certificates at interim and final stages of projects: The construction of 9 shallow well boreholes by Kortek General Agencies Ltd Contract REF NO. BUKW 567/WRKS/21-22/00002 where the interim payment was made on 24th June, 2022 and the Environmental Officer and CDO signed on the payment certificate on 24th June 2022. The interim payment of the extension of gravity flow scheme from Sosho - Kapsess by Kortek general Agencies Ltd contract REF NO. BUKW567/WRKS/21-22/00002 was made on 23rd June,2022 and the payment invoice was signed on 24th June, 2022 by the environment officer and the DCDO. | 2 |
| 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 | Monitoring of the 9 shallow water wells at the LG was carried in the months of May,2022 and June, 2022 with recommendations such as restoration of the dry well dug pit areas and backfilling with earth materials prepared and approved by the Environment officer and DCDO 28th May,2022 and 29th June, 2022 and the contract was signed on 1st March, 2022. | 2 |

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 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>Bukwo DLG had no data on irrigated land for the previous two FYs that showed MSI grants beneficiaries.</p> <p>However, the LG had only data on irrigated land of 7.7 Acres for non-beneficiaries installed by MOWE in Amanang Sub county (a former Bukwo sub county) as per the reported dated 13/9/2022.</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"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 | <p>The LG had no data on increased acreage of newly irrigated land for the previous FYs because they had just been enrolled on the program.</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 LG will receive UGX 334,135,159 for MSI grant FY 2022/2023 to use on eligible development components of procurement and installation of irrigation equipment and training.</p> <p>The budget performance report dated 24/12/2021 did not contain information on MSI grant funds used because the Districts enrolled the program this FY</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. Thus, equipment were not procured.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 0 |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 - 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 | Information on recruitment of extension workers was not availed to the assessment team. | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 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 | Not availed | 0 |
| 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 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 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 | The District had just been rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023 thus equipments were not procured. | 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 | Not yet done. | 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 | There was no evidence that the quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | No evidence availed to the PAT at the time of assessment | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | No evidence availed to the PAT at the time of the assessment. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | Based on performance contracts signed on 31/7/2022 by CAO and the staff lists reviewed on 1/11/2022, evidence indicated that all the 32 staff for production were budgeted for with an allocation of UGX 998,665, 000 for the FY 2022/23 | 1 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0 | Information not availed during the time of assessment | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> | <p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Based on the three sampled sub counties i.e. Bukwo sub-county, Bukwo TC, and Amanang sub-county, the DLG had the staff lists of extension workers deployed to various LLGs and it was established that all the extension staff are working and deployed as per guidelines. For instance, Masika Elijah Ndinyo (AO) and Kwemoi Collins (AHO) were in Bukwo TC, Opio Peter (AHO) and Mangusho Andrew Chombe (AAO) were in Bukwo Sub-county While Mangusho Andrew Chombe (AAO) and working in Amanang Sub-county.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | | |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> | <p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The DLG deployed the extension workers, and had the deployment sheet but failed to display the staff list on the on District and LLGs noticed board.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p> | <p>It was evident that 3 out of ten Extension Workers were appraised for FY 2021/22 for instance Cherotich Synthia (Assistant agricultural officer) Kapkoros Sub-county was appraised by SAS, Cherotwo Oscar (Assistant Agricultural officer) Riwo Sub-county was appraised by the SAS and Abdul Karim, Animal husbandry Officer was appraised by(SAS) Solimo Robert.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum score 4</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>No evidence of corrective actions taken by the District Production Coordinator at the time of the assessment</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 4</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|----------|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers | b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | No evidence of corrective actions taken by the District Production Coordinator at the time of the assessment | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers | ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0 | The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 10 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 9 | Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. | b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0 | The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 0 |
| | Maximum score 10 | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>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 LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023.</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 score 10</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023.</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 LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023.</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"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p> | <p>The LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023.</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 | The LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023. | 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 | The LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023. | 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 | The LG had just rolled on the program FY 2022/2023. | 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 | The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 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 | The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023. | 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>There were no micro scale irrigation systems incorporated in the Current FY Procurement Plan.</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>The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023</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>No evidence provided at the time of assessment</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>The LG had just rolled on the program in FY 2022/2023</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 micro scale irrigation systems incorporated in the Current FY Procurement Plan</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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG as just being rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the programme FY 2022/2023 | 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 | The LG had just been rolled on the program FY 2022/2023 | 0 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0 | There was no display of mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework at the production department notice board and the LLG notice boards at the time assessment | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | The LG had a log for grievances for recording the grievance at the LG but the LG had not rolled out the project | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | The GRC was in place at the LG but the LG had not rolled out the project | 0 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | There were no responses to the aggrieved parties at the LG since the project had not been rolled out | 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>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The grievances were not there at the LG since the project had not been rolled</p> | 0 |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There were no projects implemented at the LG due to no funding from the government and therefore no MoU between the LG and farmers</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|----------|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation due to no funding from the government, there was no any Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----------|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation due to no funding from the government and there was no project to monitor</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----------|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation due to no funding from the government and there was no project to certify for compliance</p> | 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

