



## LGMSD 2021/22

Kumi District

(Vote Code: 529)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	59%
Education Minimum Conditions	85%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	59%
Educational Performance Measures	74%
Health Performance Measures	79%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	71%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	19%
<b>Crosscutting Performance Measures</b>	

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

**Local Government Service**

**Delivery Results**

1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized as per the purpose of the projects The following were the 3</p> <p>Sampled projects</p> <p>Construction of Livestock Market at Kanapa Sub County</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Residence CAO's Residence</p> <p>Construction of Administration block at Kumi Sub County</p>	4
---	---	--	---	---

2	Service Delivery Performance	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LLGS were not assessed in the previous assessment</p> <p>There is no basis of Comparing performance assessment results This issue is not applicable for the time being</p>	<b>0</b>
---	------------------------------	---	---	----------

2	Service Delivery Performance	<p>There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented were 100 % completed as per performance contract ( with AWP) as indicated below</p> <p>Constructed Livestock Market at Kanapa Sub County page 57 of the Performance Contract ( AWP) and reported to have been Completed on page 60 Of the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</p> <p>Constructed Administration block at Kumi Sub County page 14 of Annual Performance Contract and was Completed as per page 40 of 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</p>	<p>Rehabilitation of CAO'S Residence</p> <p>page 14 of Annual Performance Contract and was Completed as per page 40 of 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</p> <p>Constructed Administration block at Kumi Sub County page 14 of Annual Performance Contract and was Completed as per page 40 of 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report</p>
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> <p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>		

3  
Investment  
Performance

Titling of Government land  
UGX  
55,000,000

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

Capacity Building UGX  
60,105,515

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:

Monitoring and  
Supervision of  
Investments UGX  
198,651,000

Score 2 or else score 0.  
LG budgeted for UGX

1,325,845,294 and spent  
UGX 1,325,600,813 on  
eligible activities indicated  
below;

Transfer to LLGs UGx  
724,790,142

Infrastructure  
developments  
UGX 318,298,640

3 Investment Performance	79,586,546 with a variation of UGX 413,454 represented by 0.51%.	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of the fence for Kanapa Livestock market budgeted at UGX 90,000,000, actual was UGX 85,810,662 with a variation of UGX 4,189,338 represented by 4.7%.</li> </ul>	a information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,
b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renovation of CAO's residence phase II budgeted at UGX 79,000,000, actual was UGX 79,143,420 with a variation of 143,420 represented by 0.2%.</li> </ul>	score 2 or else score 0 The review of the thr e sampled LLGs indicated that the information filled in LLGs per minimum staffing stands was accurate.
infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,	The variations were within the range of +/- 20% as per the requirement	The Human Resource and LLGs staff lists had the same information on the filled positions at the sampled LLGs of Atatur S/C, Kamunyo S/C and Mukongoro T/C.
score 2 or else score 0 The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows:	4	At Atatur Sub County the staff list had 13 filled positions and HR staff list had 13 these included; SAS Mr. Ekungu
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of the Administration block at Kumi sub county budgeted at UGX</li> </ul>	Accu acy of reported information	
<b>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</b>	80,000,000, actual was UGX	

r . Evidence that e  
Simon Peter, CDO Ms. Atia  
Annet and SAA Otim Alfred  
among others.

Kanyum Sub County the  
staff list had 18 filled  
positions and the HR staff  
list had 18 these included;  
SAS Mr. Opio

Damiano, Ag, CDO Akurut  
Sarah and SAA Alaso Joyce  
among others.

Mukongoro Town Council  
staff list had 19 filled  
positions and HR staff list  
had 19 these included; Mr.  
Okiria Innocent as Town  
Clerk, Ms. Ikiring Jesica

SCDO and Mr. Okiria Henry  
AAT among other.

r  
4

. Evidence that e

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

Measure

b  
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**

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

Measure

a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the state requirements for the coming FY to the MDA by September 30th of the current FY, with copies to the respective MDAs and MoFPE D.

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that Infrastructure constructed using the DDEG was in place as per reports produced by the LG

The following was the infrastructure that was in place as per the reports produced by the LG

Constructed Livestock Market at Kanapa Sub County page 57 of the Performance Contract ( AWP) and reported to have been Completed on page 60 Of the 4th Quarter Budget

Performance Report

Rehabilitation of CAO’S Residence

page 14 of Annual Performance Contract and was Completed as per page 40 of 4th Quarter

Budget Performance Report

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6

r . Evidence that e  
Constructed Administration block at Kumi Sub  
County page 14 of Annual Performance Contract and  
was Completed as per page 40 of 4th Quarter

Budget Performance Report

0

The District did not provide evidence  
to show that it had consolidated and  
submitted its staffing requirements of  
the FY

2022/2023 to the MoPS

Perfo mance  
management

Maximum 5 points on  
this Performance

Measure  
a the

District/Municipality has  
conducted a tracking  
and analysis of staff  
attendance (as guided  
by Ministry of Public  
Service CSI):

Score 2 or else score 0  
The District conduct d a  
tracking and analysis of  
staff attendance, as was  
guided by MoPS, for the  
months of 31

September 2022, 18  
October

2022, 4 November 2022



Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance

Measure

i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:

HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous

FY: Score 1 or else 0 0

There was evidence that the District appraised some heads of departments as follows;

1. Mr. Okaali Joseph DP appraised by Mr. Abdu

Batambuze the CAO on 16/8/21.

2. Mr. Orone Justine Ag.DE was appraised by Ms. Adongo Roseline

Luhoni the CAO on 7/Sept/2022.

3. Ms. Ikiring Emma Ag. Natural Resource appraised by Mr. Imagnant Christine on 26/7/22 signed by Mr. Fred Naunga PAS.

4. Mr. Gogol Rajab DPO was appraised by Mr. Batambuze

Abdu the CAO on 10/7/21

5. Mr. Olupot Thomas was supervised by Ms. Adongo

Roseline Luhoni on 4/7/2022.

6. Mr. Mawanga Peter Patience

Civil Engineer was appraised by

Mr. Orone Justine the Senior Engineer on 12/8/2022.

7. Dr. Asio Sarah DHO was appraised by Ms. Adong Rose Luhoni the CAO 12/12/2022.

8. Mr. Wandera Peter the CFO was appraised by Ms. Adongo

Roseline Luhoni on 15 /5/2022.

However, the following were not appraised ;

The CDO Mr. Onoria Alex

Okirigi.

The DEO Ms. Adongo Sarah.

<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance</p>	<p>vehicle Reg. No.UG.7069M attached to the district health officer's office in accident along Kumi highway.</p>	<p>Score 1 or else 0</p> <p>The District had established a Consultative Committee on 16th June 2021.</p>
<p>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>2. Ms. Pule Penninah Parish Chief was sanctioned under Min 4/4/KDRSC/2022 for having poor attendance on duty from Kanapa S/C. She defended herself and the committee cautioned her confirmation letter should be stayed until her attendance to duty and performance was analyzed for further notice and her Probation period be extended to 6 months.</p>	<p>The committee members were,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Mr. Emorut Stephen Akol principal educator officer Chairperson.</li> <li>2.Mr. Mawanga Peter Patience DWO member.</li> <li>3.Ms. Aboyo Catherine Senior probation and social welfare officer member</li> <li>4.Mr.Osire Otai Emmanuel HRO. member</li> <li>5.Mr. Omoding Emmanuel Ichariat Member.</li> </ol>
<p>Score 1 or else 0</p> <p>Administrative rewards and sanctions had been administered as per the guidelines of the MoPS.</p>	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance</p>	<p>The committee was functional as evidenced in the minutes for the meetings held for example one held on 16th September,2021.</p>
<p>1.The meeting held on 19th April 2022 Mr. Ojiman Paul Patrick</p> <p>Driver under Minute number 4/4/KDRSC/2022 was interdicted from all duty for knocking down</p>	<p>Measure</p> <p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p>	<p>Min 1/09/2021 Prayer was led by HRO.</p>

Min 2/09/2021 Communication from the chairperson .	Min 5/09/2021 Resolutions.	the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:
Min 3/09/2021 Presentation of the issue for discussion by HRO.	Min 6/09/2021 Closure. 8	Score 1. The District recruited 30 staff in the previous Financial Year all accessed there payroll not later than two months after appointment.
Min 4/09/2021 Discussions of issues raised.	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance  Measure or else score	1. Ms. Ajulong Rose was recruited on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 1/12/2021. accessed payroll on 2/12/2021.
9  Pension Payroll management	0 a. Evidence that 100% of  on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 1/12/2021.	7. Mr. Etomet ,Gabriel was recruited on 15/11//2021 and accessed payroll on 2/12/2021.
Maximum 1 point on this Performance a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two 2. Mr. Gilbert Otim was recruited on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 1/12/2021.	4. Ms. Adeke Betty Sarah 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 1/12/2021.	8.Mr. Olupot George was appointed on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 2/12/2021.
3. Mr. Agony Everlyne was recruited	5. Ms. Asio Christine was recruited on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 3/12/2021.	9.Ms. Aujo Loyce was appointed on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 2/12/2021.
	6. Mr. Orone Ivan Francis was recruited on 15/11/2021 and	10. Ms. Adinyo Josephine was appointed on 15/11/2021 and accessed payroll on 2/12/2021.

0

The District had 13 staffs who retired in the previous FY 2021/2022 and only 9 accessed their pension pay roll within two months after retirement.

Measure or else score 0	months after retirement:	These included;
	Score 1.	<p>1.Mr. Osire Peter Senior Accountant retired on 10/12/2021 and accessed pension payroll on 20thJan 2022.</p> <p>2.Mr Otai John Michael DEO retired on 4th/4/2021 and accessed pension payroll on 2 1st/5/2021.</p> <p>3.Mr. Onapito John Peter Education Assistant II retired on 2nd/2/2022 and accessed pension payroll on 3rd/3/2021.</p> <p>4.Ms Opolot Jane Education Assistant II retired on 11/11/2021 and accessed pension payroll on 10th12/2021.</p> <p>5.Mr. Osire John Calvin headteacher retired on 22nd/2/2022 and accessed pension payroll on 20th/4/2022.</p> <p>6. Mr. Aisu Robert Education Assistant II retired on 5th/5/2022 and accessed pension payroll on 3rd/7/2022.</p> <p>7.Mr. Oleico Stephen deputy headteacher retired on 17th/2/2022 and accessed pension pay roll on 18th/4/2022.</p> <p>8.Mr Oenen Samuel Education Assistant II retired on 12th/6/2022 and accessed pension payroll on 29th/7/2022.</p>

9.Mr.Emudong Fred Education Assistant II retired on 5th/7/2022 and accessed pension on 2nd/8/2022.

Those who did not access in time were as follows;

1.Mr.Oseka William Deputy headteacher retired on 10th/5/2022 and accessed pension payroll on 23rd/10/2022 among others

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

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0 2 Direct transfer (DDEG) to LLGS was executed in accordance within the requirement of the Budget as follows;	LLGS against a Budget of UGX 241,596,714  2nd Quarter A total of UGX 241,596,714 was transferred to LLGS against a Budget of UGX 241,596,714  3rd Quarter A total of UGX 241,596,714 was transferred to LLGS against a Budget of UGX 241,596,714
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance  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):	<b>2</b> The LG did timely warranting/Verification of Direct DDEG transfers to LLGS in accordance within the requirements of the budget  1st Quarter Cash Limit Date 23rd July 2021 Amount UGX 241,596,714 Warrant Date 23rd July 2021 Amount UGX
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	

241,596,714	241,596714 10	Score 2 or else score 0	<b>0</b>
2nd Quarter Cash Limit Date	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	The LG did not provided evidence of timely invoicing and communication as per the schedule prepared by the district accountant	
15th October 2021 Amount UGX			
241,596,714 Warrant Date 19th	Maximum 6 points on this Performance	Q1 date of invoicing was 6th August 2021 and date of communication was 15th July 2021.	
October 2021 Amount UGX			
241,596,714	Measure	Q2 date of invoicing was 20th October 2021 and date of communication was 6th October 2021	
3rd Quarter Cash Limit Date	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:	And Q3 date of invoicing was 12th January 2022 and communication was 4th January 2022.	
21st January 2022 Amount UGX			
214.596,714 Warrant Date 25th			
January 2022 Amount UGX			
11	1st Quarter report dated 1st Sept 2021	Routine oversight and monitoring	
Routine oversight and monitoring		Maximum 4 points on this Performance	
Maximum 4 points on this Performance	2nd Quarter report dated 7th December 2021	Measure	
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:	
a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	2nd report dated 7th December 2021		
		Score 2 or else score 0	<b>2</b>
Score 2 or else score 0	3rd Quarter report dated 7th March 2022	1st Quarter Discussed under meeting of 21st September 2021 cMinute 3/2/2021	
There was evidence that the District mentored all LLGS as per the reports indicated below	4th Quarter report dated 8th June 2022	2nd Quarter Discussed under meeting of	
	11	4th December 2021 (Minute	

3/12/2021

3rd Quarter Discussed  
under meeting of 15th  
March 2022  
(minute 4/32022) /

4th Quarter Discussed under a meeting  
of 5th April 20222  
(minute 4/42022

**Investment Management**

12

Planning and budgeting  
for investments is  
conducted effectively

3 categories of assets  
outlined on pages 169-170  
of the Local I

Governments Financial and  
Accounting

Maximum 12 points on  
this Performance

Manual 2007 . The  
assets covered  
included Land  
Motorcycles /Vehicles  
Furniture and Fittings  
and Buildings

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***

**2**

The District maintained an  
updated assets register Assets  
register covered the details of



<p>12</p> <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous</p>	<p>of existing assets and disposal of assets: Score 1 or else 0</p>
<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had used the Board of survey report of FY 2020/221 and FY 2021/2022 to make assets management decisions.</p>
<p>12</p> <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>20th October 2021 Submitted TO MLHUD 15th March 2022.</p>	<p>Joseoh Okiria— District Agricultural Officer appointed as a member on 5th October 2020</p>
<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Minutes of a meeting held on 12th April 2022 Submitted to</p>	<p>Alex Onoria Okirig Community Development Officer appointed as member on 10th September 2015 Joseph Okiria DistrictT Agriculture Officer</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>MOLHUD on 26th August 2022. Minutes of meeting held on 12th January 2022 Submitted to MOLHUD on 27th October 2022.</p>	<p>appointed as on 5th October 2020. Emma Ikiring District Physical Planner appointed 12 Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>
<p>There was evidence that the District had a functional Physical Planning Committee as it had produced and Submitted 4 sets of minutes s meetings to MOLHUD.</p>	<p>Minutes of meetings held on 29th June 2022 Submitted to NOLHUD on 26th August 2022.</p>	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure d.For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are:</p>
<p>Minutes of meeting held on</p>	<p>List of members</p>	<p>(i) derived from the third LG Development</p>

<p>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>for all DDEG projects as per reports indicated below;</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p>
<p>Score 2 or else score 0 as a member as a member on 10th September</p>	<p>Appraisal report dated 15th July 2021 for construction of Administrative block for Kumi sub county</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>2015 Ms. Sarah Adung District Education Officer appointed as a member on 5th October 2015</p>	<p>Appraisal report dated 8th July 2021 for renovation of CAO's residence phase 1</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0  There was documentary evidence to show that LG conducted field appraisals for all DDEG funded projects as per field appraisal reports indicated below</p>
<p>Moses OPIO Ag District Natural Resources Officer appointed as a member on 5th October 2020 DE Salah Asio District Health Officer appointed as a member on 5th October 2020.</p>	<p>Appraisal report dated 8th July 2021 for construction and fencing of Kanapa Cattle market.  the prioritised investments were derived from page 77 of LGDP</p>	<p>Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for construction of Administrative block for Kumi sub county</p>
<p>The LG did have a physical development plan.</p>	<p>III 2 planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for renovation of CAO's residence phase 1  Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for construction and fencing of Kanapa Cattle market</p>
<p>There was evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals 12</p>	<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure Measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0. <b>0</b> There was no documentary evidence that project profiles for current FY have been developed and discussed.</p>
<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</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>Maximum 12 points on this Performance</p>		

P n The

t

<p>12 Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>form of screening reports for the current FY 2022/2023 DDEG projects. Screening had not yet been done.</p>	<p>DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure 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>13 Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure a. Evidence that all</p>	<p>LG provided evidence to show that DDEG funded infrastructure projects were incorporated in the LG approved Procurement Plan signed on 1st July 2022 by DCAO Kitutu Fredrick. Some of the projects included; 1. Renovation of buildings Page 2. Construction of nonresidential buildings Page 1 3. Energy installations page 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Score 2 or else score 0 There was no evidence in the</p>	<p>13 Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current</p>	<p>for Current FY contained in meeting dated 28th June 2022, under min NO 5/KDCC/06-3/2022-2023, examples of DDEG funded projects included;</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>13 Procurement, contract management/execution</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of Contracts Committee approval for all DDEG projects Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure c. Evidence that the LG has properly established</p>	<p>Renovation of buildings Construction of nonresidential buildings Energy installations the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>13 Procurement, contract management/execution</p>	<p>Measure c. Evidence that the LG has properly established</p>	<p>Score 1 or else 0 LG did not provide documentary</p>	<p>0</p>

1

P n The

t

evidence to the assessment team to show that the Project Implementation Team was established.