The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation due to no funding from the government and there was no project to certify for compliance

0

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|-----------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p> | <p>The position of the Senior Agriculture Engineer was substantively filled by Mr. Kott John Rungeso appointed on 17th August 2021 directed by min No. 107.1/2022</p> | 70 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p> | <p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p> | <p>During the FY 2021/2022, the LG had not yet been enrolled on the MSI programme. Therefore, undertaking E&S climate change screening was not applicable.</p> <p>For the current FY 2022/2023, Planned activities for the Micro Scale Irrigation project include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness creation, 2. Selection and creation of demonstration sites 3. Selection of farmers that will benefit in the coming FY. | 30 |

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|---|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0. | There was evidence that the district had substantively recruited Mr. Limo George Festo as Civil Engineer (Water), as directed by DSC Min No. 100.1/2019 Ref CR:156/1 | 15 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0. | There was evidence that the district had substantively recruited Chebaram Jonex as Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, as directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010; Ref CR/156/1 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | There was evidence that the district had substantively recruited Maigut Mike Makitor as Borehole Maintenance Technician as directed by DSC Min No. 53/2008 on 2nd May 2008. | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0. | The position of Natural Resources Officer was vacant at the time of assessment | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0. | There was evidence that the district had substantively recruited Chemutai Olive as Environmental Officer on 26th July 2006 as directed by DSC Min No. 5/81/006 Ref CR156/2 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0. | There was evidence that the district had substantively recruited Chepsikor Alfred Sabila as Forestry Officer on 26th July 2006 as directed by DSC Min No. 5/81/006 Ref CR156 | 10 |

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

If the LG:

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

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for water projects for the previous FY as per the examples below;

Screening for the extension gravity flow tap water from Sosho to Kapsess scheme in Kortek sub-county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example re-vegetation and compaction of loss soils the screening form was prepared and signed by Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May, 2022

Screening for the construction shallow water well borehole at kapkware in Riwo town council. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 12th May, 2022.

Screening for the construction shallow water well borehole at chebiyiny in Kapterewa sub-county. impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example waste management and backfilling of the dug pits screening form was prepared and signed by Senior Environment officer and the DCDO on 19th May, 2022.

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 in the LG did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because the projects that were under the water sector are under schedule 4, part 2 section(3a&b) of the National environment Act 2019 which were small projects that require screening and had minimal impacts. Mitigation measures of the impacts for water projects were identified in the screening form and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the ESMPs.

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

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

There was no evidence of a drilling permits and abstraction since the projects required contractors to have a drilling and abstraction permit.

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Dr. Sabiti Edward was substantively recruited on 12th March 2021 through Min No. 27.1/2021</p> | 10 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p> | <p>The position of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was not substantively filled.</p> <p>Mr. Kibet Fred a Senior Nursing Officer was the Ag. the officer assigned additional duties by CAO as per the letter dated 22nd June 2021 through letter Ref CR.214/2.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>The position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health was not substantively filled.</p> <p>Mr. Sabilia Fred, a Senior Environmental Officer was assigned additional duties of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health by CAO Mr. Limo Moses Chelimo as per the letter dated 15th January 2021 through letter Ref CR 161/1.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mr. Ngeywo Cosmas was substantively recruited as a Principal Health Inspector on 18th October 2021 directed by Min No. 113.1/2019</p> | 10 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mr. Mangusho Steven was substantively recruited as a Senior Health Educator on 24th March 2016 directed by DSC Min No. 52.12015</p> | 10 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. | Mr. Chemutai Simon Onesmas was substantively recruited as Biostatistician on 9th July 2015 directed by DSC Min No. 10.1/2015 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. | Mr. Soyekwo Julius C was substantively recruited as a District Cold Chain Technician on 1st December 2005 directed by DSC Min No. 89/2005 | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0. | Not applicable at the time of assessment | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0. | Not applicable at the time of assessment | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0 | Not applicable at the time of assessment | 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) | If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health projects for the current FY 2022/2023. The implementation of the proposed projects had not yet been commenced. | 15 |
| | Maximum score is 30 | | | |
| 2 | Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) | b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0. | At the time of assessment, the LG had not yet started implementing the proposed projects for 2022/2023 and as such, this indicator was not applicable as screening defines what instrument (i.e. either Project brief, ESMPs or EIAs) to be undertaken according to the NEA. 2019. | 15 |
| | Maximum score is 30 | | | |