Procurement, contract d.  
management/execution

The e

<p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> <p>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> <p><b>1</b></p>	<p>t</p> <p>onto the concrete poles , 3 lines of gauge 12 galvanized wire for tensioning the chain link, 3 strands of barbed wire to top of reinforced concrete poles, all as per the designs /BOQs provided by the</p> <p>LG Engineer</p>	<p>all as per the design provided by the DE</p> <p>Another project visited was Renovation of CAO's office phase II, Internal doors of size 900 x 2100mm made out of wood were used, Metallic external door size 1200 x2100 fitted with glass panes , Plastic emulsion paint was applied on plastered ceiling surfaces, Iron sheets were repainted with approved roof paint as per the designs provided by the DE Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> <p>Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>0</b></p>
<p>re was evidenc to show that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical design; Examples of visited projects included;</p> <p>Fencing of the Kanapa Livestock Market; Metallic poles cast in ground with concrete as per the design,2.1m high gauge 10 chain link fixed with galvanized binding wire</p>	<p>Completion of construction of Administration block at Kumi Sub County headquarter; rainwater harvesting system comprising of 5000 L PVC tank mounted on ground concrete base, and connected to the 110mm PVC gutters by a 75mm diameter PVC pipe as per the design, casemate windows of size 1500 x 1200mm were installed, Gauge 26 pre- painted iron sheets were used</p>	<p>LG did not provided evidence of supervision by the relevant technical officers of the infrastructure projects as per the reviewed inspection reports captured below;</p> <p>Inspection report for renovation of CAO's office dated 1st March 2022; CDO and Environment officer did not participate</p>

Procurement, contract e.

management/execution

Inspection report  
for construction of  
Administration  
block at Kumi Sub  
County dated 5th  
April

2022; CDO and  
Environment

Officer did not  
participate

Inspection report  
for construction  
of Fence at  
Kanapa cattle  
market dated 7th  
March 2022;  
CDO and  
Environment  
officer did not  
participate

Procurement, contract management/execution

	t	
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	timely paid on 11th May 2022 under voucher NO. 43265351	initiated and timely paid on 28th March, 2022 under voucher NO 42515623
<p>The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p>	<p>Fencing of Kanapa Livestock market by Tajowa Enterprises Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX</p>	
Score 1 or else score 0	65,437,200 issued on 12th May, 2022 and	
<p>DLG had verification of</p>	<p>Subsequent payment to the contractor</p>	
<p>Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes as follows:</p>	<p>was initiated and timely paid on 22nd June, 2022 under voucher NO</p>	
<p>Construction of Administration block at Kumi Sub County by Talons general supplies (U) Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 37,597,044 issued on 7th April 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and</p>	<p>44460342</p> <p>Renovation of CAO's residence phase II by Mwonzi construction and Engineering services Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 26,55,281 issued on 3rd March ,2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was</p>	



<p>Procurement, contractg. management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p>	<p>e e</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing of Kanapa Livestock market; minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 15th December 2021 and evaluation report dated 24th September 2021.</li> </ul>	<p>District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p>
<p>Score 1 or else 0 From a sampl of 3 fil s, there was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. Examples of project files reviewed;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renovation of CAO's residence phase II ,minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute</li> </ul>	<p>Score: 2 or else score 0 0 no vid nc in the form of n appointment letter designating someone as the grievance focal person for the DLG.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructio n of Administration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4/KDCC/091/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 9th December 2021 and evaluation report dated 23rd September, 2021.</li> </ul>	<p>The appointment letter that was availed was for Mr. Emorut Stephen Akol (Principal Education Officer) assigning him duty as a chairperson of the complaint desk committee by Mr. Malinga Fredrick (for CAO) on 16/06/2021.</p>
<p><b>Environment and Social Safeguards</b> block at Kumi Sub County ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 28th September 2021, minute 3/KDCC/09-2/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 15th December 2021 and evaluation report dated 23rd September</p>	<p>4 G i vance red ess mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure a Ev dence tha the</p>	<p>The task of the assignment was to receive complaints deferred by the Inspectorate of Government back to the district to be handled at district level. The letter was not appointing Mr. Emorut Stephen as the Grievance Focal Person. There was no evidence of the Grievance Redress committee. The appointment letters for the so called GRC availed were for the same task as for Mr. Emorut Stephen.</p>

r e r . i t There was e e e

a

There were no GRC meeting minutes availed

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.

operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

If so: Score 2 or else 0

c District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.

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

The grievance/complaints log book had no clear information and the LG had not publicly displayed information on grievance redress on the notice boards by assessment time.

If so: Score 1 or else 0 0

not any information on grievance redress publicized neither on the LG notice boards nor on LG website.

4 Grievance redress mechanism

15

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

a. Evidence that

Score 1 or else score 0

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with:

0 T

here was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team to show that Environment, social and climate change interventions were incorporated into LG development plan

15

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk

DDEG guidelines

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

management

score 1 or else 0

b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced

here was no documentary evidence to show that LG disseminated to LLGs enhanced

0 T

DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change



e or i t There was d e t

5 Saf guards f service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

(For nvestmen s financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):

c. Evidence that the LG incorporated 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 3  
 evi enc tha the LG incorpor ted costed ESMPs into contractual documents (BOQs) for DDEG projects

ESMP for the Renovation of CAO’s residence signed by Environment Officer Mr. Opio

Moses and DCDO Mr. Alex Okirigi on 20/01/2022 costed at UGX. 6,900,000/-

ESMP for the fencing of Kanapa livestock market in Kanapa subcounty signed by Environment officer on 19/01/2022 costed at UGX. 12,700,000/-

ESMP for the construction of Administration block at Kumi Subcounty (Phase I) signed by Environment officer on 15/12/2021 costed at UGX. 13,895,000/-

15 Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

additional impact from climate change.

Score 3 or else score 0 0 There was no project with costing of additional impact from climate change.

15 Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

d. Examples of projects with costing of the Score 1 or else score 0 0 There was evidence of one land title for the CAO’s residence which was renovated

Saf guards f service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

There were no Land ownership documents for Kanapa livestock market in Kanapa Sub-County and Site for the Admin block at Kumi Sub-county provided.

f environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

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

no ocumen ary

<p>e or . Evidence that evidence in the form of monthly monitoring and supervision reports.</p>	<p>There was renovation of CAO's residence dated 20/05/2022 signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO.</p>	<p>Subcounty dated 19/05/2022 signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO</p>
<p>Monitoring and supervision reports were prepared once per DDEG project as listed below;</p>	<p>Monitoring and supervision report for the fencing of Kanapa livestock market in Kanapa invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p>	<p>Monitoring and Supervision report for construction of Administration Block at Kumi Sub-county dated 19/05/2022 signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO.</p>
<p>Monitoring and supervision report for Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0</p>
<p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>There were no Environment and Social Compliance Certificates for all the DDEG financed projects.</p>	<p>evi enc tha LG had carried out Bank reconciliations up to the end of FY 2021/2022 and as at 31st October 2022 ( at the time of the assessment)</p>
<p><b>Financial management</b></p>	<p>LG makes m nthly Bank reconciliations</p>	<p>the bank accounts that had been reconciled were as indicated below;</p>
<p>g. Evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors'</p>	<p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure a the LG</p>	<p>KUMI DLG ACDP Youth Livelihood programme resolving fund</p>
<p>17 LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p>	<p>2nd Quarter report dated 3rd February 2022 was in place</p>
<p>LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0 2 1st Quarter report dated 28th October 2021 was in place.</p>	<p>3rd Quarter report dated 29th April 2022 was in place was in place.</p>

16

o . Evidence that

There was d

e t

4th Quarter report dated 29th July 2022 was in place.

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the

LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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.

Score 1 or else score 0 0

There was no evidence at the time of assessment that the LG had provided information to the Chairperson and LGPAC

on the Status of implementation Internal Audit findings FY 2021/2022

. Evidence that

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the

Score 1 or else score 0 1st Quarter report dated 28th

Officer on 4th February 2022 and LGPAC on 7th February 2022.

LGA Section 90

October 2021 was Submitted to

3rd Quarter report dated 29th

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Accounting Officer on 28th October 2021 and LGPAC on 28th October 2021.

April F 2022 was Submitted to Accounting Officer on 9th May 2022 and LGPAC on 9th May 2022.

internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG

4th Quarter report dated 29th

Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:

2nd Quarter report dated 3rd February 2022 Submitted to

July 2022 was Submitted to Accounting Officer on 1st August 2022 and LGPAC on 1st August 2022 .

Accounting

LGPAC reviewed all the internal audit reports and followed them up

**Local Revenues**

2021/2022

year (last FY year but one)

18

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

Local revenue collected UGX 252,405,673

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

Local revenue collection ratio was (252,405,673/595,722,000)

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

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.

X 100 = 42.3%

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

And the resulting deficit was

(100-42.3) = 58%  
9

0

The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial

Audited accounts 2020/2021

Local revenue decreased from UGX362,558,038 FY 2021/2022 to UGx 252,405,673 resulting into a decrease of

0

Local revenue budget FY 2021/2022 UGX595,722,000 page 6 of Approved budget FY

r a .

UGX110,152,365	Therefore % decrease was	110,152,365/362,558,038x100 giving 30.3%
20	60,052,969/92,389,183x100 giving 65%. Therefore the LG satisfied the requirement of remitting 65% as enshrined in the LG act	published on the procurement Notice Board. The sampled awarded contracts were:
Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency	21 LG shares information with citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Administration block at Kumi Sub county was awarded to Talons general supplies (U) Ltd at UGX 79,586,546 and displayed on 30th September 2021</li> </ul>
Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing of Kanapa Livestock market awarded to Tajowa Enterprises Ltd at UGX 85,810,662 was displayed on 24th September 2021</li> </ul>
a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	Measure 2 a Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renovation of CAO's residence Phase II awarded to Mwonzi Construction and Engineering services Ltd at UGX 61,103,763 was displayed on 24th September 2021</li> </ul>
Amount subjected to sharing was UGX 92,389,183 as per the schedule provided by the CFO.	Score 2 or else score 0	
Amount remitted to lower LLGs was UGX 60,052,969.	The Procurement Plan and awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer and	
Therefore % remittance was	Measure	
21	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website	0 LG did not provide documentary evidence to the assessment team that the LG had publicized performance assessment results on public notice boards and website
LG shares information with citizens		
Maximum 6 points on		
<b>Transparency and Accountability</b>		
this Performance	for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	
21	Maximum 6 points on this Performance	Measure
LG shares information with citizens		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 **0**

There was no documentary evidence that LG had conducted discussions with the public in the form of barazzas and radio talk shows to give feedback to the public on the status of implementation of Government programmes. However they presented a report on radio talk show dated 7th July 2022 which related to Financial 2022/2023.

<p>21 LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>r a .</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:</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0</b></p> <p>LG did not provide documentary evidence to the assessment team to show that it made publicly available information on taxes rates and collection procedures</p>
---	---	--

22

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations

which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora.

Score 1 or else score 0

**1**

LG did not have any issues with IGG

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

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>1.4% as shown below;</p> <p>2019</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>143+1697+1287=3127</p> <p>3127/3898*100=80.2%</p>
<p>Learning Outcomes:</p> <p>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>	<p>The LG PLE pass rate declined between the previous school year but one and the previous year by</p>	<p>2020</p>

G1+G2+G3	) rate has improved	2019
133+1671+1475=3279	between the previous	G1+G2+G3
3279/4161*100=78.8 %	school year but one and the previous year	
	• If improvement by more than 5% score 3	37+200+399=636
80.2%-78.8%=1.4%		636/1373*100=46.3%zs
decline.	• Between 1 and 5% score 2	
1		
Learning Outcomes:		2020
The LG has improved	• No improvement score	
PLE and USE pass	0	G1+G2+G3
rates.		<b>3</b>
	The LG UCE pass rate	148+305+453=906
Maximum 7 points	improved between the	906
on this performance	previous school year but	
measure	one and the previous year	
b The LG UCE pass	by	/1524*100=59.4%
	13.1% as shown below;	

59.4%-46.3%=13.1% improvement.

2

- No improvement score

Service Delivery

0

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

0 LLG were not assessed in the previous assessments

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



3 2

Investment a) If the The

Performance:

The LG has managed

education projects as per guidelines

Ajuket PS, Kajamaka PS, Omerein PS, Agurut PS, Moruita

PS.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

Education department grant totaling to shs 507,327,000 was used on eligible activities as was reported on the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/2022 generated on 1st July 2021, 11:17

under vote 529, pages 33-35. This development grant was used as follows;

-classroom construction and rehabilitation at 291,327,000 at Kapokin PS & Kalungar PS,

Kajamaka New PS,, Akadot PS,

Bisina Lake PS,, Okemer PS, Olumot PS..

-Latrine construction and rehabilitation at 216,000,000 at Orapada PS, Bisina Lake View

PS, Owogoria PS, Kajamaka PS,





3 2

Investment a) If the The

Performance:

The LG has managed

education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

DEO,

Environment Officer and

CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the

DEO, Environment Officer CDO verified on works before payments as indicated below;

Voucher 44460340 dated 22nd

June 2022 to Agobi General

Enterprises Ltd amounting UGX 27,003,510 for construction of a 2

Voucher 44460344 dated 22nd June 2022 to Simpjo Tech (U) Ltd amounting UGX 60,208,922 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Kalangur P/S; DEO, Environment offer, CDO and DE , signed.

Voucher 44460360 dated 22nd June 2022 to Kaba General

Hardware Ltd amounting UGX 62,906,614 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Atatur P/S; DEO, Environment offer, CDO and DE,

variations in the

variations in the contract price and Engineer's

contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0

estimates of the sampled education sector projects were as follows:

previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0

classroom block at Kapolin P/S; DEO, Environment offer, CDO and DE ,signed.

signed.

education projects as per guidelines

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Kalungur P/S budgeted at UGX 70,000,000, actual was

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

UGX 69,574,754 with a variation

of UGX 425,246 represented by 0.6%.

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Kapolin P/S budgeted at UGX 70,000,000, actual was UGX 69,786,260 with a variation of UGX 213,740 represented by

0.3%.

3 2

Investment b) If the

P  
e  
r  
f  
o  
r  
m  
a  
n  
c  
e  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

h  
a  
s

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
d

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Atukur P/S budgeted at UGX 75,000,000, actual was UGX 74,683,823 with a variation of UGX 316,177 represented by

0.4%.

The variations were within the range of +/- 20% as per the requirement

3 2

Investment d) If the

P  
e  
r  
f  
o  
r  
m  
a  
n  
c  
e  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

h  
a  
s

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
d

2

LG did not undertake Seed Secondary School projects in the previous FY

3 2

Investment d) If the

P  
e  
r  
f  
o  
r  
m  
a  
n  
c  
e  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

h  
a  
s

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
d

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

- If 100% score 2

3 2

Investment d) If the

P  
e  
r  
f  
o  
r  
m  
a  
n  
c  
e  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

h  
a  
s

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
d

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

- Between 80 – 99% score 1

3 2

Investment d) If the

P  
e  
r  
f  
o  
r  
m  
a  
n  
c  
e  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

h  
a  
s

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
d

• Below 80% score 0

Ac ) enc The  
4

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

Maximum 6 points on  
this performance  
measure

a Evid e that the LG  
has recruited primary  
school teachers as per  
the prescribed MoES  
staffing guidelines • If  
100%: score 3

• If 80 - 99%: score 2

- If 70 – 79% score: 1
- Below 70% score 0

LG had 75 primary schools as  
per the staffing requirements of 7  
teachers per school, the HR staff  
register had 1110 teacher.

$$75 \times 7 = 525$$

4

Ac ) n The  
 $1110/525 = 211.4\%$



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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

The percentage of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

• If above 70% and above score: 3

- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

LG consolidated Assets register 2020/2021 dated 17th

Ac ) n The  
 August 2020 that captured assets (The assets included; 638 classrooms, 859 latrines, 3010 desks, 13 laboratories, 456 teachers' houses) for the 75 UPE schools. And 7 UCE schools was in place.

The LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 dated 24th

August 2021 that captured assets (The assets included; 6438 classrooms, 874 latrines, 3073

desks, 13 laboratories, 457 teachers' houses) for the 75 UPE schools. And 7 UCE schools was in place.

This implies that in both Financial years, 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format.

<p>Percentage of schools that met DES guidelines was:</p>	<p>Accuracy)      The 75/75*100=100% accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately</p>	<p>service performance.  Maximum 4 points on this</p>
---	--	---

**Total Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

<p>schools that complied/total(UPE &amp; USE)*100</p>	<p>reported      on teaching staff in a place,      school infrastructure, and</p>	<p>performance measure Evidence that the LG</p>
---	--	---

Accuracy ) n The  
has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.

• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

• Else score: 0

assessor was able to access a teacher deployment list dated 10th August 2022.

From the sampled schools;

2

Mukongoro Rock PS in Mukongoro SC had 19 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.

Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC had 15 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's

9

Accuracy )  
office.

nc The  
Kapokina PS in Atatur  
SC had 19 teachers  
on ground and this

was the same number the assessor  
found at the DEO's office.

5

Accuracy of reported  
information: The LG  
has accurately  
reported on teaching  
staff in place, school

infrastructure, and  
service  
performance.

Maximum 4 points  
on this

performance measure  
b) Evidence that LG has a school asset  
register accurately reporting on the  
infrastructure in all registered primary  
schools.

Ac ) n The

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score  
2

- Else score: 0  
2 The LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 dated 24th

August 2021 that captured assets (The assets included; 6438 classrooms, 874 latrines, 3073 desks, 13 laboratories, 457 teachers' houses) for the 75 UPE schools. And 7 UCE schools was in place.

From the sampled schools;

Mukongoro Rock PS in Mukongoro SC had 20 classrooms, 15 latrines, 232 desks, 6 teachers' houses

Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC had 8 classrooms, 5 latrines, 110 desks, 1 teachers' houses

Kapokina PS in Atatur SC had 10 classrooms, 9 latrines, 157 desks, 4 teachers' houses

ccane a)

School compliance and performance improvement:

h  
statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:

13th December 2021

2. Otaro Stanslas

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4

Omurang PS

10th January 2022

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

- Between 80 – 99% score: 2

3. Odeke Moses

- Below 80% score 0

Kapokina PS

31st December 2021

Only 3/75 schools handed in on time before January 2022. Examples included;

$3/75 * 100 = 4\%$

1. Ilaborot Naome

Kalapata PS

an a) ro

h

6

S hool ompli c and  
performance  
improvement:

- Between 30– 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

68 schools were represented as evidenced by the attendance sheet that was signed by all members present.

**4**

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

15th Ap il 2022 report on training of Head Teachers and Deputy Head Teachers on conflict resolution, School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and performance agreements held on 14th April, 2022 at Bishop Maraka College, Kumi District.

68/75\*100=91%

b UPE s hools

supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

From sampled schools;

Mukongoro Rock PS in

Mukongoro SC, Kajamaka New

PS in Kanyum SC and Kapokina PS in Atatur SC all had SIPs.

- If 50% score: 4

members were guided on how to develop SIPs

6 School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS

- If 100% score: 4:



<p>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</p> <p>• Below 90% score 0</p> <p>The LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the 75 UPE and 7 USE registered schools from the previous FY year. This was evidenced by a document on enrolment which was submitted to the Permanent Secretary MoES on 17th November 2021</p> <p><math>75/75 * 100 = 100\%</math></p>	<p>7 Budgeting for 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>Evidence that the LG as 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> <p>P.7 for the current FY:</p>	<p>Score 4 or else, score: 0 4</p> <p>LG approved budget estimates FY 2022/23 with a wage bill of UGX 7,719,211,000 as per the Kumi District, vote:872, Page 43, not dated as a result of system issues according to the planner.</p> <p>This was for 1,121 teachers on ground as per the staff list as at 10th August 2022, and This was for 75 UPE schools in the current financial year as per the staff list.</p> <p><math>1121/75 = 14.9</math> teachers per school</p> <p>and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's</p>
--	---	--

**Human Resource Management and Development**

<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>DEO'S Office. The assessor was able to access a staff list from the DEO dated 10th August 2022.</p> <p>From the sampled schools;</p>	<p>office.</p> <p>Kapokina PS in Atatur SC had 19 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</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>Mukongoro Rock PS in Mukongoro SC had 19 teachers on ground and this was the same number the assessor found at the DEO's office.</p>	
<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p> <p>The LG deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the</p>	<p>Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC had 15 teachers on ground</p>	

an ) If T r

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

each deployment data was disseminated and publicized on the LG notice board dated 10th August 2022.