**Education
Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-----------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | Mr. Sokuton Fred Twalla was substantively recruited as District Education Officer as per appointment letter dated 16th November 2009 as directed by DSC Min No, 54/2009; Ref CR/156/11. | 30 |
| | <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | <p>1. Kotii Francis was substantively recruited as District Inspector of schools on 24th March 2016 as directed by DSC Min No, 37.3/2016; Ref CR:ADM/156</p> <p>2.Yapchesang Mary was substantively recruited as Inspector of schools on 24th March 2016 as directed by DSC Min No, 37.4/2016;Ref CR:ADM/156</p> <p>3.Kusuro Isaac was substantively recruited as Senior Inspector of schools on 18th May 2022 as directed by DSC Min No, 75.1/2022;Ref CR:155/2.</p> | 40 |
| | <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | | | |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) | If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | <p>The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and climate change Screening for all Education sector projects for the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Such projects include;</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at kamunchan P/S, construction of 2 classroom block at Kapngokin P/S, renovation of 3 classrooms at Bukwo p/s</p> <p>The environment officer and the DCDO said the education sector projects were not screened because of lack of facilitation from the sector head to carry out the activity</p> | 0 |
| | <i>The Maximum score is 30</i> | | | |

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

The Maximum score is 30

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

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, because the projects that were under the education sector were under schedule 4, part 2 section(4d) of the National environment Act 2019 which were small projects that require screening and have minimal impacts. Mitigation measures of the impacts for education projects could be identified during the screening process and the Implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the ESMPs, However the LG did not carry out the required environment, social and climate change screening for the education projects in the previous FY

**Crosscutting
Minimum
Conditions**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Bukose Andrew appointed on 3rd March, 2008 as was directed by DSC Minute No.29/2008 through letter Ref.CR:156/1. | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0 | The position of the District Planner was vacant. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0 | The post of District Engineer was vacant at the time of assessment. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of Natural Resources Officer was vacant at the time of assessment | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The post of District Production Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kitiyo B. Franklin appointed on 23rd May 2019 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 49.1/2019 through letter Ref.CR/160/1 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0 | The position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Cherotwo Francis appointed on 30thMay, 2019 as was directed by DSC Minute No.72.1/2019 through letter Ref.CR/160/1 | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of DCO was substantively filled by Mr. Toskin Tom as per DSC min 55/2022 and letter of appointment signed by CAO Ogwang Robert Charles dated 16/03/2022. | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0. | The position was substantively filled by Araptai Joseph as per DSC min 52.3/2015 and appointment letter dated 24/03/2016 and signed by Ag CAO Sokuton Fred Twalla. | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Cherop Emily Sakajja appointed on 14th July 2016 as was directed by DSC Minute No.71.2/2016 through letter Ref CR:ADM/156. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The post of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled by Kissa Irene Toskin appointed on 24th March, 2016 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 56.1/2016through letter Ref.CR:ADM/156 | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Sikor Stephen Mella appointed on 26th July, 2006 as was directed by DSC Minute No.5/81/006 through letter Ref.CR/156/ | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0 | The post of Senior Land Management Officer was vacant at the time of assessment. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0 | The post of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Cherukut Sophie appointed on 12th March, 2021 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 39.1/2021 through letter Ref.CR/156/1 | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Mr. Batya David Alinyo appointed on 22nd December, 2005 as was directed by DSC Minute No.71/2005. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Mudima Richard appointed on 27th November 2018 as was directed by DSC Minute No.86.1/2018 through letter Ref.CR/160/1</p> | 2 |
| 2 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p> | <p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p> | <p>There was evidence that all the positions of SAS/TC in the LLGs were substantively filled as follows: (1) Sabila Ben SAS appointed on 4th /07/2018 (Ref DSC Min No.60.1/2018; (2) Cheptanui Catherine appointed as SAS on 20th /09/2010 (Ref CR/154/1 and DSC Min No. 94/2010; (3) Kiprotwo Hanington SAS appointed on 12th /07/2018 (Ref Min No. 68.1/2018 (4) Sikoria Alfred Sub County Chief appointed 10th /08/2015 (DSC Min No. 32.1/2015 (J)); (5) Sokuton Davis SAS appointed on 20th /9/2010 (DSC Min No. 94/2010 and CR/154/1 (1));(6) Kapkwomu Paul Sub-county chief appointed on 8th/11/2010 (Ref Min No. 123/2010); (7), Salimbani Albert Sub-county chief appointed on 19th /12/2007 (DSC Min No.53/2007 and Ref Admin./156/1;(8) Chepsikor Patrick SAS appointed on 29th /09/2010 (DSC Min No.93/2010 and Ref CR/154/1; (9) Satya Saul Stanley a Sub-county chief appointed on 19th /12/2007 (DSC Min No. 54/2007 and Ref Admin./156/1;(10) Chelimo Enock Joram, appointed as Sub County Chief on 11th /11/2010 (DSC Min No.123/2010; (11) Turihohabwe Julius appointed on 10th /08/2015 as a sub county chief under (DSC Min No. 32.2/2015(J) and Ref ADM/156; (12) and Kiplimo Stephen Mwangari a Principal Township Officer appointed on 10th /08/2015 (Ref Min No. 32.1/2015.</p> | 5 |