From the sampled schools namely;

Mukongoro Rock PS in

Mukongoro SC,

Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum

SC,

Kapokina PS in Atatur SC, teacher deployment data had been displayed on the respective school notice boards though it was not dated.

Mukongoro Rock PS in Mukongoro SC had displayed 19

teachers, Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC had displayed 15 teachers, while

Kapokina PS in Atatur SC had 19 teachers displayed.

education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to

DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score:

0

0

Performance ) If T t e  
management:

Appraisals have been conducted  
for all

he majority of primary  
school headteachers had  
not been appraised during  
FY 2021/2022.

2. Mr. Okwana  
John Peter of kwarikwa  
primary school was  
appraised on  
19/5/2022.

2. Mr. Okim Malinga Fidelis of  
Agaria Alukat primary school

3. Mr. Mim Robert Ontungin of Akide  
primary school.

Those appraised were as  
follows;

Those who were not  
appraised included ;

4. Mr. Ocem Jairus Omatenga primary  
school, among others.

1. Mr. Kedi Francis  
Moruikara P/S appraised by  
Mr. Ariong Julius Moses on  
18/5/22.

1. Ms. Anyait Florence  
Denen of Ojie  
primary School.

8 Performance management:  
Appraisals have been  
conducted for all  
education management  
staff, head teachers in

the registered  
primary and  
secondary schools,  
and training  
conducted to

address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this  
performance measure

Performance a) If T o  
management: h

Appraisals have been conducted for all

b) If all secondary school appraisal reports 0  
head teachers have been submitted to HRM 0  
appraised by D/CAO (or Chair  
BoG) with evidence of Score: 2 or else, score:  
c all staff in the LG  
Education department  
have been appraised  
against their

The information was not availed to  
Assessment Team during the time of  
assessment.

5. Ms. Akiteng Betty Inspector  
of schools was appraised by Emorut  
Stephen Akol SEO on 30th/6/2022.

education performance plans

management staff, head teachers in the score: 2.  
Else, score: 0 registered primary and secondary  
schools, and training conducted to address  
identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this  
performance measure

he staff in Education depar m nt had been  
appraised against their performance plans  
forexample,

1. Mr. Okia Kesiron inspector of schools was  
appraised by Ms.

Adong Sarah the DEO on 30th/June/2022.

2. Ms. Imurang Jane Francis inspector of  
schools was appraised by Emorut Stephen Akol  
Senior Eduction Officer on 30th/6/2022.

3. Mr Oditai John Peter inspector of schools  
appraised by Mr. Emorut Stephen Akol SEO on  
26th/06/2022.

4. Mr. Oselle Bernard inspector of schools  
appraised by Mr. Emorut

Stephen Akol SEO on 30/06/2022.

8 2

Performance ) o t e

management:

Appraisals have been conducted for all

d The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the

education school and LG level,

management staff, head teachers in the score: 2 Else, score: 0 registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure Education and sports department

Capacity building and Training plan for FY 2021/2022 dated 25th

November 2021 prepared by the Ag DEO.

Activities included among many others training of;

-DEO on PBS for 3 months

-SEO on additional training skills on Excel and Micro soft programs for 6 months

-Senior Inspector of schools on Program budgeting system for 3 months

-Inspector of schools on information management system and project management for 6 months

-Education officer on financial management; information management system for 9 months

-Office typist on computer advanced level secretarial studies stage 3 for one year

-Head teachers on financial management and record keeping for 6 months

-Secondary and Primary on psycho-social support and this is ongoing.

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

The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure 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 The LG confirmed in

writing h list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the

Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually as per the document below;

Document on enrolment which was submitted to the Permanent Secretary MoES on 17th

Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds ) Evidence that

for Service Delivery:

November 2021

<p>9 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>education was allocated 130,000,000</p> <p>This was in line with sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of US\$ 4 million per LG, plus US\$</p>	<p>grant within 5 days as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 cash limit date was 23rd July 2021 amount UGX 413,489,200 and date of warrant was 23rd July 2021 for 3rd term activities</p>
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>336,000 (6 inspections at US\$</p>	<p>Q3 cash limit date was 21st January 2022 amount UGX 413,489,200 and date of warrant was 25th January 2022 for 1st term activities</p>
<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>56,000) per school for the 3 terms</p> <p>The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>Q4 cash limit date was 5th May 2022 amount UGX 413,489,200 and date of warrant was 5th May 2022 for 2nd term activities</p>
<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0 75 UPE schools with 77,828 pupils</p>	<p>prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>(The schools follow a calendar year and note financial year)</p>
<p>7 USE schools with 890 students</p>	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	
<p>LG Approved budget estimates</p>	<p>c LG</p> <p>2 submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last</p>	
<p>FY 2021/2022 VOTE: 529 Kumi DLG generated on 1st July 2021 at 11:17 pages 37- 38</p>	<p>3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	
<p>Monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation</p>	

Planning, Budgeting, ) en e

and Transfer of  
Funds for  
Service  
Delivery:

The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.	Mukongoro SC Term 3- 6,469,133 Term 1- 6,469,133
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure 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.	Term 2- 6,469,133 Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC Term 3- 8,050,000 Term 1- 8,050,000 Term 2- 8,100,000
If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0 Q1- 413,489,200 dated 10th December 2021	Kapokina PS in Atatur SC Term 3- 4,250,067
Q3- 413,489,200 dated 31st January 2022	Term 1- 4,250,067 Term 2- 6,261,867
Q4- 413,489,200 11th May 2022	
From sampled schools;	
Mukongoro Rock PS in	





10 2

Routine oversight and a) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and b) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and c) Evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

has prepared an

10 2

Routine oversight and d) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and e) Evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

meetings conducted to

10 2

Routine oversight and f) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and g) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

inspections.

10 2

Routine oversight and h) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and i) Evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

score: 2, else score: 0

10 2

Routine oversight and j) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and k) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and I) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and m) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and n) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and o) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

many others;

10 2

Routine oversight and p) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and q) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and r) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and s) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and t) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and u) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and v) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and w) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and x) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



Routine oversight and y) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and z) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and aa) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and bb) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and cc) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and dd) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

Routine oversight and ee) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ff) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and gg) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and hh) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ii) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and monitoring  
e  
en e er

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and monitoring  
Evidence that  
to e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and II) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and mm) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

was delegated to the

10 2

Routine oversight and nn) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and oo) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and pp) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and qq) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and rr) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ss) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and tt) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and uu) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and vv) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and ww) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

inspection tblet was

10 2

Routine oversight and xx) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

Routine oversight and yy) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and zz) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and monitoring  
aaa) Evidence that  
to e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and bbb) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ccc) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ddd) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and (e) Evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

each officer who was to

10 2

Routine oversight and fff) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ggg) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and hhh) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

Routine oversight and iii) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

Routine oversight and monitoring  
en e er  
e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and kkk) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and III) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



Routine oversight and mmm) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and nnn) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and (oo) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ppp) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and qqq) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and rrr) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ss) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

ction was

10 2

Routine oversight and ttt) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and uuu) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and vvv) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

Routine oversight and www) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and xxx) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and yyy) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and zzz) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and aaaa) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and bbbb) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



Routine oversight and ccc) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and dddd) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ffff) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and gggg) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and hhhh) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and iii) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and jiji) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and kkkk) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and III) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and mmmm) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and nnnn) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and oooo) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ppp) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

Routine oversight and qqqq) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and rrrr) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and ssss) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and tttt) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and uuuu) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and vvvv) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and www) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and xxx) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and yyy) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and zzzz) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



10 2

Routine oversight and aaaaa) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and bbbbb) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

Routine oversight and cccccc) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and dddd) en e er  
e  
monitoring

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and evidence that  
monitoring to e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and ffff) en e er  
e

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*

10 2

Routine oversight and ggggg) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

was inspected on 23rd

10 2

Routine oversight and hhhh)  
e

en e er

monitoring

*M*

*a*

*x*

*i*

*m*

*u*

*m*

*1*

*0*

*p*

*o*

*i*

*n*



Routine oversight and iiiii) Evidence that  
monitoring t o e

*M*  
*a*  
*x*  
*i*  
*m*  
*u*  
*m*

*1*  
*0*

*p*  
*o*  
*i*  
*n*  
*t*

10 2

Routine oversight and monitoring  
jjjjj) en e er e

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

Score: 2 or else, score:

0

monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0  
23rd February 2022 inspectors meeting. Min 3/2022 where inspectors shared their findings during the first inspection.

20th June 2022 Term 2 meeting to disseminate inspection findings. Min 11/2022 where findings from school inspection for term 2 were discussed and they included: dusty classrooms; dotted uniforms in most government schools; inadequate sitting facilities; good number of learners not feeding in schools; undated and un evaluated lesson plans; low adherence to the teaching time table.

Min 12/2022 teachers were encouraged to have schemes and lesson plans; make classroom environment conducive; adhere to the timetable; have good sanitation and follow SOPs; enhance dress code.

Term 3 2021 submitted to DES Mbale regional office on 15th November 2021

Term 1 2022 submitted to DES Mbale regional office on 10th May 2022

Term 2 2022 submitted to DES Mbale regional office on 9th September 2022

2

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and

10 2

Routine oversight and ) Evidence that the Ther e  
monitoring

*Maximum 10 points  
on this performance  
measure*

11

Mobilization of parents  
to attract learners

e e was evidenc that the  
council committee committee responsible for responsible for  
Education met on 28th April 2022 education met and  
and discussed the budget for the discussed service sector,  
delivery issues including  
inspection and monitoring  
findings, performance  
assessment results, LG  
PAC reports etc. during  
the previous FY: score 2  
or else score: 0

*Maximum 2 points on  
this performance  
measure*

Evidence that the LG 21st July 2021 SMC & PTA Education  
department Executive meeting held at Aakum has conducted  
activities PS. Min 05/07/2021 where to mobilize, attract  
and mobilization of learners to come retain children at  
school, back to school was discussed.

Members were tasked to engage

score: 2 or else score: 0 partners like LC 1's, Parish

2

## Investment Management

chiefs, religious leaders to mobilize  
learners to go back to school.

21st July 2021 SMC & PTA  
committee meeting held at Bishop  
Maraka SSS on mobilization of  
learners to attend and complete

1 1

Planning and budgeting for investments

school. Min 06/07/2021 where the DEO said that strategies should be put in place to address high level of school dropout. Members

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

are is

12

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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*

schools. And 7 UCE schools was in place.

an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

From the sampled schools;

Mukongoro Rock PS in Mukongoro SC had 20 classrooms, 15 latrines, 232 desks, 6 teachers' houses

Kajamaka New PS in Kanyum SC had 8 classrooms, 5 latrines, 110 desks, 1 teachers' house

Kapokina PS in Atatur SC had 10 classrooms, 9 latrines, 157 desks, 4 teachers' houses

There was evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals for all education sector projects

were tasked to engage partners like LC 1's, Parish chiefs, religious leaders to mobilize learners to go back to school.

LG consolidated Assets register 2021/2022 dated 24th

August 2021 that captured assets (The assets included; 6438 classrooms, 874 latrines, 3073 desks, 13 laboratories, 457 teachers' houses) for the 75 UPE

as per reports indicated below;

Appraisal report dated 15th July 2021 for construction of 2 classroom block at Okemer P/S

Appraisal report dated 8th July 2021 for construction 2 classroom block at Bisina Lake view P/S

Appraisal report dated 8th July 2021 for construction of 2 classroom block at Agule P/S

The education sector projects were derived from pages 87-89 of the LGDP III

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

LG

has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii)

1 2

P n ) Evidence that the The e

environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0

e was docum ntary evidence

to e  
to show that LG conducted field appraisals for all education sector projects as per field appraisal reports indicated below

Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for construction of 2 classroom block at Okemer P/S

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, *score: 1, else score: 0* Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for construction 2 classroom block at Bisina Lake view P/S

approved by CAO on 1st July 2022 availed to the assessment team, Construction of Dr. Aporu Akol seed secondary school on page 2 was incorporated.

Appraisal report dated 22nd July 2021 for construction of 2 classroom block at Agule P/S

1

From a copy of the consolidated LG Procurement plan

Procurement, contract) Evidence that the The e  
 management/execution o

9

m

Maximum points on  
 this performance  
 measure

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

re was evidenc that the education infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee as per the sampled projects below;

1. Construction of 2 classroom block at Kalunguru P/s was approved on 24th September 2021 under meeting minute N0 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022
2. Construction of 2 classroom block at Atutur P/s was approved on 24th September 2021 under meeting minute N0 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022
3. Construction of 2 classroom block at Kapolin P/s was approved on 24th September 2021 under meeting minute N0 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022

Procurement, contract c) Evidence that the LG

management/execution established a Project

Maximum 9 points on (PIT) for school this  
 performance construction projects

measure constructed within the

According to the letter of appointment by CAO dated 13th September 2021 reviewed by the assessor, the Project Implementation team was not fully established as per the guidelines. The list of members appointed included;

13 1

Procurement, contract) a t The e  
management/execution

9

m

last FY as per the  
guidelines. *score: 1, else  
score: 0*

Okiringi Alex - CDO

Opio Moses- Environment officer

Adongo Sarah-DEO/contracts  
manager

d

LG did not have S ed Secondary

scho l infrastructure  
followed the standard  
technical designs provided  
by the MoES

School projects in the previous  
FY

*Maximum  
this perfor  
measure*

*points on ance Score: 1, else, score: 0*

13

Procurement, contract  
management/execution

*Maximum 9 points  
on this  
performance  
measure*

The team did not have a Clerk of  
works and project manager  
sector infrastructure projects planned in  
the previous FY *score: 1, else score: 0*

1

e) Evidence that  
monthly site meetings  
were conducted for all

LG did not have Seed Secondary

School projects in the previous

FY

13

Procurement, contract  
management/execution

*Maximum 9 points  
on this performance  
measure*

planned sector infrastructure projects in  
the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint  
technical supervision involving engineers,  
environment officers, CDOs etc .., has  
been conducted *score: 1, else score: 0*

f) If there's evidence  
that during critical stages  
of construction of

Procurement, contract) Evidence that the

e management/execution o

9

m

LG provided evidence of joint technical supervision of Education sector projects contained in the reviewed inspection reports indicated below;

Inspection report for construction of a 2 classroom block at Kapolin P/S dated 17th

February 2022, a team consisting of DE,DEO,CDO and Environment Officer jointly visited site

Inspection report for construction of a 2 classroom block at Atatur P/S dated 6th June 2022, a team consisting of g If sector infr s ructure

DE,DEO,CDO and Environment Officer jointly visited site

Inspection report for construction of a 2 classroom block at

Kalungur P/S dated 19th April

2022, a team consisting of

DE,DEO,CDO and Environment Officer jointly visited site

DLG had evid nce of



Procurement, contract) at The e  
management/execution

9

m

Maximum points on  
this performance  
measure

projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes as follows:

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Kapolin P/S by Agobi General enterprises Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 29,089,284 issued on 17th February 2022 recommended by DEO and

Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 28th March 2022 under voucher NO 42515635

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Atutur P/S by Kaba General Hardware Ltd was

certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 62,906,614 issued on 10th June 2022 recommended by DEO and

Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 22nd June 2022 under voucher NO 44460360

.Construction of 2 classroom block at Kalungur P/S by Agobi General enterprises Ltd was certified by District Engineer for 1st payment UGX 29,089,284 issued on 17th February 2022 recommended by DEO and

Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 28th

13 1

Procurement, contract) Evidence that the  
management/execution o

e

9

m

March 2022 under voucher NO  
42515635

13

Procurement, contract h) If the LG Education

1

13 1

Procurement, contract) at The e  
management/execution

9

m

management/execution department timely

submitted a *Maximum*  
*9 points on* procurement plan in *this*  
*performance* accordance with the

*measure*

PPDA requirements to

the procurement unit by  
April 30, *score: 1, else,*  
*score: 0*

DEO submitted Procurement plan for  
sector projects to PDU on 9th April  
2021 which was before the deadline.

Procurement, contract management/execution a

*Maximum 9 points on this performance*

i) Evidence that the LG From a sample of 3 files, there has a complete was evidence to show that the LG procurement file for had a complete procurement file each school with all records as per PPDA.

infrastructure contract Examples of project files  
*measure* with all records as reviewed;

required by the PPDA

*Law score 1 or else* • Construction of a 2 classroom  
*score 0* block in Kapolin P/S ;minutes of

meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 15th February 2022 and evaluation report dated 23rd September 2021

• Construction of a 2 classroom block in AtutarP/S ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 15th February 2022 and evaluation report dated 23rd September 2021

• Construction of a 2 classroom block in Kalungur P/S ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-

1 0  
re The

2022, contract agreement signed  
15th February 2022 and evaluation  
report dated 23rd

September 2021

### Environment and Social Safeguards

4 *Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*  
Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0  
re was no functional grievance redress committee in place to handle complaints/ grievances based on project implementation. The committee that in place was the complaint desk committee with the task of the assignment to receive complaints deferred by the Inspectorate of Government back to the district to be handled at

15  
Safeguards for service delivery.

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 3, or else score:*

0  
district level according to the letters of appointment of the GRC members.

0

There was no evidence

16 0

Safeguards in the ) i  
delivery of investments

*Maximum points on this  
performance*

16 Safeguards in the  
delivery of investments

construction of a  
two classroom block  
at  
Kapolin Primary  
School costed at UGX.

The construction of a two classroom  
block at Atatur Primary School had no  
Costed ESMP to incorporated in its  
BOQ

*Maximum 6 points on*

6

a LG has in place a Not all Education projects had costed ESMP and  
this is costed ESMPs to incorporate in incorporated within the the  
respective BOQs.

m

measure

BoQs and contractual documents, *score: 2,* The Costed ESMPs  
for the two *else score: 0* projects that is, construction of a

*this performance  
measure*

6,815,000/- were  
incorporated in their  
respective

There was no evidence of any land  
ownership document for all the sampled  
Education projects implemented in  
previous FY

0

b) If there is proof of land  
ownership, access of school  
construction projects, *score:  
1, else score:0*

BOQs.

two classroom block at  
Kalungar Primary School  
costed at UGX.

However;

2021/2022

9,250,000/- and the

Safeguards in the ) i

delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure* The construction of a two classroom block at Kalungar

c Evidence that the Primary School.

Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on

recommended

corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports,

*score: 2, else score:0*

Only one monitoring and Supervision report for one education project was provided.

That is, Monitoring and Supervision report for the construction of a two classroom block at Atatur signed by Environment Officer and DCDO on 11/05/2022

There were no monitoring and Supervision reports for the other two education projects as listed below;

The construction of a two classroom block at Kapolin

Primary School

Safeguards in the ) i  
delivery of investments

d E&S There w s ev denc of  
certifications were Environment and Social approved and  
signed by Compliance Certificates prepared

6 the environmental signed by both DCDO and the  
m officer and CDO prior to Environment Officer prior to *measure*  
executing the project executing contractor payments.

contractor payments

The construction of a two  
*Score: 1, else score:0* classroom block at Kalungar  
Primary School

Contractor- Simpjo Tech (U) Ltd.

Payment date: 22/06/2022

Environment Officer and DCDO signed  
the Environment and

Social Compliance Certificate on

4/02/2022

The construction of a two classroom  
block at Kapolin Primary School.

Contractor- AGOBI General

Enterprises Ltd

Payment date: 22/06/2022

Environment Officer and DCDO signed  
the Environment and



Social Compliance Certificate on

25/5/2022

The construction of a two classroom  
block at Atatur Primary

School

Contractor- KABA General

Enterprises Ltd

Payment date: 22/06/2022

Environment Officer and DCDO signed  
the Environment and

Social Compliance Certificates on

31/05/2022

**Health Performance**

**Measures**

**Summary of No.  
requirements**

**Definition of compliance**

**Compliance justification**

**Score**

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**



1 2

New\_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.

. If the a registered attendance for previous FY and multiply by 100)  
1). Omatenga HCIII:

e 3).Agurutu HC III  
FY 2020/2021 deliveries = 104cases,  
FY 2021/2022 deliveries= 225 cases

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

FY 2020/2021 deliveries = 460cases,

increase in utilization = 121

% increase  $121/104 \times 100 = 116\%$  3

a LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.

FY 2021/2022 deliveries: 648cases

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

increase in utilization = 188

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

• By 20% or more, score 2

% Increase  $188/460 \times 100 = 41\%$

a LG budgeted

• Less than 20%, score

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.

0 Upon calculating the annual OPD

2). Atatur HCIII

attendance and deliveries for health facilities using the monthly reports (HMIS107). The summaries for the 3 sampled health facilities were as follows:

FY 2020/2021 deliveries = 877cases,

LG budgeted for UGX

FY 2021/2022 : 2092cases

159,380,438 and spent all the budgeted amount as indicated below;

increase in utilization = 1215

Construction of Maternity ward at Agaria HCII 103,980,012

(Percentage utilization = Registered attendance for previous FY minus registered attendance for current FY, divided by

% increase  $1215/877 \times 100 = 139\%$

Construction of maternity ward at

3 Investment performance: The LG has managed health

projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure  
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 Kanyum HCIII 47,878,197	. If the 22nd June 2022 to Kaba general	voucher N0 44585538 dated 22nd June 2022 to for construction of 2 stance lined pit latrine at Health department office amounting to UGX 8,853,010. DE, DHO, CDO signed however the Environment officer did not sign
Construction of VIP latrine at DHO's office 8,321,829	Hardware amounting to UGX 41,693,164 for construction of maternity ward at Kanyum HCIII ; DE,DHO signed however CDO and Environment Officer did not sign	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.
As per the sampled vouchers, CDO and Environment Officers were not signing on all the the payment certificates and vouchers as indicated below;	0 Voucher N0 42654124 dated 6th April 2022 to Alwar General works (U) Ltd amounting to UGX 93,682,012 for construction of maternity ward at Agaria HCII; DHO, DE,CDO and environment officer signed	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure c variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0 The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled Health sector projects were as follows:
Voucher N0 44460360 dated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Construction of a 2 stance lined pit latrine at the Health department office budgeted at UGX 10,000,000 actual was UGX 9,879,996 with a variation of UGX 120,000 represented by 1.2%.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the maternity ward at Kanyum HCIII budgeted at UGX 50,000,000, actual was UGX 49,282,700 with a variation of UGX 717,300 represented by – 1.4%.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Construction of the maternity ward at Agaria HCII budgeted at UGX 110,817,000 actual was UGX</li> </ul>

3 2

. If the  
t  
a  
  
e  
t

110,697,428 with a variation of  
119,572 represented by 0.1%.

The variations were within the range  
of +/- 20% as per the requirement

2

LG did not have projects for Upgrade  
of HCII-HCIII during previous FY

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this  
performance measure

d. Evidence that the  
health sector  
investment projects  
implemented in the  
previous FY were  
completed as per work  
plan by end of the FY •  
If 100 % Score 2  
• Between 80 and 99%  
score 1  
  
• less than 80 %: Score

0

<p>t . e t 4</p> <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 hat the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0 According to the staff structure of health center each HCIII has to be with 19 staff and HCIV 49 staff. The district had 6 HCIII and the staff filled Positions were 119.</li> </ul> <p>6X19=114</p> <p>119/114x100=104.3%</p> <p>The district did not have health center four</p>
<p>4</p> <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LG did not have projects for Upgrade of HCII-HCIII during previous FY</p>
<p><b>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</b></p>		
<p>5</p> <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>2</p> <p>The information on filled health workers' positions at the district was found to be</p>	<p>accurate and consistent with the staff found at the sampled health centers which included;</p> <p>Ongino HC III</p> <p>DHO 's list had 17 and HC list had 17,</p> <p>Nyero HC III</p> <p>DHO's list had 22 and HC list had 22</p>	<p>Kanyum HC III</p> <p>DHO's list had 20 and HC had 20</p> <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 hat information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate:</p> <p>Score 2 or else 0</p> <p>LG did not have any heal h facility upgraded in the previous FY</p>

	. e t t	
<p>6</p> <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance</p> <p>Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning</p>	<p>Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul> <p>There was evidence that the budgets were prepared by 31st March.</p> <p>For example;</p> <p>1) Nyero HCIII, prepared and submitted annual work plan and budget FY 2021/2022 by the Facility In charge on 14th July 2021.,</p> <p>2).Kamaca HCIII ,prepared and submitted annual work plan and budget by facility in-charge on 8th July 2021.</p>	<p>3).Mokongoro HC III prepared and submitted Annual work plan and budget by facility in-charge on 9th July 2021.</p> <p>Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> <p>b Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul> <p>The health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Budget Performance reports for FY 2021/2022 past July 15 of the previous FY as indicated from the sampled facilities below;</p>
		<p>0</p>

6

Health Facility ) a  
Compliance to the  
Budget and Grant  
Guidelines, Result  
Based Financing and  
Performance

1). Nyero HCIII, was prepared and submitted on 5th August 2021.

2). Kanyum HC III was prepared and submitted on 21st October 2021.

3) Ongino HCIII was prepared and submitted on 9th September, 2021

6

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

Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• Score 2 or else 0

LG Health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans as indicated below;

Nyero HCIII, forwarded information on 10th January 2022 and the issues included inadequate human resources, drug stock outs, inadequate staff accommodation,

Kanyumu HCIII, reported on 3rd March 2022 and issues included inadequate

2



. e t t

drug supplies, lack of  
ambulance services for  
referrals, inadequate staff  
housing

Ongino HCIII forwarded  
information on 10th  
February 2022

and major issues were  
inadequate staff  
accommodation , lack of  
ambulance services for  
referrals

<p>Health Facility ) Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance</p>	<p>t</p>	
<p>Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ted quarterly HMIS reports within the required timeline as illustrated below;  Mukongoro HCIII</p>	<p>Q1 submitted on 6th October 2021  Q2 submitted on 6th January 2022  Q3 submitted on 7th April 2022</p>
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure d Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,  • score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Q1 submitted on 6th October 2021  Q2 submitted on 6th January 2022  Q3 submitted on 7th April 2022  Q4 submitted on 7th July 2022  Olimayi HCIII<sub>2</sub></p>	<p>Q4 submitted on 6th July 2022  Omatenga HC III  Q1 submitted on 7th October 2021  Q2 submitted on 5th January 2022  Q3 submitted on 5th April 2022  Q4 submitted on 7th July 2022</p>
<p>LG health facilities submi Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e H alth 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>From s mpled facilities; Kamacha HC III Q1 submitted on 6th October 2021</p>
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>Q2 submitted on 5th January 2022 Q3 submitted on 13th April 2022</p>

Health Facility ) The  
 Compliance to the  
 Budget and Grant  
 Guidelines, Result  
 Based Financing and  
 Performance

Q4 submitted on 10th  
 July 2022

Q2 submitted on 12th January  
 2022

Omatenga HCIII

Q3 submitted on 6th April 2022

.Q1 submitted on 7th  
 October  
 2021

Q4 submitted on 10th July 2022

Q2 submitted on 6th  
 January  
 2022

Therefore, there were timely submission  
 of RBF invoices by

Health Facilities to DHO's office  
 Improvement: LG has enforced Health  
 Facility Compliance, Result Based  
 Financing and implemented Performance  
 Improvement support.

Q3 submitted on 6th  
 April 2022

Maximum 14 points on this performance  
 measure

Q4 submitted on 9th July  
 2022

**1**

Mukongoro HCIII

Q3 was submitted on 19th April  
 2022

Q1 submitted on  
 10th October 2021

Q4 was submitted on 14th July

6 Health Facility ) Evidence that e a  
 Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance  
 2022

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

four quarterly RBF invoices were submitted to MOH as follows;  
 Q1 was submitted 19th October 2021  
 Q2 was submitted on 20th January 2022

Therefore LG submitted to MOH within the required time line.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure  
 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  
 1 LG provided evidence as follows;  
 Q1 was submitted on 15th October 2021

Q2 was submitted on 17th January 2022  
 Q3 was submitted on 20th April 2022  
 Q4 was submitted on 22nd July 2022  
 Therefore LG timely submitted the budget performance reports

Health Facility ) Evidence that he There was a  
 Compliance to the  
 Budget and Grant  
 Guidelines, Result  
 Based Financing and  
 Performance

h t LG Improvement support.

has:

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

evidence th t LG prepared PIP for weakest performing health facility, Nyero HCIII and the issues included staff absenteeism, drug stock out and drunkardness of staff

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

Officer from Kamaca to Nyero HCIII as in charge,

Staff warning letter dated 10th August 2021 to Tino Esther enrolled midwife

Staff warning letter dated 3rd October 2021 to Otim Bosco, asst nursing Officer

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance

There was evidence that LG implemented PIP for weakest performing facility as indicated below;

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).

Improvement support.

transfer of Ajole Jane Clinical

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a t LG

) Evidence that he has:	There was	a	Government prepared by DHO 12th January 2022 and approved by the by CAO on 15th March 2022, page 1 of the approved budget
i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0	proof of the approved budget for the Health workers and, work plan for the Financial Year 2022-2023 Kumi Local		Amount budgeted was UGX 2,732,598,000

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

2

From Kumi DLG staff audit, for health department, the approved structure was 299 staff, the filled positions were 276, therefore the percentage deployment;  $276/299 \times 100$  representing 92% which was above the minimum requirement.

7 ) Evidence that he There was a  
 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 Maximum 9 points on this performance measure  
 b alth workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0 evidence th t the health

workers were deployed in their respective HCs visited included;,  
 · Nyero HC1II, duty roaster dated 1st October 2022, 22 staff were deployed  
 · Kanyumu HCIII, duty roaster dated 1st October 2022, 20 staff were deployed

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure  
 c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0

· Ongino HCIII, duty roaster dated 1st October 2022, 17 staff were deployed  
 As per the duty roasters there was evidence that staff were working at their respective places of deployment.

2 There was evidence that the LG had

) Evidence that he There was a publicized health worker's deployment and dissemination as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities' notice boards.

The displayed lists indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, designation, and gender among others.

The list that was displayed at each of the visited health facilities (Ongino HCIII, Nyero HCIII, Kanyum HCIII) was in tandem with the deployment list from the

DHO's office, dated 1st October 2022.



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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

DHO/MMOHs has:

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

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance

appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed

DHO /MMOHs conducted

annual performance appraisal of Health facility in charges against the agreed performance plans as follows.

1. Ms. Alupo Helen Senior medical clinical officer appraised by Oteeni Samuel Town Clerk on 23 /06/2022.
2. Ms. Isiman Betty nursing officer performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

The health facility in charges conducted performance appraisal reports of health facility workers against the agreed performance plans as follows,

1 was appraised by lisa Anne on 7/7/2022.

3. Akol Reuben senior clinical officer appraised by Aiyo Suzan senior SAS on 31/08/2022.

4. Ms. Aiju Proscovia enrolled Midwife appraised by Isoto Florence Osire nursing Officer midwife 29/07/2022.

5. Ms Ikilai Jane enrolled nurse was appraised by Akol Reuben SMCO on 12/07/2022.

6. Mr. Epabu Solomon enrolled nurse appraised by Akupo Helen SMCO on 30/6/2022.

1. Ms. Atuko Lydia enrolled nurse was appraised by Ms. Akello Teddy Assistant nursing officer on 30/6/2022.

2. Amoding Celina Rose enrolled midwife appraised by Ms. Akello Teddy Assistant Nursing Officer on 2/7/2022.

3. Ms. Adumo Sarah Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised by Mr. Okamanya Francis Senior Clinical Officer on 1/7/2022

4. Ms. Alimo Jane Enrolled Nurse was appraised by Ms. Akello Jenipher Nursing Officer on 30/6/2022.

P .

5. Ms. Akello Pheobe Ojelel Enrolled Nurse nurse was appraised by Ms. Apolot Josephine Ocloki Nursing Officer on 12/7/2022.

6. Ms. Bwade Anna Mary Enrolled Nurse was appraised by Oluput Omagor Edward on 1/8/2022.

7. Ms. Kanik Stella Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Olupot Omagor Edward clinical officer on 3/8/2022.

8. Ms. Akello Stella enrolled nurse was appraised by Ms. Aguti Ruth assistant nursing officer on 20/07/2022.

9. Ms. Epoodia Kevin enrolled nurse appraised by Ikilail Jane on 7/7/2022.

Some of the appraisal reports indicated that certain staff were appraised past the due financial year 2021/2022 thus not complaint clinical officer was transferred from Kamacha to Nyero HCIII due to absenteeism.

Tino Esther Enrolled Midwife was

sanctioned for indiscipline and warned on 3 /10/2022.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0  
There was evidence that corrective actions based on appraisal reports were implemented for instance Ms. Ajore Jane

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>LG provided evidence of training of Health works, a report on UNEPI training of cold chain Technicians dated 20th March 2022</p> <p>Report on training of staff on Covid 19 home based care dated 2nd October 2021</p> <p>Report on training of HUMT members on health promotion and prevention dated 21st July 2021</p>	<b>1</b>
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG provided evidence of documentation of training activities, as indicated in the training logbook which was opened on 8th January 2018; some of the trainings documented included, Training on health promotion and prevention, training on home based for covid 19, training on cold chain maintenance</p>	<b>1</b>

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

Planning, budgeting, .

f

a  
n  
d  
t  
r  
a  
n  
s  
f  
e  
r  
o  
f  
f  
u  
n  
d  
s  
f

a Evidence that the  
CAO/Town Clerk

confirmed the list of  
Health facilities (GoU

9 2

Planning, budgeting, c. e ft

a  
n  
d  
t  
r  
a  
n  
s  
f  
e  
r  
o  
f  
f  
u  
n  
d  
s  
f

2 or else score 0  
The CAO of Kumi DLG  
forwarded

a list of all health facilities which  
benefited from PHC grants to the

9 2

Planning, budgeting, d. If th LG ft

a  
n  
d  
t  
r  
a  
n  
s  
f  
e  
r  
o  
f  
f  
u  
n  
d  
s  
f

9 2

Planning, budgeting, e. e ft

a  
n  
d  
t  
r  
a  
n  
s  
f  
e  
r  
o  
f  
f  
u  
n  
d  
s  
f

budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

9 2

Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The	f. If th LG	f t
Local Government has Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	service delivery and management of District health services, in line with the health sector grant guidelines as follows;  Total budgeted for PHC was UGX 52,320,000  Monitoring allocation UGX 21,800,000  %allocation was (21,800,000/52,320,000) x100  which 41% which was above the minimum requirement budgeted, used and disseminated	funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum 9 points on this performance measure If th 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 LG provided evidence o imely warranting as per the schedule prepared by the district accountant.
Maximum 9 points on this performance measure		
b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH),		Q1 date of release was 19th August 2021 and date of warranting was 19th August 2021.  Q2 date of release was 11th November 2021 and date of warranting was 11th November 2021.
score 2 or else score 0. 2 The LG provided evidence that the allocations towards monitoring		Q3 date of release was 14th February 2022 and date of warranting was 14th Febraury 2022.



Planning, budgeting, g. e f t

and transfer of funds for service delivery: The

Local Government has

And Q4 date of release was 11th

May 2022 and warranting was 11th May 2022.

All the 4 quarter releases were warranted within the confines of 5 days

budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

e 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

LG provided evidence o imely invoicing and communication as per the schedule prepared by the district accountant

Q1 date of invoicing was 20th August 2021 and date of communication was 20th August 2021.

Q2 date of invoicing was 15th November 2021 and date of communication was 15th

November 2021

Q3 date of invoicing was 19th February 2022 and

date of communication was 19th Febraury2022.

And Q4 date of invoicing was 15th May 2022 and communication was 15th May 2022.

All the 4 quarter releases were warranted within the confines of 5 days

Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The

Local Government has

budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

2 or else score 0 Q2 expenditure limit receipt was 11th November 2021 and displayed on 15th November

2021

h. Evidence that 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

as evidence that he LG had publicized quarterly financial Q3 expenditure limit receipt was 10th January 2022 and displayed on 10th January 2022

Q4 expenditure limit receipt was 11th April 2022 and displayed on 11th April 2022

LG provided evidence that recommendations of DHMT were implemented

There was transfer Akol Reuben

Senior clinical Officer from

Ongino HCII to Kobwin HCIII

There w t releases for all the four quarters. These were displayed on the health department notice board, and on notice boards of all visited Health facilities notice boards.