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG
Maximum score is 15

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

All positions of Community Development Officers and senior Community Development Officer in Bukwo SC/Town Council were substantively filled during the time of assessment for instance; (1).Cheptoek Immaculate was appointed as CDO on 20th September 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010 Ref CR/156/1; (2).Kiplagat Morris was appointed as Senior CDO on 27th March 2020 as was directed by DSC Min No. 25.2/2020; Ref CR/1/60/1; (3).Kipyeko Moses was appointed as CDO on 16th November 2009 as was directed by DSC Min No. 55/2009; (4).Kwemoi Raphael was appointed as CDO on 20th September 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010; Ref CR/156/1; (5).Solimo Robert was appointed as CDO on 8th November 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 123/2010 Ref CR/156/1; (6).Lwendok Ben Chesang was appointed as CDO on 8th November 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 123/2010 Ref CR/156/1; (7).Batya Nelson was appointed as CDO on 24th March 2016 as was directed by DSC Min No. 51.3/2016 Ref CR: ADM/156; (8).Chelangat Ann was appointed as CDO on 14th July 2016 as was directed by DSC Min No. 51/2016; Ref CR: ADM/156; (9).Yapsolimo Monica was appointed as CDO on 12th March 2021 as was directed by DSC Min No. 38.1/2021 Ref: CR/156/1; (10).Masaba Andrew was appointed as CDO on 22nd January 2021 as was directed by DSC Min No. 06.29/2021; Ref CR/156/1; (11).Satya Patrick was appointed as CDO on 20th September 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010 Ref CR/156/1(12).Cheptoek Immaculate was appointed as CDO on 20th September 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010 Ref CR/156/1 and (13).Kwemoi Rachael was appointed as CDO on 20th September 2010 as was directed by DSC Min No. 93/2010 Ref CR/154/1

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG
Maximum score is 15

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

There was evidence that all the positions of SAA/Accounts Assistants for LLGs were substantively filled as follows