Q1 expenditure limit receipt was 19th August 2021 and was displayed on 20th August 2021

There was disciplinary action taken against one of the security men

There were letters of warnings to some staff members who had been involved in habitual absenteeism  
 0 Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

b e 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

There was evidence to show that LG quarterly performance review

t igt . Evidence that	There w	
involved all in charges and implementing partner as indicated below	TB /leprosy supervisor, TASO	Q3minutes dated 20th January 2022 at DHO’s office, all in charges attended, RDC, CDO, CAO, TASO
Q1 minutes dated 26th July 2021 at DHO’s office, all in charges attended, RDC, CAO, LV5, CDO,	Q2 minutes dated 18th October 2021 at DHO’s office, all in charges attended, RDC, CDO, , TASO	Q4 minutes dated 26th May 2022 at DHO, all in charges attended, RDC, CDO, TB/Leprosy supervisor, TASO
<p>10</p> <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 <b>1</b> The LG did not have HCIVs and general hospitals (including PNFPs recieving PHC) Routine overs h 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</p>	<p>DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score ere reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the lower Health facilities examples included;</li> </ul> <p>Comprehensive report on joint support supervision of Lower HC by Atatur Hospital dated 29th March 2021</p> <p>comprehensive report on joint support supervision of Lower HC by Atatur hospital dated 12th</p>
<p>10</p> <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG</p>	<p>monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health</p>	<p>facilities.</p>

1

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure  
e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure  
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

There was a report on SPARS supervision to Kumi Health centers dated 16th May 2022

There was a report on supervision of HCs regarding management of medicines dated 13th October 2021

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure  
e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure  
1 or else score 0  
December 2021

he LG provided proof of use of results from recommendations as

1

illustrated,

there were staff transfers effected like Akol Reuben In charge Ongin HCIII was transferred to Kobwin HCIII

1 There was warning letter dated 15th February 2022 to Amongin Stella enrolled nurse for absenteeism

	t i . If th LG e e		
	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>are allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities,</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0 2</p> <p>From the budget release for health department of 2021/2022, page5, non-wage was UGX</p>	<p>52,320,000</p> <p>a) allocations</p> <p>to health promotion was UGX 25,000,000</p> <p>percentage allocation</p> <p>25,000,000/52,320,000 giving 48%</p>
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0 1</p>	<p>There was evidence presented regarding health promotion and prevention ,</p> <p>A mobilization report on mass covid 19 round 2 vaccination dated 11th March 2022</p>
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports:</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0 1</p> <p>1 There was a report on water quality assessment dated 18th</p> <p>January 2022</p> <p>A report on covid 19 contact tracing dated 15th March 2022</p>	<p>A report on sanitation data collection dated 8th October 2021</p> <p>dated 22nd June 2022 lanning a d 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 e LG</p> <p>has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score</p> <p>1 or else 0</p> <p>f availability</p>
<b>Investment Management</b>	<p>Report on covid 19 vaccination status</p>		<p>of asset r gister which includes land, equipment and machinery updated 30th June 2022; equipments included in last financial year included; 10 motorcycles, 5 office computers, lab equipments etc</p>

12 1

P n . Evidence that th There was evidence o

12 (ii) desk appraisal by the Health Sector for FY 2021/2022 were derived from the LG

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

LG; and

Development plan

(iii) eligible for

expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary

The prioritized investments phased Construction of Surgical ward at Serere HC1V was linked to the LGDP page 125

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Development

Kamod Hc11 upgrade to HC111 wa linked to LGDP page 125.

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were:

Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0 0

There was no evidence that the

(i) derived from the third

The prioritized investments in the

LG had conducted desk Appraisal

LG Development Plan

The two prioritized projects were eligible for expenditure under

(LGDPIII);

DDEG guidelines

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

1 or else score 0

0 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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

There was no evidence that the

LG had conducted field Appraisal

f

c. Evidence that the LG

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

Environment and Social screening reports and costed ESMPs for all the sampled health projects implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.

has conducted field

Screening report for the construction of a 2 stance lined pit latrine at Health Offices

Appraisal to check for:

(i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

signed by DCDO and

Environment Officer on

13

1 1

P n . Evidence that the There was evidence o

<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 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 9/02/2022 and costed ESMP at</p>	<p>DHO submitted Health Sector Procurement Plan on 14th April 2022 which was within the 30th April deadline</p>
--	---	---

UGX. 5,015,000/-

Screening report for the construction of Maternity ward at Kanyum HCIII (Phase III) signed by DCDO and Environment

Officer on 9/02/2022 and costed

ESMP at UGX. 4,500,000/-

Screening report for the construction of Maternity ward at Agaria HCII signed by the

Environment Officer on

9/04/2022 and costed ESMP at

UGX. 9,595,000/-

Procurement, contract. e a th There was evidence o s o  
 management/execution: t e  
 The LG b If th LG He l departmen t h w that  
 procured and submitted procurement the LG H alth department  
 managed health request form (Form PP1) submitted procurement request  
 contracts as to the PDU by 1st form (PP1) to PDU by 1st quarter of  
 per guidelines Quarter of the current the current FY; as per sampled  
 Maximum 10 points on FY: score 1 or else, score projects below;  
 this performance 0  
 measure  
 –Completion of PP1 was submitted on 21st April  
 construction of  
 maternity ward at  
 Kanyum HCIII,

13 2022 which was the sampled projects below;  
 Procurement, contract within the required  
 management/execution: timeframe.  
 The LG procured and -Construction of  
 managed health Maternity ward at  
 contracts as per Agaria HCIII, PP1  
 guidelines was submitted on  
 Maximum 10 points on 21st April 2022  
 this performance  
 measure  
 c. Evidence that the health 1  
 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  
 There was  
 evidence that the  
 Health  
 infrastructure  
 projects for the  
 previous FY were  
 approved by the  
 Contracts  
 Committee as per  
 d LG  
 properly es ablished a  
 Project implementation  
 team for all health  
 the sampled projects below;  
 1. Construction of Maternity  
 ward at Kanyum HCIII was  
 approved on 24th September 2021  
 under meeting minute NO  
 6/KDCC/09-  
 1/2021-2022  
 2. Construction of Maternity  
 ward at Agaria HCII was approved  
 on 24th September 2021 under  
 meeting minute NO 4/KDCC/09-  
 1/2021-2022  
 3. Construction of 2 stance  
 lined pit latrine at Health  
 department office was approved on  
 18th March 2022 under meeting  
 minute NO 4/KDCC/18-3/2021-  
 2022  
 projects composed of: (i) :  
 score 1 or else score 0



13 1

Procurement, contract. Evidence that the  
ve ets o management/execution: t

T  
h  
e

L  
G

p  
r  
o  
c  
u  
r  
e  
d

a  
n

13 1

Procurement, contract . Evidence that the ve e ts o management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines

measure

project, provide the score

Upgrade of HCII-HCIII in the previous FY

LG did not ha proj c f r

13

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs

provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

1

LG did not have projects for Upgrade of HCII-HCIII in the previous FY

13

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works

that are consolidated weekly to the District

Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

(SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson maintains daily records

If there is no project, provide the score

1

contracts as per guidelines

LG did not have projects for Upgrade of HCII-HCIII in the previous FY

g LG

the Community

held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief

Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0

of the HUMC, in-charge

If there is no project, provide the score

for beneficiary facility ,

LG did not ha proj c f r

Upgrade of HCII-HCIII in the previous FY

13

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and

managed health contracts as per guidelines

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least

13 1

Procurement, contract. Evidence that the

ve e ts o management/execution: t

The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

**1**

LG did not have projects for Upgrade of HCII-HCIII in the previous FY

Procurement, contract. Evidence that he management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	The v e t	
Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	District Engineer for 2nd payment	initiated and timely paid on 22nd June 2022 under voucher NO 44585538
i t 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	UGX 41,693,164 issued on 14th June 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 22nd June 2022 under voucher NO 44460360	3. Construction of Maternity ward in Agaria was certified by District Engineer 1st payment UGX 93,368,925 issued on 18th February 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was initiated and timely paid on 6th April 2022 under voucher NO 42654124 guidelines
LG had evidence that DHO verified works however some payments were initiated and effected beyond the 2 weeks timeframes as per the sampled projects below:	0 2. Construction of 2 stance lined pit latrine at Health department office by certified by District Engineer Final payment UGX 8,853,010 issued on 14th June 2022 with recommendation from the DHO and Subsequent payment to the contractor was	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure j t 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 From a sample of 3 files, there was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. Examples of project files reviewed;
1. Construction of Maternity ward at Kanyum HCIII by Kaba general hardware Ltd was certified by		

re . Evidence tha he The

- Constructio n of maternity ward in Agaria HCII ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 24th September 2021, minute 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 15th December 2021 and evaluation report dated 23rd September 2021.

1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 4th April 2022 and evaluation report dated 18th March 2022

- Constructio n of 2 stance lined pit latrine at Health Department office ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a t t

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

0

re was no functional grievance redress committee in place to handle complaints/ grievances based on

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

- Constructio n of maternity ward in Kanyum HCIII ;minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 18th March 2022, minute 6/KDCC/03-

18th March 2022, minute 4/KDCC/03-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 7th April 2022 and evaluation report dated 18th March 2022 4

project implementation. The committee that in place was the complaint desk committee with the task of the assignment to receive complaints deferred by the Inspectorate of Government back to the district to be handled at district level according to the letters of appointment of the GRC members.

15

Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures

safeguards for service delivery

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health

13 1

Procurement, contract. Evidence that he management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per

facilities : score 2 points or else score 0

0

There was evidence of guidelines at the visited health facilities (Omatenga HCIII, Nyero HCIII and Kanyum HCIII) however, there was no evidence on follow up on their implementation

1	0	Safeguards	Evidence that he The
5	<p>for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> <p>b. t t LG</p>	<p>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>re was no operational/ dedicated budget for medical waste management in the LG current FY Annual budget. According to the ADHO, medical waste management was budgeted under Health promotion and disease prevention (reference: Kumi Health Department annual work plan) with only 2 subsets that is, allowance for Advocacy and social mobilization and;</p>
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>All Health facilities never had incinerators and were practicing open burning of medical waste in open pits.</p>	<p>Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p>
c.	<p>Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0 allowances for health inspection for health activities which does not stress out Medical/ healthcare waste management budget.</p>	<p>There was evidence of the training report on waste management in health facilities dated 14/04/2022 signed by ADHO-EH Mr. Oonyu Moses with attendance list attached</p> <p>6</p> <p>S in th</p>	<p>a. t a</p> <p>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 2</p> <p>costed ESMPs were incorporated in their respective BOQs</p>
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG</p>	<p>Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards</p>	<p>in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG</p>

1 0

Safeguards in the delivery of health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

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

0  
There was no documentary evidence in the form of any land ownership document for health infrastructure projects available during Assessment time.

16  
Safeguards in the delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

delivery of the investments  
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure  
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.

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 of any prepared and signed Environment and Social compliance Certificate available by the Environment Officer

There were no monitoring and supervision reports available to the assessment team during assessment time.

6

on the

Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the



Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures

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

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the sector MIS report for access, functionality and population density for 2021/22, the functionality of water facilities for Kumi District was 87%. This was between 80 and 89%.	1
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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:  o 90 - 100%: score 2  o 80-89%: score 1  o Below 80%: 0	According to the District Software MIS report for 2021/22, Kumi District had the functionality of water user committees of 96%, which was between 90 and 100%.	2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment performance assessment	Th	
2	<p>a The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is</p> <p>a. Above 80% score 2</p> <p>b. 60 -80%: 1</p>	<p>c. Below 60: 0</p> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts) is issue will be assessed when the ongoing performance assessment for LLGs is completed</p>
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		
2	<p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p> <p>Kumi district had a safe water coverage of 78%. The sub counties below this were</p> <p>Mukongoro at 62% and Kanyum at 68%.</p> <p>In 2021/22 financial year, Kumi LG drilled 9 boreholes and 1 production well as follows;</p> <p>1. Apapai community borehole in Atatur Sub County (DWD 87538)</p> <p>2. Okemer community borehole</p>	<p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>3. Kongura community borehole in Ongino Sub County, now Kanapa Sub County, (DWD 87536)</p> <p>4. Moruita community borehole in Nyero Sub County (DWD 87535)</p> <p>5. Apeduru community borehole in Kanyum Sub County (DWD 87539)</p> <p>6. Okatabu community borehole in Ongino Sub County (DWD 87534)</p> <p>7. Omiriamiria community borehole in Mukongoro Sub County, now Kadami Sub County, (DWD 87532)</p>
<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>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p> <p>in Kanyum Sub County, now Kamaca Sub County, (DWD 87533)</p>

8. Achede community borehole in Mukongoro Sub County, now  
Kadami Sub County, (DWD  
87531)
9. Agolitom community borehole in Kumi Sub County  
(DWD 87537)
10. And Kajamaka production well in Kanyum Sub County  
(DWD 87579)

It also constructed 15 protected springs with 3 in Atatur Sub County, 5 in Kanyum Sub County, 4 in Mukongoro Sub County, and 3 in Nyero Sub County.

It finally extended water to Dr. Aporu Okol Memorial Seed School in Nyero Sub County and designed a piped water scheme at Akadot in Mukongoro Sub County.

15 of the 27 water projects were located in the two sub counties with safe water coverage below that of the district.

$$(14/27) * 100 = 55.6\%$$

This was less than 80%

Service	Delivery	Performance	Average score in the water and environment performance assessment	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure
2		Average score in the water and environment performance assessment	<p>If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of engineer's estimates</p> <p>If within +/-20% score 2</p> <p>If not score 0</p>	<p>free contracts were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of 9 boreholes and 1 production well was estimated at UGX 230,000,000 and contracted at UGX 214,055,928. The variation was +8.9%</li> <li>2. Protection of 2 springs under and design another piped water scheme.</li> </ol> <p>All the above 44 water and sanitation projects were completed by the end of the financial year.</p> <p><math>(44/44) * 100 = 100\%</math></p> <p>N w_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>
2	Service Delivery	Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment	<p>3. And the construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Tisai</p> <p>Island was estimated at UGX 22,595,491 and constructed at UGX 22,464,486. The variation was +0.58%</p> <p>All water projects had their variations within +/-20% of the engineer's estimates</p>	<p>2</p> <p>If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p> <p>lot 4 was estimated at UGX 13,000,000 and contracted at UGX 12,582,045. The variation was +3.2%</p> <p>For the financial year 2021/22, Kumi LG planned to construct 9 boreholes, 1 production well and 15 protected springs. It also planned to rehabilitate 16 boreholes, extend one piped water scheme</p>
d. % of WSS	infrastructure projects	completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.		

3 2  
e . e e Th

3 New\_Achievement of Standards: o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

o If there is no increase : score 0.  
The functionality of water and sanitation committees was 99% in 2020/21 and 96% in 2021/22, hence a decrease of 3

0

b. If there is an Increase in %

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

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

Three facilities constructed in 2021/22 were visited and these were; Kongura community borehole in Kanapa sub county, Apapai community borehole in Atatur Sub County, and Achede community borehole in Kadami Sub County.

3

All these three facilities were found in place and were functioning as had been reported in the 4th quarter report for 2021/22 financial year.

of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).

percentage points between the two financial years.

The DWO attributed this decline to the on and off covid restrictions which led to a reduction in community mobilization activities.

o If increase is more than 1% score 2

e or . e ha e Th  
e

S

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

a Evidence that the LG

5

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

- Quarter three monitoring report dated 8th April 2022

Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on subcounty water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2  
ere were water source monitoring reports for all the

- And quarter four monitoring report dated 8th July 2022.

The information collected in these reports were used to fill in the form 4 water source monitoring reports from the Ministry of Water and Environment.

Quarterly form 4 monitoring reports for all the water sources were submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment for updating of the MIS database as follows; Quarter one reports were submitted on 29th October 2021, quarter two reports

four quarters and these were as follows;

- Quarter one monitoring report was dated 30th September 2021
- Quarter two monitoring report dated 7th January 2022

on 18th January 2022, quarter three reports on 13th April 2022, and quarter four reports on 18th July 2022.

Form water reports on new water sources were also submitted to the Ministry on 18th July 2022, along with those for quarter four.

3

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

5  
 Evidence that DWO or . e has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans:  
 Score 2 or else 0

*Note: Only applicable from the assessment*

*where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.*

0

Not applicable for Financial Year 2021/22 assessment

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6  
 Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff

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

Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician:  
 Score 2

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &

b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff:

6 Sanitation staff: 1 Civil

e or . ha  
1 Natural Resources

*Maximum 6 points  
on this performance  
measure*

Officer; 1 Environment

Officer; 1 Forestry

a The DWO s

Officer: Score 2

**2**

appraised District Water  
Office staff against the  
agreed performance plans  
during the previous

There was evidence that  
the DWO budgeted  
76,958,020

FY: Score 3

shillings for the Civil Engineer

**3**

(Water), Engineering  
Assistant

Mr. Mawanga Peter  
Patience Civil  
Engineer was  
appraised by Mr.  
Orone Justine Senior  
Engineer.

(Water) and the Borehole  
Maintenance Technician.

The DWO had only one  
staff to appraisal

**2**

There was evidence that the

Environment and Natural

Resource Officer budgeted

UGX 147.000.000 for  
the Forestry Officer and  
other staffs.

7

P r f mance

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



Performance

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

3

During the staff appraisal for

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

8 0

Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service

2021/2022, the DWO identified capacity gaps in areas such as data management, bookkeeping, water quality testing and preventive management.

In the Capacity Building Work

Plan for Kumi LG for

2022/2023, dated 12th May

2022, the LG had allowed for UGX 5,000,000 for skills development courses not exceeding one month. The Human Resource Officer said that this was the money that

would be used to train staff in basic skills such as computer skills, data management and bookkeeping among others, from which the staff in water would use. He also said that the said training had not been embarked on as the funds for such activities had not been released.

For courses exceeding one month, like water quality management, the Human

Resources Officer said that the LG did not have the funds to sponsor such cases. It however encouraged the respective officers to organize and conduct such courses on their own private arrangement. The LG on the other hand would give those officers study leave with full salary to enable them undertake those trainings.

a) Evidence that the At the time of planning for DWO has prioritized Financial Year 2022/23, Kumi budget allocations District had a safe water to sub-counties that coverage of 80%. The sub have safe water counties with their safe water coverage below that coverage below this were

<p>delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>40,825,000</p>	<p>latrine in Kanyum Sub County at UGX 20,500,000.</p>
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>3. Protect 7 springs, 2 in Mukongoro Sub County, 2 in Kanyum Sub County, 1 in Nyero Sub County, 1 in Ongino Sub County and the other in Atatur Sub County each estimated at UGX 6,500,000.</p>	<p>The LG allocated UGX 229,906,530 to the sub counties with safe water coverage below that of the district, out of the entire development budget of UGX 497,891,807.</p>
<p>of the district:</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> </ul>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p></p>	<p><math>(229,906,530/497,891,807)*100</math></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p></p>	<p>= 42.6%</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If below 60 %:</li> </ul>	<p></p>	<p>8</p>
<p>Score 0 Mukongoro at 66% and Kanyum at 74%.</p>	<p>4. Design 2 piped water scheme, 1 in Kanyum and the other in Mukongoro Sub Counties each estimated at UGX 30,715,765</p>	<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>For the Financial Year 2022/2023, Kumi LG planned</p>	<p></p>	<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>
<p>to;</p>	<p></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to</p>
<p>1. Construct 3 boreholes, 1 in Kumi Sub County, and 2 in Mukongoro Sub County, each estimated at UGX 26,000,000.</p>	<p>5. Rehabilitate 12 boreholes, 5 in Mukongoro Sub County, 1 in Kumi Sub County, 3 in Ongino Sub County, 1 in Atatur Sub County and 2 in Nyero Sub County, each estimated at UGX 5,830,000</p>	<p>the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3 This was less than 60%</p>
<p>2. Construct 2 production wells, 1 in Ongino Sub County and the other in Mukongoro Sub County, each estimated at UGX</p>	<p></p>	<p>The DWO communicated to the LLGs on their water source allocation via a letter on 8th July 2022. Kanapa Sub County received its letter on 12th July, Atatur received its letter on 11th July, and Ongino received its letter on 8th July 2022 among others.</p>
<p>UGX</p>	<p>6. And construct a 4 stance VIP</p>	<p></p>

<p>9</p> <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS</p>	<p>facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> <li>If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>4</p> <p>There were form 4 monitoring reports for all the point water sources in the district for all the quarters of 2021/2022. This gave the indication that at least 95% of all the water sources had been monitored for each of the four quarters of 2021/2022</p>
<p>9</p> <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>boreholes that were not working like the one for Kanyum Primary School and Ominai village, and some communities were using water from unprotected springs.</p> <p>2. The DWSCC meeting for quarter two was held on 16th November 2021. In this</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</p> <p>the current FY AWP.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings as follows;</p> <p>1. The DWSCC meeting for quarter one was held on 24th September 2021. In this meeting, key issues from quarterly monitoring of WSS were discussed under minute 4/2021/2022. These included meeting, key issues from quarterly monitoring of WSS were discussed under minute 4/2021/2022. These included some communities not contributing money towards O&amp;M, some water user committees being nonfunctional, and some communities sharing water with animals.</p> <p>3. The DWSCC meeting for quarter three was held on 24th March 2022 and under minute 4/2021/2022, key issues from monitoring were discussed. These included low yield on some protected springs due to the prolonged drought, and non-functional water user committees for some water facilities.</p>

4. The DWSCC meeting for quarter four was held on 8th July 2022. In this meeting, key issues from quarterly monitoring of WSS were discussed under minute 4/2021/2022 which included the completed water projects for 2021/2022.

Among the recommendations discussed and carried into the Financial Year of 2022/2023 were protecting 7 more springs, rehabilitating 12 boreholes and retraining of the nonfunctional water user committees.



e

<p>9</p> <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all subcounties:</p>	<p>Score 2 Displayed on the notice board at the District Water Office was a list of water projects planned for the Financial Year 2022/2023, dated 8th July 2022. This display indicated the water source allocations for the different Lower Local Governments.</p>
<p>10</p> <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>	<p>• If not score 0</p> <p>The NWR budget for 2021/22 was UGX 70,294,978 of which UGX 37,106,154 was allocated to software activities which included conducting advocacy meetings at district and sub county level, establishing and training water user committees, and conducting home improvement campaigns</p>	<p>= 52.3%</p> <p><b>3</b></p> <p>This was more than 40% of Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>b For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3. raining of water user committees was done in the months of June and July 2022. Among the topics that the water user committees were taken through were hygiene and sanitation, safe water chain,</p>
<p>• If funds were allocated score 3</p> <p><b>Investment Management</b></p>	<p>(37,106,154/70,294,978) * 100</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>above information such as collecting O&amp;M funds and maintaining good hygiene at the water facilities and constructing fences around the water sources to keep animals away.</p>
<p>11</p> <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>responsibilities of the different water user committee members and bookkeeping among others.</p> <p>The water user committees members for all the visited boreholes of Kongura, Apapai and Achede demonstrated recall of some of the</p>	<p>4</p> <p>Kumi LG water department had an asset register which had a total of 896 water sources including 462 boreholes, 234 spring wells and 164 shallow wells among others.</p>

1 3

i n i . T

It had also been updated to include water facilities that had been constructed in the Financial Year 2021/2022.

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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 nonfunctional 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:

all WSS projects as indicated below;

Drilling and construction of bore holes appraised on 5th July 2021

Construction of 3 stance lined pit latrine in Tisal S/C was appraised on 5th July 2021

Extension of piped water supply to Dr Aporu Okol memorial Seed school was appraised on 5th July 2021

Score 4 or else score 0. here was evidence to show that LG conducted Desk appraisals for





11 2

Planning and Budgeting . et T e

for Investments  
is conducted  
effectively

*Maximum 14 points on  
this performance  
measure*

c All budg ed  
investments for current  
FY have completed

applications from  
beneficiary communities:

Score 2  
he District Wat r Officer  
had on file community  
applications for all the

planned water facilities for  
2022/23. For example;

1. The community of

4. The community of Ariet village in  
Kanyum Sub County applied to have  
their spring protected on 10th June  
2022.

5. And the community of

Okomion village in Kumi Sub  
County applied for a community  
borehole on 4th July 2022 among  
others.

11

Planning and Budgeting  
for Investments is  
conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on  
this performance measure*

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

Opetoi/Kajamaka applied to have their spring  
protected on 26th June 2022.

0

There was no documentary evidence to  
show that field appraisals were  
conducted

2. The community of Obotia village applied to have their  
spring protected on 15th June 2022.

3. The community of Amosingo village applied for a  
community borehole on 28th June 2022.

*Maximum 14 points on  
this performance  
measure*

e all water  
infrast icture 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

None of the curr nt FY

2022/2023 water infrastructural  
projects had been screened for  
Environment and Social risks by  
assessment time. There was no  
evidence in the form of  
Environment and Social screening  
reports.

0

12

Contract

Procurement and

<p>Planning and Budgeting conducted effectively Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>. Evidence that . Construction of 15 spring wells, page 3 , Rehabilitation of 16 bore holes, Page 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a piped water supply for Dr. Aporu Okol</li> </ul>	<p>e for Investments is r projects for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee as indicated below;</p> <p>Extension of piped water supply to Dr. Aporu Okol memorial Seed SS was approved on 24th September</p>
<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Memorial Seed Secondary School, Page 3 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>2021 under meeting minute N0 4/KDCC/09-1/2021-2022</p> <p>Drilling and installation of 9 deep bore holes and 1 production well was approved on 24th September 2021 under meeting minute N0 4/KDCC/091/2021-2022</p>
<p>There was evidence to show that the WSS infrastructure investments for previous FY were incorporated in the LG procurement plan approved by CAO on 2nd August 2021;</p>	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Rehabilitation of 8 bore holes in selected sites lot 1 was approved on 18th March 2022 under meeting minute N0</p>
<p>Sampled projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Siting, Drilling and Construction of 9 deep bore holes in Kumi District, Page 3</li> </ul>	<p>b water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2: There was evidence that the water sector</p>	<p>4/KDCC/18-3/2021-2022</p>

Procurement and . Evidence that the e  
Contracts

Management/execution:

The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  
*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

Distric Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines  
Score 2:  
According to th letter of appointment by CAO dated 4th Jan 2022

reviewed by the assessor, the Project Implementation team for the Water sector was fully established as per the guidelines. The list of members appointed included;  
Okiring Alex - CDO

12

Procurement and Contract

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

DWO: Score 2  
Orone Justine-DE/Project manager

Opio Moses-Environment officer

Mawanga Peter-DWO/contracts manager

Imem Deo-Clerk of works

Aboyo Catherine-Labour officer

There boreholes constructed in 2021/2022 were visited and assessed. These were;

Kongura community borehole in Kanapa Sub County, Apapai community borehole in Atutur Sub County and Achede community borehole in Kadami Sub County.

All these boreholes were found to have been constructed as per the bills of quantities, and that there were no serious defects on them except normal wear and tear.

2

d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the

Procurement and . s e

Contract

Management/execution:

The LG has effectively

managed the WSS procurements

relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects:

Score 2

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

LG provided evidence of joint technical supervision of water sector projects contained in the reviewed inspection reports indicated below;

Inspection report for construction of piped water supply to DR Aporu Okol Seed School dated 23rd March 2022, a team consisting of

DE,DWO,CDO and Environment Officer jointly participated

Inspection report for siting, drilling and installation of 9 deep boreholes in Kumi District dated 29th July 2021, a team consisting of DE,DWO,CDO and Environment Officer jointly participated

Inspection report for construction of spring wells for Kumi District dated 28th April

2022, a team consisting of DE,DWO,CDO and

Environment Officer jointly participated

managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

f For the sampled

contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within

specified timeframes in the contracts

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

Procurement and Contract . Evidence that the

Management/execution:

The LG has effectively

From the amplified projects below, payment to contractors were initiated and made within specified 2 months' timeline,:

1. Construction of piped water supply to Dr Aporu Okol memorial seed school by Balbert water solutions Ltd was verified by DWO for payment UGX 87,292,391 issued on 29th March 2022 and Subsequent payment to the

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements	Icon projects Ltd was verified by DWO for 1st payment UGX 203,349,961 issued on 13th June 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 23rd June 2022 under voucher NO 44460166	complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;  The projects included;  . Construction of piped water supply to Dr. Aporu Okol memomerial seed school  ,minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision
	<i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>		
g.	Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 2, If not score 0 contractor was effected on 11th May 2022 under voucher NO 43265339	3 Rehabilitation of 8 bore holes in Kumi District by Icon projects Ltd was verified by DWO for payment UGX 35,290,752 issued on 7th June 2022 and Subsequent payment to the contractor was effected on 22nd June 2022 under voucher NO 44460208	

2. Siting,Drilling and Installation of 9 bore holes in Kumi District by

The DLG had evidence of

dated 24th September 2021,  
minute 4/KDCC/09-1/20212022,  
contract agreement signed 15th  
December 2021 and evaluation  
report dated

23rd September 2021

- Rehabilitation of 8 bore holes ;

minutes of meeting for contracts  
committee decision dated 18th  
March 2022, minute 6/KDCC/03-  
1/2021-2022, contract agreement  
signed 7th April 2022 and  
evaluation report dated 18th  
March 2022

- Siting and Construction of 9  
deep bore holes

,minutes of meeting for contracts  
committee decision dated 24th  
September 2021, minute  
4/KDCC/09-1/20212022, contract  
agreement signed 9th February  
2022 and evaluation report dated  
23rd

September 2021

Construction of 15 spring wells

minutes of meeting for contracts  
committee decision dated 18th  
March 2022, minute 6/KDCC/03-  
1/2021-2022, contract agreement  
signed 7th April 2022 and  
evaluation report dated 18th  
March 2022

Construction of 3 stance lined pit  
latrine in Tisal S/C

e e There was c

minutes of meeting for contracts committee decision dated 18th March 2022, minute 6/KDCC/03-1/2021-2022, contract agreement signed 7th April 2022 and evaluation report dated 18th March 2022

### Environment and Social Requirements

<p>3</p> <p>Gri vance Redr ss: 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</p>	<p>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>no fun tional grievance redress committee in place to handle complaints/ grievances based on project implementation. The committee that in place was the complaint desk committee with task of the assignment to receive complaints deferred by the Inspectorate of Government back to the district to be handled at district level according to the letters of appointment of the GRC members.</p>
<p>14</p> <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</p>	<p>have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> <p>There was evidence of guidelines on water source management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>and catchment protection and natural resource management.</p> <p>However, There were no minutes from the dissemination meeting of the guidelines to the Sub-county CDOs by the DWO and Environment Officer. The guidelines were just sent to the CDOs on 05/07/2021.</p>
<p>15</p> <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource</p>	<p>There were no water source protection plans and natural resource management plans availed</p>	<p>by the Environment Officer and the DCDO during Assessment time.</p> <p>5</p> <p>Saf guards in th 0 Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>

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

Score 3, If not score 0

eviden e  
 that the Local Government constructed water facilities on land where there was consent from the land owners. For example;

1. On 11th February 2022, Mr. Odeke M of Kajamaka village in Kanyum sub county gave part of his land for construction of Otuta protected spring
2. On 23rd April 2022, Mr. Oroba Apollo Milton of Akatabu village in Ongino Sub County gave part of his land for construction of the

c  
 Okatabu community borehole.

3. On 10th November 2021, Ms. Amogin Sarah of Kongura village in Kanapa Sub County gave part of her land for construction of Kongura community Borehole.

4. And on 12th March 2022, Mr. Osuret Solomon of Moruita village in Nyero Sub County gave part of his land for construction of Moruita community borehole among others.



1

5 Evidence that There was  
 Score 2, If not score 0

Saf guards in th  
 Delivery of Investments  
*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

c. E&S

c  
 0 memorial seed school by Balbert water solutions Ltd

under voucher NO 44460166 dated 23rd June 2022 for  
 Siting,Drilling and Installation of  
 9 bore holes in Kumi District by Icon projects Ltd

Micro-scale  
 Irrigation  
 Performance  
 Measures

**Summary of**

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

**Local Government Service Delivery Results**

	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:	per payment vouchers indicated below;  voucher NO 43265339 dated 11th May 2022 for Construction of piped water supply to Dr Aporu Okol	voucher NO 44460208 dated 22rd june 2022 for  Rehabilitation of 8 bore holes in Kumi District by Icon projects Ltd
15	Safeguards in the  Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0 0 One of the three WSS projects never had a monitoring and supervision report, that is, the extension of piped water to Dr.	The other two water projects, that is, the construction of  Kongura community borehole in Kanapa sub-county and construction of Apapai community borehole in Atatur Sub-county had single monitoring reports dated 4/06/2022. The monitoring reports were not done on a monthly basis.
d.	Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with	Apom Okol Memorial Seed Secondary School.	1 Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land

## Evidence that

<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 nonbeneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>2</b></p>	<p>The data on irrigated land were available. In FY 2020/21 report authored by the Senior Agricultural Engineer – Agnes Adikini and submitted to CAO on 1/7/2021 indicated that 29 acres of land were under irrigation in different sub counties. A 30th June 2022 report authored by Agnes Adikini</p>	<p>indicated the land under irrigation had increased to 46.5 acres. In the year, the Ministry of Water and Environment commissioned Amosingo small scale irrigation system with 9 acres of land under drip irrigation system and two other farmers.</p> <p>All the irrigated land belonged to farmers who were non – beneficiary of UGiFT's micro scale irrigation program.</p>
--	---	---

2

<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) the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the reports by Senior Agricultural Engineer, the District in the FY 2020/21 had 29 acres of irrigated land which increased to 46.5 acres in the FY 2022/23. Therefore, the increase in the irrigated land was</p> $((46.5 - 29)/29) \times 100 = 60.3\%$
--	--	--

3	<p>Investment</p> <p>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):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the District was in the second phase of the UGiFT microscale irrigation program and thus had no support for the program in the previous FY. Even the approved work plan for the Production and Marketing Department had no activities related to UGiFT micro-scale irrigation program planned for FY</p> <p>2021/22</p>	0
3	<p>Investment</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the microscale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY</p> <p>2022/23.</p>	1



<p>Investment</p> <p>Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>because the projects had not yet started. Therefore, no supplier quote/contract and Engineer estimates/Bill of quantities were presented for assessment</p>
---	---	--

Maximum score 6

3

Investment

0

<p>Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p>	<p>Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment for both demonstration and farmers' sites were neither procured nor installed yet. The District was in the second phase of the project and the preparatory activities such as awareness creation, was just planned for the FY</p>
---	---	---

Maximum score 6

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

2022/23

		4	0
		Evidence that applicable	Not applicable
<p>4 Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had recruited LLG extension workers as per the staffing structure.</p> <p>The LLG staff structure list had 35 and the staff list had 18.</p> <p>18/35x100=51.4%</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>4 Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the microscale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed. The Local Government was in the second phase of the project, with implementation just planned to begin in FY 2022/23 as the micro scale irrigation equipment were neither yet procured nor installed because the District was in the second phase, and the project implementation was just</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and microscale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has on position of extension workers filled is accurate: information</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5		Maximum score 4 planned for FY 2022/23.	
---	--	---	--

) Evidence that Not applicable

e

2 Officer, Mr. Amega John

According to the sampled Sub Counties Kamunyo,

Atatur and Mukongoro Town Council it was evident that the information on positions of extension workers filled was accurate;

At Kamunyo Sub County 3 extension workers were deployed Mr. Ibirot Julius Agriculture Officer, Mr.

Echodu Charles Veterinary

Officer and Okiring John Paul Fisheries Officer.

Atatur Sub County had 2 extension workers Ms. Abiro Bridget Rose Veterinary

Baptist Agriculture Officer. Ajongo John Bosco was volunteering.

Mukongoro Town Council had 4 extension workers of which 2 were substantive and two assigned duty. Euron Joseph Agriculture officer, Mr. Odongo Julius Fisheries Officer were substantive.

Mr. Ochen Robert

Entomologist and Mr. Apadel Charles VO.

Accuracy of reported

b information

because

information: The LG has reported accurate information

on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate:

ther was no installation at either the demonstration or the farmers' sites. The district was in the second phase of the UGiFT project, whose implementation was planned for FY 2022/23.

Maximum score 4

Score 2 or else 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

No Quarterly supervision and monitoring report was availed during the assessment. The District was in the second phase of the project, and all the rigorous activities of supervision were just planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23.

0

6 0

Evidence that Not applicable

e

6 Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	No MIS report was presented for the assessment. The Senior Agricultural Engineer – Agnes Adikini was reportedly trained on the use of Irritrack system under the Micro Scale Irrigation Program between 20th July and 1st
--	--	---

August 2022

Maximum score 6



7	0	<p>Reporting and Performance</p> <p>Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. Also, the MIS reports were nonexistent</p>	
6					0
		<p>Reporting and Performance</p> <p>Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable since the District was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and it had not implemented the project at the time of assessment.</p>	
6		<p>Reporting and Performance</p> <p>Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable since the District was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project and it had not implemented the project at the time of assessment. Thus had no improvement plan and had nothing to implement.</p>	0

<p>ting ) Evidence that m n o or Budge for, actual recruit e t and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>s Maximum score 6 a the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>he LG had budgeted UGX 803,675,611 for FY 2022/2023 this was to cater for the 35 extension workers.</p>
<p>7  Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>Mr Ibirot Julius AO,Mr. Echodu  Charles VO and Mr.Okiring John Paul FO as was indicated on the DPO's staff  list.</p>	<p>w rkers are w king in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0 <b>2</b> According to the sampled Sub Counties Atatur,  Kanyum and Mukongoro Town Council it was evident that the extension workers are working where they were deployed. The staff list had their names displayed ,also they registered in the attendance book</p>
<p>Maximum score 6 ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0  From the sampled LLGs extension workers were deployed as per the guidelines for instance;</p>	<p>Mukongoro T/C had four extension workers Euron  Joseph AO,Odongo Julius FO<sub>1</sub> Ochen Robert Entomologist and Apadel Charles VO the same number was verified at the DPO's staff list.</p>	<p>Atatur S/C had two extension workers Abiro  Bridget Rose VO, Amega  John Baptist AO</p>
<p>Atatur S/C only had two extension workers deployed and they were Ms. Abiro  Bridget Rose VO and Mr Amega John Baptist AO the same number was verified at the DPO's staff list.</p>	<p>7 Budge for, actual recruit e t and  deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>Kanyum S/C had three extension workers and these were ,Ibirot Julius AO, Echodu Charles VO and Okiring John Paul FO.  Mukongoro T/C had Euron  Joseph AO, Odongo Julius FO, Ochen Robert Entomologist and Apadel</p>
<p>Kanyum S/C had three extension workers deployed and they were</p>	<p>Maximum score 6 b exten ion</p>	<p>Charles VO.</p>
<p>7  Budgeting for, actual recruitment and</p>	<p>deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted,</p>	<p>deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted,</p>

9 1

ting ) Evidence that T m n  
actually recruited and  
deployed staff as per  
guidelines

Maximum score 6

c) Evidence that extension  
workers' deployment has  
been publicized and  
disseminated to LLGs by  
among others displaying staff  
list on the LLG notice board.  
Score 2 or else 0

2

In all the three sampled Sub

Counties of Kamunyo

S/C, Atatur S/C and  
Mukongoro T/C the staff  
list of extension workers  
was displayed on the  
notice board.

8 1

Performance ) Evidence that s T r

management: The LG o or

has appraised,  
taken corrective  
action and trained  
Extension

Workers

a the Di trict

Pr duction Co dinator 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

Maximum score 4

he extension worke s were  
appraised as follows,

1. Mr. Opolot Samuel AHO was appraised by Dr. Okwalinwa Michael P.V.O 30/6/2022.
2. Mr. Obwanga Samuel AAHO was appraised by AKello Deborah on 30/6/2022.
- 3 .Mr. Emurwon Joseph AO appraised by Okello Martin SAO on 30/6/2022.
- 4 Mr. Ocaga Vincent Isaac Agriculture Officer was appraised by Akello Deborah Sub Chief on 30/6/2022.
- 5 Odongo Julius Assistant Fisheries Officer appraised by Ajena Stephen.

8 1

Performance ) Evidence that s s  
management: The LG o or  
has appraised,  
taken corrective  
action and trained  
Extension  
Workers

6 Mr. Otuket Moses  
Assistant Animal Husbandry  
Officer was appraised by  
Oteeni Samuel Town Clerk on  
14/6/2022.

7. Mr. Amega John Baptist  
Agriculture Officer was  
appraised by Okia Francis  
Senior Assistant secretary

8. Mr. Ocker Benjamin  
Assistant Animal Husbandry  
Officer was appraised by Mr.  
Okello Robert on 30/6/2022.  
Mr. Okello Martin wa Senior  
Agriculture Officer was sent  
for further studies.

Good ponds were constructed  
and good hygiene practices  
were

Maximum score 4 carried out.  
a the Di trict

8 1

Performance t T  
p t h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

u

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p v h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G



8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
w

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

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	The District trained its staff on different areas in the last FY. The available reports and certificates showed that:	<b>1</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

8

1

Performance t T  
p x h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

y

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8

1

Performance t T  
p z h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

aa

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p bb h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
cc

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p dd h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G



8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
ee

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p ff h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

gg

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p hh h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

ii

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p jj h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
kk

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p ll h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G



8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
mm

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p nn h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

oo

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p pp h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

qq

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8 1

Performance t T  
p rr h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
ss

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p tt h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G



8 1

Performance )  
Evidence that s  
uu

management: The LG o  
or

h  
a  
s

a  
p  
p  
r  
a  
i  
s  
e  
d  
,

8 1

Performance t T  
p w h

m  
a  
n  
a  
g  
e  
m  
e  
n  
t  
:

T  
h  
e

L  
G

8 1

Performance )

Evidence that s

ww

management: The LG o

or

h

a

s

a

p

p

r

a

i

s

e

d

,

8

1

Performance t T p xx h

management:

The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers

ii Evidence that raining activities were documented in the training database:

Score 1 or else 0

Maximum score 4

raining files resen ed ad reports of training received by staff since 2021. In addition to the training certificates and reports highlighted in Section 8(b), the training files

training:

A report by Alupo Caroline (Senior Fisheries Officer) authored on 28/06/2021 showed that Agricultural Extension workers were trained on Parish

Development Model at the District Administration Board Room on 28/06/2021

Dika Toby's report also showed the farmer groups and extension workers were trained on the Agronomy of the Agricultural Cluster Development Project commodity crops in Kumi

Sub County from 13/9/2021, 15/9/2021, 20/9/2021, 22/9/2021 and 28/9/2021.

8 1

Performance ) Evidence that s yy  
management: The LG o or  
has appraised,  
taken corrective  
action and  
trained  
Extension

Workers  
contained reports of the following

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>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</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0</b></p>
---	--

It was not applicable in the FY 2021/22 because the district was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned for FY 2022/23. The draft work plan of the

Department for the FY

2022/23 indicated that the District has allocated 100% for complementary services as recommended in the first year of implementation

P g t ) Evidence that the p e he

e

<p>9 lanning, bud e ing 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>b) budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i)</p>	<p>maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was not applicable in t FY 2021/22 because the district was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned for FY 2022/23. The draft work plan of the Department for the FY 2022/23 indicated that the District has allocated 100% for complementary services as recommended in the first year of implementation</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> <p>c) Evidence that the cofunding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>micro scale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned for FY 2022/23. The draft work plan of the Department for the FY 2022/23 indicated that the District has allocated 100% for complementary services as recommended in the first year of implementation</p>	<p>service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> <p>d 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>It was not applicable in the FY 2021/22 because the district was in the second phase of the</p> <p>9 Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for</p>	<p>0 lanning, bud e ing and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for</p>	<p>It was not applicable in t FY 2021/22 because the district was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned for FY 2022/23. The draft work plan of the Department for the FY 2022/23 indicated that the service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>

P g t Evidence that p e he e

e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer cofunding: Score 2 or else 0 District has allocated 100% for complementary services as recommended in the first year of implementation

Not applicable because the District was in the second phase of the micro scale irrigation project. The awareness creation

0 activities were just planned to begin in FY 2022/23.

10 Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines

Not yet applicable since the micro-scale irrigation equipment was neither procured nor installed to warrant monitoring. The district was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin in the

FY 2022/23

Maximum score 8 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.)

- If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2
- 70-89% monitored score 1

Less than 70% score 0

	g t	Evidence that the	Not yet applicable because	
			the ir a ei	
	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	b. LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or	m c o-sc l rrigation equipment for demonstration and the farmers' sites were neither yet procured nor installed. The district was in the second phase, and all the micro	
			activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23	
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation project had not yet reached that stage. The district was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23	0
	Maximum score 8			
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation project had not yet reached that stage. The district was in the second phase, and all the micro scale irrigation activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23	0
	Maximum score 8			
	Maximum score 8	else 0 mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	scale irrigation activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	Not yet applicable because the micro-scale irrigation had not started. The District was in the second phase of the project, and most of the activities were just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.	Maximum score 4 b District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	
	Maximum score 4	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted	m c o-sc l rrigation program und r UGiFT was not planned i the FY 2021/22. The	
	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to			



o n ) Evidence that the Not yet applicable because  
 the i r a e i  
 e  
 n

aforementioned FY 2022/23.  
 activities were planned  
 to begin in the

**Investment Management**

12 Planning and budgeting a) Evidence that the LG has for Not yet applicable because 0  
 investments: The LG an updated register of the District was in the second  
 has selected farmers and micro-scale irrigation phase of the microscale  
 budgeted for microscale equipment supplied to irrigation project. The micro  
 irrigation as per farmers in the previous FY as scale irrigation equipment had  
 guidelines per the format: Score 2 or neither been procured nor  
 else 0 supplied yet.  
 Maximum score 8

12 Planning and budgeting b) Evidence that the LG Not yet applicable because the 0  
 for investments: The LG keeps an up-to-date has District was in the second  
 selected farmers database of applications at and phase of the microscale  
 budgeted for micro the time of the assessment: irrigation project and the  
 scale irrigation as per Score 2 or else 0 farmers had not yet been  
 guidelines sensitized about the project  
 Maximum score 8

12 Planning and budgeting for complete Expressions of lanning a d budgeting for 8  
 investments: The LG has Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else investments: The LG has  
 selected farmers and 0 selected farmers and  
 budgeted for microscale budgeted for microscale  
 irrigation as per irrigation as per guidelines  
 guidelines  
 8

c) Evidence that the District Not yet applicable because the Maximum score 8  
 has carried out farm visits to District was in the second d For DDEG financed  
 farmers that submitted to begin in the FY projects:  
 2022/23. Evidence that the LG District

i e

Maximum score

12	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: scale irrigation systems</p> <p>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p> <p>Not yet applicable because</p>	<p>As per the copy of approved LG Procurement Plan for current FY reviewed by the assessment team signed by CAO on 1st July 2022, micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated on page 5</p>	1
----	---	---	--	---

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: from The LG procured and managed micro-scale by irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the microscale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

13	<p>Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on</p> <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p>District was in the second phase of the irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>	<p>microscale irrigation project, and most of the project activities were just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0

Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the microscale

i e

Maximum score

		<p>d the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee; Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>District was in the second phase of the microscale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>
13	<p>0 Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because the District was in the second phase of the microscale irrigation project, and most of the activities were planned to begin in the FY 2022/23.</p>
13	<p>Maximum score 18</p>		<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>f) Evidence that the scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the managed micro-scale design output (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Maximum score 18</p>		<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>13</p>
13	<p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>Not yet applicable because there were not yet any installed irrigation systems at either demonstration or farmers' sites to warrant supervision. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project, and most of the activities</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the</p>	<p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Maximum score</p>		<p>0</p>

h the LG has applicable cau e  
 1 0 overseen the irrigation th  
 Procurement, contract evidence that supplier did not: micro scale irrigation  
 management/execution: The equipment was neither yet  
 LG procured and managed. Testing the functionality of procured nor installed to  
 micro-scale the installed equipment: warrant a functionality test.  
 irrigation contracts as per Score 1 or else 0 The District was in the  
 guidelines second phase of the  
 microscale irrigation  
 project and

Maximum score 18

by the supplies and goods equipment or installations to  
 received note by the approved be handed over. The District  
 farmer): Score 1 or 0 was in the second phase of  
 most of the project activities the microscale irrigation  
 were just planned to begin project and most of the  
 in the FY 2022/23. project activities were just  
 planned to begin in the FY  
 2022/23

0

Not applicable because, there were no micro scale irrigation

13 payment of the supplier scale irrigation project, and  
 Procurement, contract within specified timeframes most of the project activities  
 management/execution: subject to the presence of were just planned for FY  
 The LG procured and the Approved farmer's 2022/23. The draft work plan  
 managed micro-scale signed acceptance form: of the  
 irrigation contracts as Score 2 or else 0 Department for the FY  
 per guidelines 0 2022/23 indicated that the  
 District has allocated 100% for  
 complementary services as  
 recommended in the first year  
 of implementation  
 Maximum score 18  
 i) Evidence that the Local because the district  
 Government has made was in the second  
 phase of the micro

j) the LG has applicable cau e th  
 a complete procurement file procurement of micro scale  
 for each contract and with all irrigation equipment had not  
 records required by the yet attracted any bids. The  
 District was in the second  
 PPDA Law: Score 2 or else phase of the micro-scale  
 0 irrigation project with most  
 the project activities just

Maximum score 18

15 0

Procurement, contract Evidence that Not be s e  
management/execution: The  
LG procured and managed  
micro-scale

irrigation contracts as per  
guidelines

Grievance redress: The LG  
has established a  
mechanism of addressing  
micro-scale irrigation  
grievances in line with the  
LG grievance redress  
framework

a) Evidence that the Local  
Government has displayed  
details of the nature and  
avenues to address grievance  
prominently in multiple public  
areas: Score  
2 or else 0

0

No evidence was seen. The avenues  
for grievance redress and the nature  
of grievances were not displayed on  
any noticeboards within the  
Production Department or  
anywhere within the District.

Maximum score 6

14

Grievance redress: The LG  
has established a  
mechanism of addressing  
micro-scale irrigation  
grievances in line with the  
LG grievance redress  
framework

b) Micro-scale irrigation  
grievances have been:  
i). Recorded score 1 or else 0  
ii). Investigated score 1 or  
else 0

0

There was no Micro-scale irrigation  
project implemented in the previous  
FY 2021/2022. Therefore, there was  
no grievance to record.

Maximum score 6

iii). Responded to score 1 or  
else 0

iv). Reported on in line with  
LG grievance redress  
framework score 1 or else 0  
planned to begin in the FY  
2022/23.

14 0

r e i c s

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  
There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022. Therefore, there was no grievance to investigate.

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 was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022. Therefore, there was no grievance to respond to.

0

14

Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

Maximum score 6

b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:

iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0

There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022. Therefore, there was no grievance to report.

0

## Environment and Social Requirements

15	0			
		e Evidence that Safeguards in the delivery of investments	a) LGs have disseminated Microirrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the District had neither yet started siting nor installment of the micro scale irrigation systems. The District was in the second phase of the micro-scale irrigation project and most of the project activities were just planned to begin in the FY 2022/23
		Maximum score 6		
15		Safeguards in the delivery of investments	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.	There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous
		Maximum score 6		0
			i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	
15		Safeguards in the delivery of investments	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agrochemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous
		Maximum score 6		0
			Maximum score 6	
5		Safeguards in the delivery of investments	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

1 0

e s

score 1 or else 0 There was  
no Micro-cale

irrigation project  
implemented in the  
previous

FY 2021/2022.

15 Safeguards in the  
delivery of  
investments

Maximum score 6

iv. E&S Certification forms There was no Micro-scale are  
completed and signed irrigation project by CDO prior  
to payments of implemented in the previous

contractor FY 2021/2022.

invoices/certificates at  
interim and final stages of  
projects score 1 or else 0

0



Micro-scale Irrigation

Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of	Compliance justification compliance	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer	Ms. Adikini Agnes was appointed on probation as a Senior Agriculture Engineer on 4t May 2021 through letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 47/2021(i)(e), signed by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu  She was confirmed on 15th Feb 2022 under letter reference CR 159/1 Minute number 5 (b) (viii) as signed by the CAO Ms. Adongo  Roseline Luhoni.	<b>70</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2

New\_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.

*Maximum score is 30*

If the LG:  
Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or

There was no Micro-scale irrigation project implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.

else  
0.  
**0**

**Water & Environment**

**Minimum Conditions**

**Definition of**

**Compliance justification**

**Score**

**No. Summary of requirements compliance**

**Human Resource Management and Development**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0. |
|---|--|--|

*Maximum score is 70*

<b>15</b>	Mr. Mawanga Peter Patience was substantively appointed as Civil Engineer (water) on 30 April 2014 under letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 23/2014, signed by the
-----------	---

Th

CAO Mr. Joseph  
Balisanyuka.

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.	This position was not provided for in the approved staff structure of Kumi DLG dated 16 November, 2021 letter reference CR/151/1.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Okalebo David Livingstone was appointed on probation as Borehole Maintenance Technician on 10 Jan 2022 through letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 109(b), signed by Mr. Batambuze Abdu the CAO.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	New_Evidence that the LG	has recruited or the seconded	

staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Maximum score is 70*

1

New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Maximum score is 70*

f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0. **10** Mr. Opio Moses was appointed on

**Environment and Social Requirements**

e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.

probation as a forestry officer on 5/Nov/2015 through letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 56/2015, signed by Mr.

is position was vacant at the time of assessment.

Wotunya Peter Henry the CAO.

He was confirmed on 6 Nov 2017 under letter reference CR 159/2 Minute number

72/2017(iv), signed by Mr. Wotunya the CAO.

<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change</p>	<p>The</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>re was evidence of Environment and Social screening reports for the sampled WWS projects implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>Screening report for the extension of piped water to Dr. Apom Okol Memorial Seed Secondary School signed by the Environment officer on 19/04/2022</p>	<p>Screening report for the construction of Kongura community borehole in Kanapa Sub-county signed by the Environment Officer on 9/02/2022.</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of Apapai community borehole in Atatur Subcounty signed by the Environment officer on 10/02/2022</p>
<p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	
<p>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 above mentioned water projects never required preparation of full ESIAs. There was need of preparing ESMPs and ensure timely implementation of the ESMPs.</p>		<p>Only 2 out of the 3 sampled projects had costed ESMPs. These were;</p> <p>ESMP for construction of Kongura community borehole in Kanapa Sub-county costed at UGX. 7,030,000/-</p> <p>ESMP for the construction of Apapai community borehole in Atatur Sub-county costed at UGX. 6,715,000/-</p>
<p>Not all the sampled WSS projects had costed ESMPs.</p>		

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change

The

The WSS project that had no ESMP was;

The extension of piped water to Dr. Aporu Okol Memorial Seed Secondary School.

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

pumping and capping. At this stage, the facility had not reached the commissioning stage where it would require acquisition of an abstraction permit before it can start to be utilized by the beneficiary communities.

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

else 0.

LG constructed 9 boreholes, 1 production well and 15 protected springs.

For the production well that was constructed in Kajamaka Village in Kanyum Sub County, the scope of works included drilling the water source, installing the pipes, test



Health Minimum

Conditions

Summary of No. requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>			
1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i> a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.  The District did not have a substantive DHO but Dr. Asio Sarah was appointed to care take as DHO under letter reference CR 153/3 dated 27 June 2022 as signed by the  CAO Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni.	<b>0</b>
1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	<b>10</b> Ms. Okwakol Suzan was substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal ,Child and Nursing on 3/3/2020 as was directed by DSC Minute number 54/2019(VIII),signed by Mr. Olaboro Franco.	
1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded		The district didn't have a substantively appointed Assistant	<b>0</b>



1 1

New\_Evidence that the

s ic s

District Health Officer  
Environmental health but  
Mr.

assigned duty as a  
Assistant  
Environment Health  
Officer

Environmental Health on  
2/Jan/2020 reference number CR  
153/3, signed by Mr.  
Olaboro Franco the CAO.

Oonyu Moses a Principal  
Health Inspector was

0

Di tr t has sub tantively  
recruited or the seconded  
staff is in place for all critical  
positions.

d. Principal Health  
Inspector (Senior  
Environment Officer),  
score 10 or else 0.

Mr. Oonyu Moses was substantively  
appointed as a

Principal Health Inspector on  
25/Jan/2021 under letter  
reference CR160/1 as directed by  
the DSC Minute number  
39/2020(g), signed by the CAO

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

Mr. Batambuze Abdu

1

New\_Evidence that the  
District has substantively  
recruited or the seconded  
staff is in place for all critical  
positions.

e. Senior Health Educator,  
score 10 or else 0.

Mr. Kamiri Adae John was  
substantively appointed as Senior  
Health Educator on 17/June/2019  
through letter reference CR 160/1  
as was directed by the DSC Minute  
number 41/2019(iii), signed by

Mr. Wotunya Peter Henry the  
CAO

10

*Maximum score is 70*

1

New\_Evidence that the  
District has substantively  
recruited or the seconded  
staff is in place for all critical  
positions.

f. Biostatistician, score 10  
or 0.

Mr. Akiiso James was appointed  
on probation as Biostatistician  
under letter reference CR 156/5  
dated June

4 2018 as was directed by the  
DSC Minute number

38/2018(a) , signed by the  
CAO Mr. Wotunya Peter

10

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

New\_Evidence that the

critical positions

Henry.

District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

*Maximum score is 70*

He was confirmed on 17/June/2019 under letter reference CR 159/1 Minute number 32/2019(ii), signed by Mr. Wotunya Peter the CAO.

h. Medical Officer of Health Services

/Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

1

*Applicable to Districts only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

**10**

*Applicable to MCs only.*

Mr. Nalungu Ivan was appointed on probation as District Cold Chain technician under letter reference CR 156/5 dated 5 March 2018 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 18/2018(a)(v) , signed by the CAO Mr. Wotunya Peter Henry.

1

New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

*Maximum score is 70*

g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.

He was confirmed on 13 Jan

2020 under letter reference CR

*Applicable to MCs only.*

1 1

New\_Evidence that the

u ic s

159/1 Minute number

54/2019(iv)d, signed by Mr.

Olaboro Franco the CAO.

1

New\_Evidence that the

vic s

j. Health Educator,

M n ipality ha score 20 or else 0

substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

### Environment and Social Requirements

2

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out:

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact

Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out:

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact

Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental, Social and Climate

Change

screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

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

**0**

There was no evidence in the form of Environment and Social screening reports for the current FY 2022/2023 health projects. Screening had not been done by Assessment time.

2

the health projects included;	(Phase II) at Agaria HCII	mentioned health projects had phased construction and had been partially implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022
The completion of maternity ward at Kanyum HCIII		<b>0</b>
Construction of Maternity ward	There was no need of preparation of full ESIA's since the above	These needed preparation of ESMPs which were not also prepared.

**Education Minimum**

**Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements compliance</b>	<b>Definition of</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
------------	---	----------------------	---------------------------------	--------------

**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	<b>0</b> Ms. Adong Sarah was substantively appointed as DEO on 20th Oct, 2021 through letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 90, signed by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu.	<b>3</b>
1	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>  New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The district had five inspectors of schools and all had been appointed substantively..  1. Mr. Okai Kesiron was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools in May 16 2019 under letter reference CR/160/2 as was directed by the DSC Minute	<b>40</b>

number 26/2019(viii), signed by Mr. Wotunya Peter .

2. Ms. Imurang Jane Francis was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 10 January

2022 under letter reference CR/156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number

85(b), signed by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

3. Ms. Akiteng Betty was appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 10 January

2022 under letter reference CR/156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number

85(b), signed by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

4. Mr. Oditai John Peter  
**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.

The Maximum score is 30 was appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 10 January 2022 under letter

reference CR/156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 85(b), signed by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

5. Mr. Oselle Bernard was appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 5/March/2018 under letter reference CR/160/2 as was directed by the DSC Minute number

18/2018(a), signed by the CAO Mr. Wotunya Peter.

15

All the Education projects implemented in the previous FY were screened for Environment and Social risks.

Screening report for the construction of a two classroom block at Kalungar Primary School signed by Environment Officer and DCDO Mr. alex Okirigi on 16/12/2022.

Screening report for the construction of a two classroom block at Kapolin Primary School signed by Environment Officer and DCDO on 15/12/2021

Screening report for the construction of a two classroom block at Atatur Primary School signed by

Environment Officer and

DCDO on 23/03/2022

<p>t 2</p> <p>Evidence that prior o commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p>	<p>All Education projects never required preparation of full ESIA's since they lie under schedule 4 part 2 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019. There was need to prepare a costed ESMP for each project and ensure timely implementation of the</p>	<p>These were;</p> <p>ESMP for the construction of a two classroom block at Kalungar Primary School costed at UGX. 9,250,000/-</p> <p>ESMP for the construction of a two classroom block at Kapolin Primary School costed at UGX. 6,815,000/-</p>
<p>The Maximum score is 30 If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>ESMPs.</p> <p>Only 2 out of 3 sampled projects had costed ESMP.</p>	<p>However, the education project for construction of a two classroom block at Atatur Primary School did not have ESMP.</p>

#### Crosscutting Minimum

##### Conditions

#### Definition of

#### No. Summary of requirements compliance

#### Compliance justification

#### Score

#### Human Resource Management and Development

<p>1</p> <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>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The District had substantively appointed Mr. Wandera Peter as Chief Finance Officer on 1st July 2011 under letter reference CR/156/5 as directed by the DSC Minute number 126/2011 as signed by the CAO, Mr. Willy Batiringanya.</p>	<p><b>3</b></p>
--	--	---	-----------------



1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The District had substantively appointed Mr. Okaali Joseph as District Planner on 19th April 2018 under letter reference CR/160/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 125/2018 (ii) as signed by the CAO, Mr. Wotunya Peter Henry.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 else 0</p>	<p>The District didn't have a substantively appointed District Planner. However, Mr. Orone or Justine was appointed in acting capacity as District Engineer on 6th Nov 2017 under letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 75/2017(i) as signed by Mr. Wotunya Peter Henry, the CAO. Wotunya Peter Henry.</p>	0

		d. District Natural Resources	This position was vacant at the time of assessment.
1	0	Officer/Senior a Environment	
		Officer, score 3 or else 0	
1	0	e. District Production	
		Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District had substantively appointed Mr. Odogol Rajab as the District Production Officer on 26th July 2019 under letter reference CR/160/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 48/2019 (ii) as signed by the CAO, Mr. Wotunya
			Peter Henry.
1	0	f. District Community Development	
		Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The District had substantively appointed Mr. Onorio Alex Okirigi as District Community Development Officer on 6 Nov 2017 under letter reference CR/160/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 71/2017 as signed by the CAO, Mr. Olupot Thomas as District Commercial Officer on 14th April 2021 under letter reference CR163/4 as directed by the DSC Minute number 34/2021(a) (i) as signed by the CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.
1	0	Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	
1	0	g. District	
		The District had substantively appointed Mr.	

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

Mr. Okillan Henry was appointed on Promotion as A Senior Procurement Officer on 21st May 2015 under letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute

2 0.

number 29/2015, signed by Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka, the CAO.

2017 through letter reference CR 159/2, Minute number 72/2017, signed by the CAO Mr. Wotunya Peter Henry.

He was confirmed on 6th Nov

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  
2 Mr. Ocela James was

substantively appointed as

Procurement Officer on 18th Feb, 2021 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 11/2021(f), signed by the CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

1

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

37.  
i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0

2

Ms. Anabo Eunice as Principal Human Resource Officer on 14th April 2021 under letter reference CR160/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 28 /2021(b) (iv) as signed by the CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is

The District had substantively appointed

j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0

This position was vacant at the time of assessment.

departments. Maximum score is 37.

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e



1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e



1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e



1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1

New\_Evidence that  
the LG has i  
a

r  
e  
c  
r  
u  
i  
t  
e  
d

o  
r

t  
h  
e

1 0

New\_Evidence that the LG has i a  
recruited or the seconded  
staff is in place for all critical  
positions in the

District/Municipal Council  
departments. Maximum score is  
37.

2 Mr. Oguli John Mich el was  
substantively appointed as

Principal Human Resource  
Officer on 8th May,2017

under letter reference CR 156/6  
as was directed by the DSC  
Minute number 49/2017(i) ,  
signed by the CAO, Mr.

Wontunya Peter Henry.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior

Assistant

Secretary (SubCounties) /Town

Clerk (Town

Councils) / Senior Assistant Town

Clerk (Municipal

Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0  
(Consider the customized structure).

Kumi District had 12 Sub

Counties and 4 Town Councils.

The LG appointed 16 substantive  
SAS and Town clerk as follows.

1. Mr. Opakasi Stephen was  
substantively appointed as

SAS of Ogooma S/C on 9th

May,2022 under letter ref CR

160/1 as directed by the DSC

Minute  
number 25g,  
signed by Ms.  
Adong  
Roseline  
Luhoni, the  
CAO.

2. Mr. Oteeni  
Samuel was  
substantively  
appointed as SAS  
of Tisai S/C on  
21st

May,2015 under  
letter ref CR

156/5 as  
directed by  
the DSC  
Minute  
number  
30/2015,  
signed by  
Mr. Joseph

Balisanyuka, the  
CAO.

3. Ms. Alupo  
Stella was  
substantively  
appointed as

SAS of Kakuris S/C on 15th

July, 2021 under letter ref CR

160/1 as directed by the DSC  
Minute number 69/2021(a),  
signed by Mr. Batambuze Abdu,  
the CAO.

4. Mr. Apiu Stephen was  
substantively appointed as

SAS of Kakuris S/C on 9th

May, 2022 under letter ref CR

160/1 as directed by the DSC  
Minute number 25(g), signed by  
Ms. Adongo Roseline



Luhoni, the CAO.

5. Mr. Opio Damiano was substantively appointed as

SAS of Kanyum S/C on 4th June, 2018 under letter reference CR 160/1 as directed by the DSC Minute number 39/2018(a) ,signed by Mr. Wontunya Peter Henry, the CAO.

6. Mr. Ekungu Simon Peter was substantively appointed as SAS of Atatur S/C on 21st May, 2015 under letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 30/2015, signed by Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka the CAO.

7. Ms. Nekesa Alice was substantively appointed as SAS of Nyero S/C on 1st August, 2020 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 38, signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

8. Ms. Tino Dinah was substantively appointed as SAS of Kadami S/C on 9th May 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(g), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

9. Mr Okiria Innocent was substantively appointed as Town clerk principal of

Mukongoro T/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR

160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(f), signed by Ms. Adongo

Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

10. Mr. Okia Francis was substantively appointed as Town clerk principal of Ongini T/C on 9th May 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(F), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

11. Ms. Asekenye Martha was substantively appointed as Town clerk of Nyero T/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(f), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

12. Ms. Aiyo Susan Aongat was substantively appointed as SAS on 23rd April, 2009 under letter reference CR 156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 17/2009, signed by Mr. Kasuzi Sulaiman, the CAO.

13. Ms. Asudo Christine was substantively appointed as SAS of Kanapa S/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(g), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

14. Mr. Ajena Stephen was substantively appointed as

SAS of Kamacha S/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(g), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

15. Mr. Okiringi James Philips was substantively appointed as SAS of Ongino S/C on 1st August 2022 under letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC minute number 39(a), signed by the  
of Nyero S/C was Substantively appointed as CDO on 7th June 2021 through letter reference CR/156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 61/2021 (b), signed by Mr. Batambuze Abdu, the CAO.

3 Ms. Amuge Lilian of Mukungoro S/C was  
Substantively appointed as CDO on 9th Dec, 2021 through letter reference CR/156/5 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 103(a) (viii), signed by Mr. Batambuze Abdu, the CAO.

4. Ms. Akurut Sarah of Kamunyu S/C was  
Substantively appointed as CDO on 1st August, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/2 as was directed by

the DSC Minute number 39(a), signed by Ms. Adongo

2

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

Maximum score is 15  
b. A Community Development

Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.  
CAO Ms Adongo Roseline Luhoni.

16. Ms. Akello Deborah was substantively appointed as

SAS Kamunyu S/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(f), signed by the CAO Ms Adongo Roseline

Luhoni the CAO

The District had appointed all the Community Development

Officers substantively in all the 16 Sub Counties for example:

1. Ms. Kongai Mary of Kakuris S/C was Substantively appointed as CDO on 9th May, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

5

2. Ms. Acam Naume

Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

5. Ms. Opolot Esther Maureen of Kanapa S/C was

Substantively appointed as CDO on 9th May, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo

Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

6. Ms. Acam Florence Jane of Nyeru T /C was Substantively appointed as SCDO on 9th May, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(i), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

7. Ms. Akurut Scovia of Ongino T /C was Substantively appointed as SCDO on 9th May, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(i), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

8. Mr. Akol Simon of Ogooma S /C was Substantively appointed as CDO on 9th May, 2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo

Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

9. Mr. .Meresa Simon of Kumi S/C was Substantively appointed as CDO on 3rd

Sept 2021 through letter reference CR/156/2 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 75(ii)

(5), signed by Mr. Batambuze Abdu the CAO.

10. Ms. Atai Annet of Atatur

S/C was Substantively appointed as CDO on 11th 08,2022 through letter reference CR/160/2as was directed by the DSC Minute number 39(a), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

11. Mr. Okiror Joseph of

Kamacha S/C was

Substantively appointed as CDO on 09/05/2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC

Minute number 25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

12. Ms. Itimat Christine of

Kadami S/C was

Substantively appointed as CDO on 09/05/2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

13. Mr. Imalingat Francis of

Anaapa S/C was

Substantively appointed as CDO on 1/08/2022 through letter reference CR/160/2 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 39(a),

signed by Ms. Adongo  
Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

14. Mr. Ecaat Kokas of Tisai S/C  
was Substantively appointed  
as CDO on 09/05/2022  
through letter reference  
CR/160/1 as was directed by  
the DSC Minute number  
25(j), signed by Ms. Adongo  
Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

15. Mr. Ageata John Richard of  
Kamunyo T/C was

Substantively appointed as SCDO  
on 09/05/2022 through letter  
reference CR/160/1 as was  
directed by the DSC

2

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

Maximum score is 15

c. A Senior Accounts

Assistant /an

Accounts

Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

Minute number 25(i), signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

16. Ms. Ikiring Jessica of

Mukungoru T/C was substantively appointed as SCDO on 09/05/2022 through letter reference CR/160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(i), signed by the CAO Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni.

The LG had 16 sub counties and town councils. The District appointed 9 substantive Senior Accounts Assistants .

Those who are substantive are as follows;

1. Mr. Ojilong Emmanuel was substantively appointed as Senior Accountants Assistant of Nyeru T/C on Monday 9th May, 2022 under

letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(e), signed by the CAO, Ms. Adongo Roseline Luhoni.

2. Mr. Odongo Daniel of Tisai S/C was substantively appointed as SAA on 16th March, 2021 under letter reference CR/156/5 Minute number 15/2021(ii)(e), signed by the CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

3. Ms. Adeke Esther was substantively appointed as Senior Accountants Assistant of Kamunyo T/C on 9th May, 2022 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 25(e), signed by the CAO, Ms.

Adongo Roseline Luhoni.

4. Ms. Alaso Joyce was substantively appointed as Senior Accountants Assistant of Kamunyo S/C on 18th Feb, 2021 under letter reference CR 160/1 as was directed by the DSC Minute number 11/2021(d) ,signed by the CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

5 Ms. Apedo Harriet was substantively appointed as Senior Accountants Assistant of Ongooma S/C on 16th March, 2021 under letter reference CR

156/5 as was directed by the  
DSC Minute number  
15/2021(ii)(e) ,signed by the  
CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

6. Mr. Ocepa Aucur Emmanuel  
was substantively appointed as  
Senior Accountants Assistant of  
Nyeru S/C on 16th March,

2021 under letter reference CR

156/5 as was directed by the

DSC Minute number  
15/2021(ii)(e) ,signed by the  
CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

7. Ms. Abuin Anthonia Anne was  
substantively appointed as  
Senior Accountants Assistant of  
Oguni S/C on 16th March

2021 under letter reference CR

156/5 as was directed by the

DSC Minute number  
15/2021(ii)(e) ,signed by the  
CAO, Mr. Batambuze Abdu.

8. The District appointed Mr.

Okiria Henry as AAT of  
Mukungulu T/C on 9/5/2022  
letter reference CR/160/1 as  
directed by the DSC Minute  
number 25(e), signed by Adongo  
Roseline Luhoni, the CAO.

9. Mr. Omuda Benjamin Moses  
was appointed SAA of  
Mukongoro and Kakurisi S/C  
on 9th May,2022 letter  
reference CR 156/5 as was



t

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

Percentage of released funds against allocated funds was 96.,2%

Maximum score is 4

to:

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

directed by the DSC Minute number 25(c) as was signed by the CAO, Mr. Adongo Roseline Luhoni.

Those who were not substantive included ;

Ms. Okai Phoebe was appointed AAT of Ongino T/C under letter reference CR 160/1 dated 9th May 2022 as signed by Ms. Adongo Roseline the, CAO.

0

Budget UGX 241,269,367

Warrant UGX

220,,657,274,page

Actual UGX 212,282,,669

% Actual UGX 212,282,,669 x100

Warrant UGX

220,,657,,274

=96,2%



3

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

Maximum score is 4  
If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY

to:

b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0. **0**  
Budget UGX 405,494,000

Warrant UGX 192,046,422

Actual UGX 190,958,420

% Actual UGX 190,958,420

Warrant UGX

192,046,422

=99.4 %

Percentage of released funds against allocated funds was 99.4 %

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,

score 4 or else 0 **0**

There was evidence of Environment and Social

Screening reports for the DDEG financed projects implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022.

Screening Report for the Renovation of CAO's residence signed by Environment Officer Mr. Opio Moses on 20/01/2022

Screening Report for the fencing of Kanapa livestock market in Kanapa sub-county signed by Environment officer on 19/01/2022

Screening report for the construction

of Administration block at Kumi Sub county (Phase I) signed by Environment officer on 15/12/2021

has

carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and

Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed

Environment and Social

Management Plans (ESMPs)

(including child protection plans)

where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out

Environment and

Social Impact

Assessments

(ESIAs) prior to

commencement

4

Evidence that the LG of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0

All the above mentioned DDEG financed projects did not require full ESIA's because in the National Environment Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

nt Act No. 5 of 2019, they are categorized under schedule 4 part 2 which consists of projects with very minimal significant Environmental and social Impacts which can be easily mitigated by timely implementation of the ESMPs thereby requiring Environment and social screening and ESMPs

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.

score 4 or 0

4

Okirigi on 20/01/2022 costed at UGX. 6,900,000/-

ESMP for the fencing of Kanapa livestock market in Kanapa sub-county signed by Environment officer on 19/01/2022 costed at UGX. 12,700,000/-

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a

Costed ESMPs

for all projects

ESMP for the Renovation of

CAO's residence signed by

ESMP for the construction of Administration block at Kumi Subcounty (Phase I) signed by Environment officer on 15/12/2021 costed at UGX.

### Financial management and reporting

implemented using the

Discretionary

Development

Environment Officer Mr. Opio Moses and DCDO Mr. Alex

13,895,000/-

does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

5

Evidence that the LG Maximum score is 10 If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;  If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5	If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0	Kumi LG had a clean / <b>10</b>  unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2021/2022
---	--	--

6

Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).  maximum score is 10	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),  score 10 or else 0.  There was evidence that	the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the Status of implementation of internal Auditor General findings FY 2020/2021 on 11th January 2022 were verified PBS  There was evidence that the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the Status of implementation of Auditor General findings FY 2020/2021 on 23rd March 2022 as per acknowledgement date stamp. The responses were Submitted after the deadline had elapsed of end of February 2022
---	--	--

7

Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY

Maximum Score 4

If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,

score 4 or else 0. **4** There was evidence that annual Performance Contract was Submitted to PS/ST

MOFPED on 1st August 2022

Evidence that the LG

8

has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year

maximum score 4 or else 0

If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0. **0**

Annual Budget Performance Report Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 5th September 2022 after the required date of 31st August.

9

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

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted

Quarterly Budget

Performance Reports (QBPRs)

for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0. **0**

1st Quarter Budget Performance Report

was Submitted to PS/ST

MOFPED on 23rd November

2021

2nd Quarter Budget

Performance Report was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 9th February 2022

3rd Quarter Budget

Performance Report was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 29th April 2022

4th Quarter Budget

Performance Report was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 5th September 2022 after the deadline of 31st August had elapsed