1. Mr. Arapchilla Albert SAA was appointed on 04th /07/2018 (Ref CR/155/3 and DSC Min No. 49.2/2018
2. Ms. Draru Florence SAA appointed on 20th /03/2019 (Ref CR/160/1; DSC Min No. 8/201.
3. Mr. Kwilat Caiphas appointed as SAA on 26/7/2006 Ref CR/156; DSC Min No. 5/81/006
4. Kiplagat Too James SAA appointed on 20th /09/2010 (Ref CR/154/1; DSC min No.93/2010;
5. Sunde Lenard Accounts Assistant appointed on 4th /07/2018 (Ref CR/155/3; DSC Min No. 54.22/2018,
6. Sande Priscilla appointed as Accounts Assistant on 26/072006 (Ref CR:154/2; DSC Min No.5/81/2006),
7. Kiprotich Hassan was appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant on 26/7/2006 (Ref DSC Min No. 5/81/006; CR/156/;
8. Kipromo Benard Chematany Accounts Assistant appointed on 26/07/2006 (Ref DSC Min No. 5/81/006
9. Chepkwemoi Rister AA appointed on 5/3/2020 Ref CR/156/1 directed by DSC Min No. 07.6/2020
10. Yeko Godfrey AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.3/2019
11. Ms. Cherotich Joan AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.5/2019
12. Cherotich Victor AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.6/2019
13. Chemutai Jackline AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.7/2019
14. Musobo James Nyekyi AA appointed on 10th August 2020 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 46.2/2020
15. Kwemoi Simon AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.2/2019
16. Juma N carolyne AA appointed on 18th September 2019 Ref CR/156/1 directed by Min No. 98.1/2019

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3 | Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: | There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the natural resources department in the previous FY, the amount warranted was UGX. 103,975,112 and the LG released 100% of the allocated funds (103,975,112) on page 13 of the financial statement ended 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 signed by the CAO on 12th September 2022). | 2 |
| | Maximum score is 4 | a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0 | | |
| 3 | Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: | There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Community Based Services department in the previous FY, the amount warranted was UGX. 203, 129,459, and the LG released 100% of the allocated funds (203, 129,459) page 13 of the financial statement ended 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 signed by the CAO on 12th September, 2022). | 2 |
| | Maximum score is 4 | b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0. | | |
| 4 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. | a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0 | <p>There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental, social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works for all the projects implemented using the DDEG.</p> <p>Screening form for the renovation of the district main administration block at the district headquarters in town cell Bukwo town council, the impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations made in the screening form such as proper waste management at the site, back filling and removal of debris on site, prepared and signed by the DCDO and Environment officer on 19thMay, 2022</p> <p>Screening for the extension of tap water to water stressed parishes /areas in Suam sub county. Impacts vegetation clearance and waste generation and mitigation measures were addressed example re-vegetation and compaction of the dug trenches to control erosion screening form prepared and signed by Environment officer and the DCDO on 08th June, 2022</p> <p>Screening form for the construction of Administration office block at Chepkwasta sub-county headquarters, the impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations made in the screening form such as planting trees and grass on the compound, site back filling and levelling prepared and signed by the DCDO and Environment officer on 19thMay, 2022</p> | 4 |
| | Maximum score is 12 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>All the DDEG financed projects did not require ESIAAs because in the National Environment Act 20219, they required only screening.</p> <p>Impacts could be mitigated or avoided through appropriate and timely implementation of recommended mitigation measures and by strictly following the requirements and guidance in the ESMPs.</p> | 4 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of costed ESMPs for all the projects implemented using the DDEG in the previous FY 2021/22 availed at the time of assessment.</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>There was evidence that Bukwo DLG obtained Un-qualified audit opinion from the statutory audit conducted by the Office of the Auditor General for the previous FY 2021/2022.</p> | 10 |
|---|--|--|---|----|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> | <p>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>The LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Auditor General's findings for FY 2020/2021 in letter ref. CR/210/9 dated 4th April, 2022. On the other hand, part of Internal Auditor's General findings for the same period, the information was not provided as required.</p> <p>In both cases the LG did not comply with the requirement of doing so by the end of February as per PFMA s.11 2g.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>maximum score is 10</p> | <p>score 10 or else 0.</p> | | |
| 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>The District submitted the Annual performance contract for FY 2022/2023 on line on 31/7/2022. This was before August 31st hence the LG was compliant.</p> | 4 |
| | | <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | | |
| 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>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>The District submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 via PBS to the MoFPED on 26th August 2022. The submission was made before August 31st which was in compliance with the requirement.</p> | 4 |
| | <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | | |
| 9 | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> | <p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> | <p>The LG submitted the quarterly budget performance reports for the FY 2021/2022 via PBS as follows:</p> <p>1st Qrt report was submitted on 24th December, 2021,</p> <p>2nd Qrt report was submitted on 22nd January, 2022, 3rd Qrt report was on 10th May, 2022 and the</p> <p>4th Qrt report was submitted on 26th August, 2022. Since all the quarterly reports were submitted by August 31st the DLG met this requirement.</p> | 4 |
| | <p>Maximum score is 4</p> | <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | | |