



## **LGMSD 2021/22**

Lamwo District

(Vote Code: 585)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	48%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	40%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	49%
Educational Performance Measures	62%
Health Performance Measures	33%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	45%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	1%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project.</p> <p>The DDEG projects implemented in previous FY included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of staff house at Pangera Health Centre II,</li> <li>2. Construction of Maternity ward at Pangera Health Centre II and</li> <li>3. Construction of OPD ward at Pangira Health Centre II</li> </ol> <p>A visit to Pangira HC II found the OPD serving the patients.</p>	<b>4</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LLGs were being assessed for the first time and there was no base for comparison.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>A review through the Annual budget performance report FY 2021/2022, There was no evidence indicated for completion of construction of staff house at Pangera Health Centre II, construction of Maternity ward at Pangera Health Centre II and construction of OPD ward at Pangira Health Centre II.</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0.	The records pertaining to the expenditure of the DDEG grant on eligible projects/activities during the previous FY was not presented to the Assessment Team. The team was informed that files were at OAG in Gulu.	<b>0</b>																								
3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	<p>The three projects sampled under DDEG funding for the previous FY 2021/2022 were all within +/- 0% of the LG Engineers estimate and these were;</p> <p>1. Construction of staff house at Pangera Health Centre II</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Engineers estimate :</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 120,000,000/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract cost:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 119,535,263/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Variation in price:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 4,647/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%age variation = /120,000,000) x100%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(4,647 = 0%</td> </tr> </table> <p>2. Construction of Maternity ward at Pangera Health Centre II</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Engineers estimate:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 422,944,000/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract cost:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 382,238,029/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Variation in price:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 407,060/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%age variation = /422,944,000) x100%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(407,060 = 0%</td> </tr> </table> <p>3. Construction of OPD ward at Pangira Health Centre II</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Engineers estimate:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 317,056,000/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract cost:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 302,849,033/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Variation in price:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Ugx 142,070/=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%age variation = /317,056,000) x100%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(142,070 = 0%</td> </tr> </table>	Engineers estimate :	Ugx 120,000,000/=	Contract cost:	Ugx 119,535,263/=	Variation in price:	Ugx 4,647/=	%age variation = /120,000,000) x100%	(4,647 = 0%	Engineers estimate:	Ugx 422,944,000/=	Contract cost:	Ugx 382,238,029/=	Variation in price:	Ugx 407,060/=	%age variation = /422,944,000) x100%	(407,060 = 0%	Engineers estimate:	Ugx 317,056,000/=	Contract cost:	Ugx 302,849,033/=	Variation in price:	Ugx 142,070/=	%age variation = /317,056,000) x100%	(142,070 = 0%	<b>2</b>
Engineers estimate :	Ugx 120,000,000/=																											
Contract cost:	Ugx 119,535,263/=																											
Variation in price:	Ugx 4,647/=																											
%age variation = /120,000,000) x100%	(4,647 = 0%																											
Engineers estimate:	Ugx 422,944,000/=																											
Contract cost:	Ugx 382,238,029/=																											
Variation in price:	Ugx 407,060/=																											
%age variation = /422,944,000) x100%	(407,060 = 0%																											
Engineers estimate:	Ugx 317,056,000/=																											
Contract cost:	Ugx 302,849,033/=																											
Variation in price:	Ugx 142,070/=																											
%age variation = /317,056,000) x100%	(142,070 = 0%																											

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	Information on the positions filled in LLGs was not presented for Assessment to ascertain its accuracy in regard to minimum staffing standards.	0
4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.  <b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b>	There was evidence in the 4th Quarter Budget Performance report for the physical existence of the DDEG infrastructure as per the examples below;  1. Construction of staff house at Pangera Health Centre II,  2. Construction of Maternity ward at Pangera Health Centre II,  3. Construction of OPD ward at Pangira Health Centre II	2

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence was seen to this effect by the end of the assessment period.	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	Attendance registers were presented together with tracking and analysis reports from 1st July 2021 to 30th June 2022 for the month of July 2021, 90% attended and the remaining 10% who were absent, reasons like having parallel Government engagement kept them off the station and therefore never signed in the attendance book.	2

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to prove that the LG conducted appraisal of the Heads of Departments for their work during the FY 2021/2022:</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented and handled the following sampled cases</p> <p>1. George Ocaya on charges of Fraud, Forgery and unethical behaviours between 15th June - 6th July 2022. Recommended for interdiction and dismissal.</p> <p>2. Opii Moses on charges of Gross Misconduct, fighting and assault. Case handled between 7th - 8th February 2022</p> <p>3. Lakot, Janet, Akena Simon Francis, Kilama Paul and Amigo Car Michael on charges of Abuse of office and incompetence, gross negligence of duty and misappropriation of public funds. Case handled between 19th - 24th August 2021</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence of establishing a functional Consultative Committee during FY 2021/2022.</p>	0

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

The LG recruited employees on 23rd February, 2022 and all given IPPS payroll numbers except 8 chiefs who were paid the whole FY from the PDM allocated budgets (as directed by the PS of MOFPED in a communication about funding of Chief through PDC budget allocation).

A few other staff who were recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed salary more than two months after being recruited i.e., from August 2022 as named here below:

1. Tabu Vincent recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

2. Opwoya George recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

3. Abanya Julie recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

4. Auma Eunice recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

5. Oyet Topy recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

6. Omoya D Ochula recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

7. Odongpiny Bosco recruited on 23rd February, 2022 but accessed the Salary Payroll in August 2022

Pension Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

Score 1.

Five of six retired staff sampled in the previous FY who retired in April 2021 accessed payroll within two months before or not later than June 2021. The retirees that accessed payroll and were on the Payroll for June 2021 as here below:

1. Sam Kaibalo retired in April 2021 and accessed payroll in June 2021

2. Grace Angeyo retired in April 2021 and accessed payroll in June 2021

3. Dories Oryang retired in April 2021 and accessed payroll in June 2021

4. Loyce Oyet retired in April 2021 and accessed payroll in June 2021

5. Doris Oryang retired in April 2021 and accessed payroll in June 2021

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG made direct transfers of DDEG to all the nine sub-counties in three equal installments of shs.320,169,808 each as per the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>1st Quarter was transferred on 12nd July, 2021 amounting to Ugx 320,169,808</p> <p>A similar amount ugx 320,169,808 for 2nd Quarter was on 27th October, 2021 and similar amount for 3rd Quarter was on 1st February, 2021.</p> <p>Corresponding release letters written with specific budget lines were addressed to the CAO through the CFO and Vote controller administration..</p>	2
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did untimely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to the LLGs for the previous FY as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 The LG expenditure limits were uploaded on 12/7/2021 and warranted on 22/7/2021 within 8 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q2 The LG expenditure limits were uploaded on 4/10/2021 and warranted on 14/10/2021 within 8 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q3 The LG expenditure limits were uploaded on 3/1/2022 and warranted on 10/1/2022 within 6 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>From the observations above the LG did not meet the 5 working days deadline as per the requirements.</p>	0
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG never presented records on Invoicing and communication of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no evidence to show that the District conducted on a quarterly basis mentoring exercises to the LLGs at least once per quarter.</p>	0

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence for support supervision and monitoring visits conducted during the previous FY.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>There was evidence that the district maintains up-dated assets register covering key assets through using a spread sheet. Assets in the register included; Land, Buildings, Furniture and Fittings, ICT Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment and Transport Equipment. The register clearly captured details like asset description like types and category, location, purpose, cost title deed for land and it adhered to the format spelt out in the accounting manual. The CFO printed a copy of the assets register and signed on 1st November 2022.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a Board of Survey report for the FY 2021/2022 in place at the time of the LGPA. The interview with the CFO and review of the board of survey report could not show that the Board of survey report was used to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets. The CFO indicated that much as the Board of Survey Report was in place, only PPDA guidelines were used during the procurement of new assets.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	--	----------



Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was evidence that District had a functional physical planning committee in place with 15 members of the committee are reflected on DPPC list 2021/2022. These members include;

- 1- Uma Charles - CAO/Chairperson
- 2- Opoka Kenneth Opika -Physical planner/Secretary
- 3-Ociti Richard- Environment officer/member
- 4-Acayo Grace- Water officer/Member
- 5-Akena Leonard-Road engineer/member
- 6-Nyeko Wilfred- District Community Development Officer/member
- 7-Arop Wilson Woodford- Senior Environmental health inspector/Member
- 8- Opio Samuel Baker- Town clerk Lamwo TC/Member
- 9- Okello Aggrey- Private Physical Planner/Member
- 10-Ochora Benard- Surveyor/Member
- 11-James Bedijo Okumu- Deputy CAO/Member
- 12- Kolo Tobia Latome - District Agricultural Officer/Member
- 13- Opio Alessius Bongomin - Town clerk Padibe TC/Member
- 14- Oroma Geoffrey Benaiza-Town clerk Palabek Kal TC/Member
- 15-Amedo Florence - Town clerk Madi Opei Town Council/Member

The committee was functional and held four meetings whose deliberations were well records and the minutes submitted to the Zonal physical planning office and to the MLHUD on the following dates;

- On 5th July, 2021, 16th September, 2021, 14th January, 2022 and on 27th May, 2022

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence in form of a report to prove that the District had conducted project desk appraisal for all the DDEG projects in the budget. A review of the LG Development Plan III indicated incorporation of the Projects and all were eligible as per sector guidelines of January, 2022 and the funding source.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Page 3 of the field appraisal report dated 30th May, 2022 signed by the CDO and Environment Officer indicated that that the District conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design for projects of FY All projects were deemed to be technically feasible, environmental and socially acceptable and advise was given to proceed with proposed mitigation measures.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence from the TPC Minutes as of 25th February 2022 that the LG developed project profiles with costing for the current FY for presentation to the TPC for discussion to ascertain whether all investments were in the AWP and were as per the Planning and DDEG Guidelines. Some of the profiled projects included; Construction of a market stall at Aneka at Ugx 32,000,000, One block of stance drainable latrine at Layama Agwatta Primary school at Ugx 22,000,000, 4 stance drainable latrine at Pawach HCII at Ugx 12,912,800</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening for environmental and social risks/impact and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction that is, the construction of 5-stance pit latrines and washrooms at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i). Kangole primary school, Paloga sub-county</li> <li>(ii). Wanglango primary school</li> <li>(iii). Madi Opei sub-county,</li> <li>(iv). Layamo Agwatta primary school, Palabek Gem sub-county,</li> <li>(v). Logopii primary school, Paaloga sub-county,</li> <li>(vi). 4 stance pit latrine at Aguu primary school,</li> <li>(vii). 3 stance pit latrine with washroom at Palabek Kal sub-county prepared on 30th May, 2022,</li> <li>(viii). Fencing of the sub-county administration headquarters at Agoro sub-county,</li> <li>(ix). Fencing of Pauma health centre II at Palabek Kal sub-county,</li> <li>(x). construction of a market stall at Anaka central, Palabek Gem sub-county</li> </ul> <p>All the screening was conducted on 30th May, 2022.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Procurement plan for the current FY 2022/2023 was available it was approved on 31st July, 2022 by the CAO for Lamwo Mr. Alex Felix Majeme, then submitted to PPDPA on 19th September, 2022 by Mr. Okumu James Bedijo on behalf of the CAO for Lamwo District.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no minutes from the contracts committee presented by the Procurement officer in regard to bidding and approval of infrastructure projects to be financed by DDEG during FY 2022/2023.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	During the time of assessment, the LG failed to present appointment letters for the Project Implementation Team for the financial under review.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding followed the standard technical design; An example was the OPD ward at Pangira HCII whose internal room dimensions were 3 x 4m, external doors were 2.1 x 0.9 m and windows 1.2 x 1.5 m, all of which comply with those given in the MoH standard designs.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	During assessment it was not possible to get information that the technical supervision of projects had been made by the competent technical staff like the CDO, DEO and the District Engineer.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	There were no procurement files, AWP, certification files nor completion certificates presented during the two days of assessment at Lamwo DLG.  The procurement officer informed the Assessment team that the procurement files had been taken to the Auditor Generals Regional office in Gulu. However, there was no evidence to this effect that was availed.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	There were no procurement files presented during the two days of assessment at Lamwo DLG.  The procurement officer informed the Assessment team that the procurement files had been taken to the Auditor Generals Regional office in Gulu. However, there was no evidence to this effect that was availed.	0

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District had designated Mr. Opio Samuel Baker the Principal Assistant Secretary to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance / complaints) as per the appointment letter dated 5th February, 2021</p> <p>The LG had established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), comprising of; Mr. Opio Samuel Baker – Principal Assistant Secretary, Mr. Joro Ben Washington – Inspection of Schools, Mr. Arop Wilson Woodford – Senior Environmental Health Officer, Mr. Akena Leonard – District Engineer, Mr. Aluku Anthony Toolit – District Community Development Officer, Mr. Kinyera Isaac – Human Resource Officer, Dr. Ojok Patrick Kijumi – Uganda Medical Association Representative, Mr. Loita Ambrose Uganda Nurses and Midwives Union, Ms. Achan Josephine Safari – Uganda Nurses and Midwives Union, Ms. Aciro Maria – Uganda National Teachers Union, Mr. Akera Johnson Okella - Uganda National Teachers Union</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have a clear specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. Although there was a centralized complaints log, it had only one recorded case with no clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path). Positively to note was that the LG had a public display of information at district offices.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had a publicized grievance redress mechanism where aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress and the chart-flow showing the path-flows from the time a grievance is captured at the LG on 2nd November, 2022.</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of integration of the environment, social and climate change interventions into  (i). the approved budget estimates FY 2022/23 (A transformed, modernized and prosperous community in Lamwo district within 30 years) on pages 4, 53, 55, 56 and 57,  (ii). the LG Vote Approved Workplan FY 2022/23 pages 13 and 14.	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management  score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of the dissemination of the enhanced DDEG guidelines for the FY 2021/2022 to the lower local governments and this was acknowledged when all recipients appended their signatures on the distribution list dated 1st November, 2021	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	No records were presented during the two days of Assessment	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There was evidence of woodlots establishment project that was planned particularly as a wind-breaks mitigation measure against infrastructural installations in the Quarterly departmental performance report FY 2021/22, output: 098303 (Tree planting and Afforestation) page. 3 and on page 59 of the LG approved budget estimates output; 098303 Tree planting and Afforestation, generated on 28th June, 2021.	<b>3</b>

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence was provided for proof of ownership for DDEG projects such as,</p> <p>Land tittles for</p> <p>(i). Palabek Ogili health centre III at plot 26, block 3 at Lagotpuk sub-county, Instrument No. GUL-00003069, issued on 29th September, 2021.</p> <p>(ii). Padibe health centre IV at plot 14, block 2 at Atwol sub-county, North Cell, with Instrument No. GUL-00003083, issued on 6th October, 2021</p> <p>(iii). Madi Opei health centre IV at plot 8, block 4 at central ward with Instrument No. GUL-00003070, issued on 29th September, 2021</p> <p>(iv). Agoro health centre III at plot 11, block 5 at central ward with instrument No. GUL-00003071, issued on 29th September, 2021</p> <p>Consent forms for voluntary land contributions for</p> <p>(v). Building out-patient department (OPD) at Katumi west village, Katum sub-county dated 19th May, 2021</p> <p>(vi). Construction of Likiliki market at Palabek Gem dated 19th October, 2021</p> <p>(vii). Fencing Pauma health centre II at Palabek Kal</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of monitoring reports on environment and social safeguards for the</p> <p>(i). construction of an out-patient department (OPD), maternity ward and staff house at Pangira health centre II that was prepared on the 30th June, 2022</p> <p>(ii). Completion of an out-patient department (OPD) at Katum health centre II that was prepared on the 30th June, 2022</p> <p>(iii). Renovation of classroom block at Kolokolo primary school</p> <p>(iv). Construction of a classroom block at Potwach primary school</p> <p>(v). construction of a staff house at Pauma primary school</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence provided of the environment and social (E&S) compliance certification forms but all of them were not signed by either the environmental officer or CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	The District was on IFMS and did its monthly bank reconciliations in the past but was not up to-date at the time of the assessment. The LG had reconciliations of up to the month that ended on 30th June, 2022. The Cash balances on the sampled LG accounts were not obtained because the Bank statements were at the OAG.	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.  Score 2 or else score 0	The District produced all the quarterly internal audit reports for the FY were produced by the internal auditor Mr. Nyeko Geoffrey Job .  The reports were produced on the dates as follows.  Quarter 1. 10th October 2021  Quarter 2. 15th January 2022  Quarter 3. 15th April 2022  Quarter 4. 07th September 2022  Notably however, the 4th quarter internal audit report was produced late (beyond the 15th day following the closure of a quarter) hence no score.	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------



17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY. This report was endorsed by the LG PAC members on 20th July, 2022.</p> <p>The members of PAC that signed on the report included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ven.Rev.Can John Ochola (chairperson),</li> <li>2. Mrs Akong Sarah Obalim (member),</li> <li>3. Mr Okot Joe (member),</li> <li>4. Mr Okot Okech (member) and,</li> <li>5. Mr. Kinyera George Bongomin (Clerk to council)</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG submitted the internal audit reports for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer and were reviewed by the LG PAC on 20th July 2022.</p> <p>However, there is no information provided on follow up on IA recommendations and minutes from LG PAC on how they followed up.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The budgeted revenue collection was 657,100,000 whereas actual collection was 481,152,000 which is above 10%</p> <p><math>481,152,000/657,100,000 \times 100\% = 73.2\%</math></p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year.</p> <p>The OSR collections for FY 2020/2021 was UGX 244,726,698 as noted on page 19 of the audited financial statements for the period.</p> <p>The OSR collection for the FY 2021/2022, the collections amounted to UGX 481,152,000 as noted on 10 of the Draft Financial Statements of the period.</p> <p>This was an increase of UGX (481,152,000 - 244,726,698) = 236,425,302, representing a 49.1% increase compared to the one before the previous financial.</p> <p>The increase triangulates to more than 10% increase</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG remitted the mandatory 65% LLGs share of local revenues during the previous FY</p>	0

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Lamwo DLG had published information regarding the procurement plan and the awarded contracts as evidenced below;</p> <p>1. Procurement ref: LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/00003/LOT 3</p> <p>Contractor: M/S WML Engineering LTD</p> <p>Contract Amount: UGx 627,144,840/=</p> <p>Project: Rehabilitation of Abakadyak-Katum road</p> <p>Date of display 8th November,2021</p> <p>Date of removal 22nd November, 2021</p> <p>2. Procurement ref: LAMW585/SUPLS/2021-2022/00001/LOT 5</p> <p>Contractor: M/S TIMROTIM INVESTMENTS LTD</p> <p>Contract Amount: UGx 51,6840,000/=</p> <p>Project: Supply of 3-seater desks to primary schools</p> <p>Date of display 8th November 2021</p> <p>Date of removal 22nd November 2021</p> <p>Had been displayed on the public notice board.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District performance assessment results and implications were published on the Notice boards on 10th July 2022</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was neither a report nor a radio script to evidence any discussions held with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation during the previous FY.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was evidence that the district publically availed information on i) Tax rates ii) Revenue collection procedures and iii) Procedures for tax appeal on the notice board on as per the public notice dated 30th May 2022</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

The clerk to council indicated that there was a case of alleged fraud and corruption detected but there was no report or minutes from the council meetings

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>School Year 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total No. of Candidates registered = 2865</li> <li>• Total absentees = 38</li> <li>• Total Grades (1, 2 &amp; 3)</li> <li>• <math>(50+1133+791) \times 100</math> (2865-38)</li> <li>• Pass rate = <math>1974 \times 100</math>  2827  = 69.8%</li> </ul> <p>School Year 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total No. of Candidates registered = 3125</li> <li>• Total absentees = 60</li> <li>• Total Grades (1, 2 &amp; 3) = 1984</li> <li>• <math>(49+1054+881) \times 100</math> (3125-60)</li> <li>• Pass rate = <math>1984 \times 100</math>  3065  = 64.7%</li> </ul> <p>The PLE pass rate declined by <math>(64.7-69.8) = -5.1\%</math></p>	<b>0</b>

1

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

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

School Year 2019

• Total No. of Candidates registered  
= 477

• Total absentees = 04

• Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = 194

= (4+56+134) X 100

(477-4)

• Pass rate = 194 X 100

473

= 41.0%

School Year 2020

• Total No. of Candidates registered  
= 582

• Total absentees = 13

• Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = 301

= (12+103+186) X 100

(582-13)

• Pass rate = 301 X 100

569

= 52.9%

The UCE pass rate increased by  
(52.9-41.0) = 11.9%

2

2

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

LLG performance assessment was  
not conducted in the previous years  
and therefore no base data to make  
a comparison

0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0	The LG undertook projects which were in adherence to the Grant and sector guidelines which included; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the 4th quarter output 078182-Teacher house construction and rehabilitation, a two unit staff house was built at Pauma P/S</li> <li>• In the same output, a classroom block was built at Potwach P/S</li> </ul>	2	
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0	From the sampled projects below(there were only two projects in the previous FY), there was no evidence that the three officers, DEO, CDO and Environment Officer verified and certified works before payments were effected as indicated below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a two unit staff house at Pauma P/S by Kakarom Investments Ltd. Among the three officers this indicator sought to certify payments, it's only the DEO who certified payment of 26, 879,115/ on 13th June 2022. The CDO and the environment officer did not certify this payment</li> <li>• The certificate for the construction of a classroom block at Potwach P/S was not availed to the assessment team. The documents were said to be at the OAG Gulu regional office.</li> </ul>	0
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	There was no information received from the LG Engineer in this regard to calculate the variations in the contract price to determine whether they are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates.	0
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure					

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There was no Seed School Project implemented during the FY under review.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The LG Teacher's staff ceiling was 939 and the UPE teachers in post were 525 serving in 71 UPE Schools.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	$\frac{525 \times 100}{939} = 55.9\%$ <p>This implied that the LG was not compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.</p>	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG Consolidated Assets Register 2021/2022 that captured assets (classrooms 641, latrines blocks 199, 3-seater desks 9,035, laboratories & libraries 2 and staff accommodation 154 units) of 73 UPE and 6 USE schools was available.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>This implied that 79 of the 80 schools met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format. One primary school, Lamwoka P/S has no permanent structures because it's sitting on forestry land. Hence it was denied permission to put up permanent structures.</p> <p>Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;</p> $\frac{\text{Total schools that complied} \times 100}{\text{Total (UPE \& USE)}}$ $\frac{79 \times 100}{80} = 98.8\%$	



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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

The LG accurately reported on teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving.

From the three (3) visited Schools of Ayago P/S(urban), Padibe Girls P/S (peri urban) and Abakadyak P/S (rural), it was verified from the teacher's displayed lists teacher's attendance books that the actual presence of the teachers is as per the deployment list at the DEO's office. The dates sampled in the attendance books were; 26th & 11th October 2022, 25th & 29th October, and 19th & 28th October 2022, for Ayago, Padibe Girls and Abakadyak P/S respectively.

- At Ayago P/S, the staff list posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office and indicated that the GoU teachers were 10 which was in agreement with the DEO's deployment list which too had 10 teachers.

- While at Padibe Girls P/S, the staff list was posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office and indicated that the GoU teachers were 13 which number was similar to that on the DEO's deployment list.

- At Abakadyak P/S, the staff list of 2021/22 posted on the wall of the Headteachers' office and indicated that the GoU teachers were 7 and the 8th Latabu Gertrude reported to be on official study leave, which number was similar to that on the DEO's deployment list.

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.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

The Consolidated School Asset register at the DEO's office indicated slight variances on the primary school assets in in the sampled schools. The assessment sampled three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Ayago P/S had; 10 classrooms, 2 blocks of latrines, 145 desks and 7 units of staff houses. However the assessor could not verify this number in the field as the teacher who had the asset register was reported to be away.

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Padibe Girls P/S had; 16 classrooms, 4 blocks of pit latrines, 189 desks and 14 units of staff houses. A comparison of the field findings indicated that there were 18 classrooms, 4 blocks of latrines, 184 desks and 16 units of staff teacher accomodation, hence presenting a variance in all aspects except for latrine blocks.

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Abakadyak P/S had; 16 classrooms, 4 blocks of latrines, 80 three-seater desks and 1 unit of staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, It was found that there were 11, 2, 135 and 1 class rooms, latrine blocks, desks and teacher accommodation respectively, hence presenting a variance in all aspects except for teacher accommodation.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was no evidence to show that the Headteachers of the 71 UPE Schools in the F/Y 2021/2022 had compiled with the Annual Budget Performance Reports and submitted a copy to the DEO as no reports could be produced.

The failure to make the reports was attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent lock downs and school closures.

The assessment however noted sections of the annual school reports like the Assets registers and the summary of PLE results 2020 from the 71 Schools that were filed at the DEO's office.

However, the field visits revealed that Abakadyak P/S had a school budget for 2021, but Padibe Girls and Ayego P/S could not show their budgets.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30– 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

The LG presented a report that of indicating that headteachers were trained in making school improvement plans on 1st September 2022 at Child Care P/S Padibe Town Council. However records indicated that only 6 headteachers had presented SIPs representing 8.1% (6/74 X 100) of compliance.

From the sampled and visited schools;

- At Ayego P/S the SIP is clearly displayed on the wall in the wall in the headteacher's office.
- At Padibe Girls P/S the SIP was available though not dated. The headteacher confirmed that he attended the training about the same on 1st September 2022.
- At Abakadyak P/S the SIP was not seen

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all the 74 UPE and 7 USE registered schools from the previous FY. OTIMS report was compiled and submitted on 27th October, 2021. It was downloaded and accompanied by the letter from the CAO and endorsed by the district planner on the same day.</p> <p>The list of government aided primary schools (74) captured in Lamwo District Performance contract FY 2021/22 generated on 21st April, 2022 is consistent with the number of schools (74) in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2021/22</p> <p>The %age of schools was;</p> $74/74 \times 100$ $= 100\%$	4
---	--	---	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/23 generated on 21st April, 2022 on page 36 indicated 5,091,588,000 as the general salaries of 579 teachers budgeted for in 74 UPE schools.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the three visited Schools; Ayego (urban), Padibe Girls (peri Urban) and Abakadyak Primary Schools, the names and number of teachers as displayed in the Headteachers' office matched with what was on the teacher's deployment list at the DEO's office.</p> <p>For example, as per the Deployment list; Ayego had 10 teachers, Padibe Girls had 13 and Abakadyak had 8 teachers including the Headteachers.</p> <p>A school verification visit observed from the displayed lists in the offices of the Headteachers the similar staff numbers and names as on the deployment list at the DEO's desk.</p>	3

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The DEO's staff list was found posted on the LG Education notice board. The Headteachers at the visited schools Ayego, Padibe Girls and Abakadyak, had too posted their respective staff lists on the walls in their respective offices.</p>	<b>1</b>
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District had a total of 71 Government aided primary schools, a review of 10 randomly sampled head teacher's files from among the 71 revealed that all the 10 sampled head teachers were not appraised during the last School year</p>	<b>0</b>
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District had 6 Government aided Secondary schools.  There was no evidence availed for assessment in regard to appraising the Headteachers of Secondary Schools</p>	<b>0</b>
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of appraising the Education department staff for their performance for FY 2019/20 as showed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DEO, Mr. Langoya Barnabas was appraised by the CAO on 15th July, 2022.</li> <li>• Mr. Joro Ben Washington the Inspector of Schools was appraised by the DEO on 21st July, 2022.</li> </ul>	2
---	--	--	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education department training plan to address the staff capacity gaps for the appraisals of 2020/2021 was made and endorsed by the DEO on 16th July, 2021.</p> <p>It captured staff capacity gaps and recommended career development and skills training.</p> <p>An invitation letter to Headteachers to attend one of the trainings was seen dated 1st March, 2022</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment noted from DEO, that the LG was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data. Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment data submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Lamwo LG.</p> <p>In the letter written by the CAO and endorsed by the district planer on 27th October 2021 , the LG included the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) that contained 74 UPE Schools and 7 secondary schools. This information was confirmed from the approved budget as generated on 21st April, 2022.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Lamwo District Education Department made allocations of UGX 45,527,000/- for monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary captured as output 078402 on page 21 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2021/22 generated on 21st June, 2022. This was above the minimum of UGX 4,000,000/- per LG stipulated by the sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines)</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters after cash limits have been uploaded in the system</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Records pertaining to the invoices of capitation to schools were not presented for assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Education department inspection plan for 2021 was not available.</p> <p>However an inspection report dated 8th August 2021 indicated that all the 74 UPE schools were inspected..</p> <p>Minutes for a post-inspection report meeting held on 30th March 2022 were seen.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the FY under review indicated that all the 74 UPE and 6 USE Schools were regularly inspected and monitored. For example a report dated 8th July, 2021 indicated that 85 primary (USE &amp; Private), 7 secondary secondary schools, were inspected.</p> <p>Another inspection report dated 2nd May, 2022 also indicated that all the 74 primary schools were inspected.</p> <p>Therefore, it was correct to infer that 100% UPE Schools were inspected during the FY under review.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was observed by the assessment team that inspection reports were discussed at both the school level and the LG level as indicated below;</p> <p>At the visited schools for example inspectors Ojara Sultan Ben and Gomic Esther visited Padibe Girls P/S on 19th July, 2022 and 20th May 2021 respectively and discussed the inspection findings with the headteacher Ayela Fred after which all parties appended their signatures to the reports. In the same school the school management committee held on 19th August 2022 discussed inspection reports.</p> <p>In Abakadyak P/S the school management committee meeting held on 27th December, 2021 discussed inspection reports in MIN 3 27/12/2021</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The DIS prepared and submitted all the inspection reports together with the Activity work plans and budgets for financial year 2021/22 for quarters I, II and III to DES Gulu office and acknowledgement of receipt dated 21st September 2022.</p> <p>In the headteachers' Beginning of Term meeting held on 2nd June 2022, inspection reports were discussed under minute Min 05/2022</p>	2



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results. The committee for Education and Sports sectoral committee meeting that sat on 27th November 2021 under item 2, inspection reports were presented on page one of the report.</p>	<b>2</b>
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of LG education department mobilizing learners to go back to school after Covid 19.</p> <p>For example the DEO was hosted on a radio talk show on Mighty Fire 91.5 FM on 17th February 2022. The show was sponsored by WORUDET.</p> <p>A recording of the show in Luo was interpreted by one assessor who knew the language and concluded that the subject matter was about mobilizing parents to send back their children to school.</p>	<b>2</b>

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Consolidated School Asset register at the DEO's office indicated slight variances on the primary school assets in in the sampled schools. The assessment sampled three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Ayago P/S had; 10 classrooms, 2 blocks of latrines, 145 desks and 7 units of staff houses. However the assessor could not verify this number in the field as the teacher who had the asset register was reported to be away.</li> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Padibe Girls P/S had; 16 classrooms, 4 blocks of pit latrines, 189 desks and 14 units of staff houses. A comparison of the field findings indicated that there were 18, 4, 184 and 16 class rooms, latrine blocks, desks and teacher accommodation respectively, hence presenting a variance in all aspects except for latrine blocks.</li> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Abakadyak P/S had; 16 classrooms, 4 blocks of latrines, 80 three-seater desks and 1 unit of staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, It was found that there were 11, 2, 135 and 1 class rooms, latrine blocks, desks and teacher accommodation respectively, hence presenting a variance in all aspects except for teacher accommodation.</li> </ul> <p>Hence the LG has to update the asset register to reconcile the figures from schools with those at the district.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for the education sector projects in the budget. The education sector were however captured into the LGDP III and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>The field appraisal report dated 30th May, 2022 signed by the CDO and Environment Officer indicated that that LG conducted project field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability. All projects were deemed to be technically feasible, environmental and socially acceptable.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan for the current FY 2022/2023 was available it was approved by the CAO for Lamwo Mr. Alex Felix Majeme on 31st July, 2022 and was submitted to the PPDPA on 19th September, 2022. On review, it was established that the Plan did not contain a seed school planned for construction.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>Lamwo DLG had no Seed School project during the FY under review and the other Education sector projects were below the threshold and never required approval by the Solicitor General. It was however hard for the assessment to establish whether the Contracts Committee cleared the small projects</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>LG did not establish the Project Implementation Team (PIT) because there was no Seed School Project during the FY under review.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed School Project implemented during FY 2021/2022 and therefore no Project Implementation Team was established.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no Seed School project implemented during the Financial Year 2021/2022 and therefore no site meeting were held.</p>	<b>1</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no Seed School project implemented during the Financial Year 2021/2022.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence provided in regards sector infrastructure projects having been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract. The assessment team was informed that the project files were at the OAG in Gulu. There was no release letter of the project files to the OAG.	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The assessors failed to access records relating to the timely submission of the Sector procurement plan to the LG Procurement and Disposal unit by April 30th.	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There was no evidence provided in regards complete procurement files for projects implemented in FY 2021/2022. The assessment team was informed that the project procurement files were at the OAG in Gulu. There was no release letter of the project files to the OAG.	<b>0</b>

### **Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence of grievances recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in the education sector.	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of the dissemination of the enhanced DDEG guidelines for the FY 2021/22 to the lower local governments and this was acknowledged when all recipients appended their signatures on the distribution list dated 1st November, 2021	<b>3</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	The LG education sector had a costed ESMP on the construction of 1 block of 2 units staff house at Pauma primary school that was integrated in the BoQs, Bill No. 1 with a cost of UGX 9,654,115	<b>2</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence of a land offer agreement between the community of Ogako Lacan primary school and Padibe east sub-county local government, for the establishment of Padibe East Seed secondary school that was prepared on 1st May, 2015 and re-affirmed in a meeting that was held on the 28th August, 2021 under minute number "Min IV/28/7/2021 confirmation of land offer to Ogako Lacan primary school"	<b>1</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was evidence of monitoring reports dated 30th June, 2022 where the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions for the (i).Renovation of classroom block at Kolokolo primary school  (ii). Construction of a classroom block at Potwach primary school  (iii). Construction of a staff house at Pauma primary school	<b>2</b>

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else score:0*

There was evidence provided for the E & S certification forms prior to executing the project contractor payments but the environmental officer and CDO did not append their signatures to them. Only the District Engineer, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Finance Officer and the District Education Officer signed them.

(i). Interim certificate number 001, issued on 13th June, 2022 for the construction of one block of two classrooms with office at Potwach, construction of a staff house at Pauma primary school and renovation of one block of two classrooms at Kolokolo primary school.

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>On calculating the annual deliveries for health facilities using the monthly reports (HMIS107). The summaries for the 3 sampled health facilities were as follows:</p> <p>Padibe HCIV: In FY 2020/21, there were 643 deliveries. In FY 2021/2022, there were 694 deliveries. The increase was <math>694 - 643 = 51</math>. The percentage increase was therefore <math>51/643 \times 100 = 7.9\%</math></p> <p>Lokung HCIII: In FY 2020/21, there were 540 deliveries. In FY 2021/2022, there were 548 deliveries. The increase was <math>694 - 643 = 8</math>. The percentage increase was therefore <math>8/540 \times 100 = 1.5\%</math>.</p> <p>Palabek Gem HCIII: In FY 2020/21, there were 303 deliveries. In FY 2021/2022, there were 307 deliveries. The increase was <math>307 - 303 = 4</math>. The percentage increase was therefore <math>4/303 \times 100 = 1.3\%</math>.</p> <p>Average percentage increase was <math>7.9 + 1.5 + 1.3 / 3 = 3.6\%</math></p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG spent 95% of the health development grant for the previous FY and had a balance of 5% hence non compliance. The budget amount Ugx 1,126,170 and amount spent was Ugx 1,065,170 which translated into 95%.. The unspent 5% was expalined to be the investment service costs, bank charges and retention.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Assessment team was informed that the project files that contained certification forms were at the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Assessment team was informed that the project files that contained records on the Engineer's estimates and the signed contracts carrying the Contract price were at the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Information on HC II being upgraded to HC III was not presented for assessment. The assessment team was informed that the project files were at the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assessment sampled the the following HC IVs and IIIs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Madi Opei HCIV had 26 staff out of 48 staffing norm = 54.2%</li> <li>2. Paloga HCIII, had 13 staff out 19 staffing norm = 68.4%</li> <li>3. Pangira HCIII had 14 staff out of 19 staffing norm = 73.7%</li> </ol> <p>Average % was (54.2+68.4+73.7)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">=65.4%</p> <p>Therefore, the staff recruitment at all HC IIIs and IVs was not as per the staffing structure.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG Health infrastructure construction projects met the approved MOH designs. A site visit to Katum HC II to HC III the OPD under construction confirmed that, the doors were of size 1.5x2.1m as specified in the design, windows were of size 1.2x1.5m as per the design, sampled room sizes (Male ward) was 5x 3.5m as specified in the design, roof structure was made of mild steel members and gauge 26 iron sheets and wall thickness met the specifications in the design</p>	2



## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

The assessment sampled the the following HC IVs and IIIs

1. Madi Opei HCIV had 26 staff out of 48 staffing norm

2. Paloga HCIII, had 13 staff out 19 staffing norm

3. Pangira HCIII had 14 staff out of 19 staffing norm

Therefore, the information on the positions filled in the Health Centres against that on the DHO's deployment list was accurate in the sampled Health Centres.

2

5

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

The list of constructed and upgraded health facilities was obtained from DHO. Out patient(OPD) , Staff house, Maternity block constructed and completed at Pangira HCII. The completed structures are not yet in use.. Upgrading of Katum HCII to HCIII was completed but the structures are not yet in use.

The Information was correctly captured in the PBS of 2021/2022. For example

1 Pangira staff house on Pg 64 of the PBS report. Pangira OPD and maternity on Pg 65 of PBS report. Katum OPD pg 67 of the PBS report

2 Constructed and completed Out Patient Department (OPD) at Pangira HCIII.

3 Constructed and completed staff House at Pangira HCIII.

4 Constructed and completed Maternity Block at Pangira HCIII. All not yet in use.

5 Upgrade of Katum HCII to III. Construction completed but facility constructed not yet in use.

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of submission of copies of the work plans and budgets for FY 2021/2022 for the health facilities of Padibe HC IV, Lokung HC III and Palabek Gem HC III to the District Health Office by March 31st 2022.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of preparation and subsequent submission of Annual Budget performance Reports FY 2021/2022 for the health facilities of Padibe HC IV, Lokung HC III and Palabek Gem HC III to the District Health Office.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

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

Health facilities had developed facility improvement plans are seen below;

Padibe HCIV PIP submitted and endorsed by DHO on 30th June, 2022 and endorsed by CAO on 30th June, 2022.

Lokung HCIII PIP submitted and endorsed by DHO on 30th June, 2022 and endorsed by CAO on 31st August, /2022.

Palabek Gem PIP submitted and endorsed by DHO on 13th July,2022 and endorsed by CAO on 18th October, 2022.

There were no reports on implementation of the submitted performance improvement plans presented from the health facilities of Padibe HVIV, Lokung HCIII and Palabek Gem HCIII.

However, all the 3 performance improvement plans do not incorporate issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely</p> <p>1 Padibe HCIV had all 12 monthly reports from July 2021 to June 2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month.</p> <p>2 Lokung HCIII had all 12 monthly reports from July 2021 to June 2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month.</p> <p>3 Palabek Gem HCIII had all 12 monthly reports from July 2021 to June 2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Submission of Quarterly Reports</p> <p>1 Padibe HCIV had all 4 Quarterly reports from July- Sep. October- December, January - March, April -June for FY 2021/2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month of the Quarter.</p> <p>2 Lokung HCIII had all 4 Quarterly reports from July- Sep. October- December, January - March, April -June for FY 2021/2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month of the Quarter.</p> <p>3 Palabek Gem HCIII had all 4 Quarterly reports from July- Sep. October- December, January - March, April -June for FY 2021/2022 submitted timely on or before 7th day of the next month of the Quarter.</p>	
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no evidence of the record of submission of RBF invoices for the previous quarter by the sampled health facilities of Padibe HCIV, Lokung HCIII and Palabek Gem HCIII at the District Health Office</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Three consolidated quarterly district RBF invoices submitted to Ministry of Health were presented for review</p> <p>:</p> <p>Quarter one invoice was endorsed by the DHO and CAO was submitted on 18th October 2021.</p> <p>Quarter two invoices presented did not have a consolidated health facility invoice so I could not verify the date of submission.</p> <p>Quarter three invoice was endorsed by the DHO and CAO was submitted on 17th May, 2022.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG submitted quarterly performance reports but this was not timely done. The quarterly reports were submitted on the dates as follows;</p> <p>Quarter one. 14th December 2021</p> <p>Quarter two. 28th January 2022</p> <p>Quarter three. 2nd May 2022</p> <p>Quarter four. 7th September 2022</p> <p>The submission of the reports for Quarter One, three and four were outside the stipulated guidelines.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Local Government did not develop a Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities in FY 2022/2023.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no report on implementation of the Local government Performance Improvement Plan since there was no Plan prepared by the local government</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Lamwo DLG had Ugx 3,590,479,000 budgeted for for wage for health workers on the staff list in FY 2022/2023 as captured on pg 30 of the approved district Budget for FY 2022/2023</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There are 187 health workers on the staff list deployed to health facilities in accordance to the guidelines provided in the health sector Grants and Budget Guidelines. Going by the staffing norms for health facilities and district Health office, the district requires 366 health workers. The staffing level in the district is therefore <math>187/366 \times 100 = 51\%</math> which is below the required minimum of 75%. At facility level, 3 samples were taken and the staffing levels were as below;</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

- 1. Padibe HCIV HCIV had 38 staff out of 48 staffing norm representing 79.2%
  - 2. Lokung HCIII, had 12 staff out 19 staffing norm norm representing 63.2%
  - 3. Palabek Gem HCIII had 12 staff out of 19 staffing norm representing 63.2%
- Apart from Padibe HCIV, Lokung HCIII and Palabek Gem HCIII had staffing levels below 75%.

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>To verify that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, the Assessment Team sampled three whose revelation is presented below;</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>1. Padibe HCIV has 38 staff on the staff list signed by the in charge on 21st October 2022. The attendance register had 23 staff that are on the staff list who signed attendance on 2nd November 2022</p>	
			<p>2 Lokung HC III has 12 staff on the staff list. On 1st November 2022 , Four (4) health workers who are on the staff list signed attendance register..</p>	
			<p>3 Palabek Gem HCIII has 12 health workers on the staff list. On 1st November 2022 all 13 health workers signed the attendance register</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of publization of Health Workers' deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY as per the findings of the field visits at the following facilities;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Lokung HCIII, Palabek Gem HCIII and Padibe HCIV all publicized health workers deployment by posting on facility notice boards;</p>	
			<p>Lokung HCIII -the posted staff list had no date when it was posted and the list was for FY 2021/2022.</p>	
			<p>Palabek Gem HCIII staff list posted on notice board was dated 05th September 2022</p>	
			<p>Padibe HCIV staff list posted on notice board was dated 21st October 2022</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Records pertaining to the appraisal of health workers were not presented during the two days of Assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Records in regard to the in-charges appraising facility workers were not presented for assessment</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No recorded were presented in regard to corrective actions taken as informed by staff appraisal</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <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>Training on clinical management of sexual and Gender Based violence (SGBV) survivors conducted from 20th through 23rd March 2022. A total of 30 health workers were trained.</p> <p>The training however seemed to have been spontaneous because there was no training plan presented to the assessment team.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Training data base for TOT for Lamwo district FY 2021/2022 was presented during assessment. Document signed by Oroma Takish a Nursing Officer. the database included activities training on clinical management of sexual and Gender Based violence (SGBV)</p>	1

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



9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Letter from the Chief Administrative Officer Lamwo District to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health confirming list of health facilities was written on 12th July, 2022 and said to have been delivered to MoH permanent Secretary but has no acknowledgement from the Ministry of Health.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines. The total allocation made for DHO (less non-wage) was 51,646,208 and PHC NWR Grant was 352,042,227.</p> <p>So <math>51,646,208/352,042,227 \times 100\%</math> was =15%</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided in regards to the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence as proof that the LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Minutes of one Quarterly DHMT performance review meeting were produced as evidence of the meeting held in FY 2021/2022. The meeting was held on 18th July 2021. The meeting recommended that health workers improve on the time management.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Two quarterly performance review meetings were held in FY 2021/2022 according to the presented and reviewed minutes.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
			<p>First meeting was held on 31st January 2022.</p>	
			<p>Second meeting was held on 12th May 2022</p>	
			<p>In both meetings held, no attendance list was produced to enable assessment confirm whether all health facility in charges, Implementing partners, DHMT and key Local government departments attended these meetings.</p>	

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence of supervision of HC IVs in Lamwo DLG for only Quarters 1 and 2 as showed below;</p> <p>Quarter one supervision report was dated 29th September 2022 and shows that the two HC IV of Padibe and Madi Opei were supervised</p> <p>Quarter 2 supervision report was dated 30th March 2022 and shows that Padibe HCIV and Madi Opei HCIV were supervised.</p> <p>There was however no records of supervision conducted by the Local government in Health Center IVs in Quarter three and four of FY 2021/2022.</p>	<b>0</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence showing that the health sub district support supervision to lower health facilities was conducted during the previous FY. At least two reports were presented during the assessment.</p> <p>1 Report on supportive supervision for quarter three dated 29th March 2022. The following health facilities were visited:</p> <p>Lokung HCIII, Paloga HC III, Pearl Medical Center III, Potika HCIII, Madi Opei HCIV, Okol HC II, Pangira HC III among others.</p> <p>2 Report on integrated support supervision to lower health facilities for quarter four dated 30th June 2022</p> <p>The following health facilities were visited: St Peter and St Paul HC III, Padibe west HC III, Palabek gem HC III, Katum HC III, Paloga HC III among others.</p>	<b>1</b>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY</p> <p>No copy of feedback letters of recommendations for specific corrective actions from supervision and monitoring visits to the sampled health facilities of Padibe HCIV, Lokung HCII and Palabek Gem HCIII were produced during the assessment period.</p> <p>No report on follow up on implementation of recommendations made was produced during the assessment period.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no medicine management supervision reports availed to the assessment.</p> <p>A power point presentation on SPARS report for FY 2021/2022 signed by Okumu Francis DMMS Lamwo dated 24th August 2022 was presented during assessment. It is not clear who the target audience for this presentation were and to be specific a presentation could not serve as a report.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did no allocate at least any amount out of the money for Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities</p>	0

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG presented Four quarterly activity reports on health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities to the assessment:</p> <p>1 Quarter one report dated 24th September, 2021.</p> <p>2 Quarter two activity report dated 30th December, 2021.</p> <p>3 Quarter three activity report dated 26th March 2022.</p> <p>4 Quarter four activity report dated 20th June 2022.</p> <p>All signed by Mr Obote, Senior Health Educator.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>In Quarter one, recommendations were made for improving nutrition activities. In Quarter two follow up was made and data on severe acute malnutrition (SAM) and moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) were collected, presented and discussed by the DHT.</p> <p>There was however no evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Asset Register presented for assessment was not in the prescribed format as per the Health sector Grants and Budget guidelines. The reviewed assets register never contained a list of health facilities in the District.</p> <p>The medical equipment list was not availed and therefore it was not possible to compare the medical equipment captured in the Asset Register with Ministry of Health list of medical equipment.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p>	<p>The prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were derived from the LGDP III, were appraised and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and  (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>These projects included; 2-stance VIP Latrines with washroom and Pawach HCIV, Fencing of Pauma HCII.</p>	
		<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>These projects are listed on pages 1&amp;2 of the appraisal report</p>	
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability and customized designs to site conditions. 7 projects were appraised and listed on pages 1&amp;2 of the appraisal report dated 30th May, 2022</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for the construction of all health sector projects prior to commencement of all civil works.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>(i). Fencing of Pauma health centre II at Palabek Kal sub-county, prepared on 30th May, 2022.</p>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to prove the submission of the health sector infrastructure plan procurement and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plans at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence proving that form PP1 was submitted to the PDU by the 1st Quarter of the current FY</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no contracts committee minutes for the previous FY that were presented by procurement officer. The assessment team was informed that all the files were with the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no record to show that the CAO had designated members to constitute the PIT. Files from procurement department were not availed to the the Assessment Team and it was alleged that they were at OAG at Gulu city.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Three projects were sampled and no defects were seen at the time of inspection and the infrastructure were in conformity with the standard designs. The project visited were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff house at Pangera Health Centre II</li> <li>2. OPD ward at Pangira Health Centre II</li> <li>3. Maternity ward at Pangera Health Centre II</li> </ol> <p>A site visit to Pangira HC II confirmed that, the doors were of size 1.5x2.1m as specified in the design, windows were of size 1.2x1.5m as per the design, sampled room sizes (Male ward) was 5x 3.5m as specified in the design, roof structure was made of mild steel members and gauge 28 iron sheets and wall thickness met the specifications in the design.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0	Record from the office of DLG Engineer could not be accessed since no LG officer was present to retrieve and provide them to the Assessment team during to two days of the Assessment.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0	The Office of the DLG engineer was not accessible for the two days of the assessment exercise to look at the necessary documentation to determine supervision of the projects.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0	Only one report for monthly supervision dated 18/7/2022 for the three projects below was presented for assessment;	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/00004</li> <li>2. LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/00005</li> <li>3. LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/00006</li> </ol>	
			There was no site instruction book presented nor a visitor's book to ascertain whether monthly supervision was conducted during the previous FY.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0	There was no file review done as the procurement Officer, informed the assessment team that the files had been taken to the OAG Gulu.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure			



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was hard for the Assessment team to establish the existence of complete Procurement files at Lamwo. The assessment team was informed that the files had been taken by the Auditor Generals Regional office in Gulu.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed on an established grievance redress mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework. This was evidenced by the absence of record of grievances log, investigations and feedback mechanism.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed on the LG health sector dissemination of guidelines on health care/ medical waste management to health facilities</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that the LG had put in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence availed from the LG health sector on conducted training(s) and or created awareness in healthcare waste management.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence of an incorporated costed ESMP that was prepared for the construction of Pangira health centre II into the BoQs, Bill No. 3 with a cost of UGX 415,505,422	<b>2</b>
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Evidence was provided on land ownership where the Health sector projects are being constructed such as;</p> <p>Land titles for</p> <p>(i). Palabek Ogili health centre III at plot 26, block 3 at Lagotpuk sub-county, Instrument No. GUL-00003069, issued on 29th September, 2021.</p> <p>(ii). Padibe health centre IV at plot 14, block 2 at Atwol sub-county, North Cell, with Instrument No. GUL-00003083, issued on 6th October, 2021</p> <p>(iii). Madi Opei health centre IV at plot 8, block 4 at central ward with Instrument No. GUL-00003070, issued on 29th September, 2021</p> <p>(iv). Agoro health centre III at plot 11, block 5 at central ward with instrument No. GUL-00003071, issued on 29th September, 2021</p> <p>Consent forms for voluntary land contributions for</p> <p>(v). Building out-patient department (OPD) at Katum west village, Katum sub-county Consent form dated 19th May, 2021</p> <p>(vi). Construction of Likiliki market at Palabek Gem consent form dated 19th October, 2021</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs with monitoring reports for the</p> <p>(i). construction of an out-patient department (OPD), maternity ward and staff house at Pangira Health Centre II that was prepared on the 30th June, 2022</p> <p>(ii). Completion of an out-patient department (OPD) at Katum Health Centre II that was prepared on the 30th June, 2022</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence of payment interim certificates No.001 for the construction of maternity ward at Pangira Health Centre II that was issued on 13th June, 2022 and for the completion of an out-patient department (OPD) at Katum Health Centre II that was issued on the 14th June, 2022 but were not 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

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The District rural water functionality status was 79%</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees was 95%.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Verrification of assessment results yet to be completed</p>	<b>0</b>

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Lamwo LG safe water coverage was 95%. The sub counties where the projects were implemented had a safe water coverage as indicated; Potika with 59.4%, Padibe West with 89.6% and Palabek Gem with 109.3% .</p> <p>Projects implemented during the FY 2012/22 included; siting, drilling and pump testing of 2 production boreholes in Potika and Padibe west s/cs, construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine in Palebek-gem s/c. The number of projects implemented in sub-county whose coverage is below the district coverage = <math>\frac{2}{3} \times 100\% = 67\%</math></p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled contracts, the variation in contract price of WSS infrastructure investments for previous FY was above +/- 20% of Engineers estimates as illustrated below:</p> <p>1. Drilling of 2 production boreholes  Engineers estimate = UGX 58,000,000  Contract sum = UGX 45,594,800  Variation = UGX 12,405,200  %age variation = <math>\frac{12,405,200}{58,000,000} \times 100\% = 21\%</math></p> <p>2. Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine  Engineers estimate =UGX 27,600,000  Contract sum =UGX 26,685,165  Variation =UGX 914,835  %age variation = <math>\frac{914,835}{27,600,000} \times 100\% = 3\%</math></p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Total projects implemented during FY 2021/2022 were; Drilling of 2 production boreholes, construction of 3 stance VIP latrine and design and build a mini piped water supply scheme. Only 2 were completed by the end of the FY as indicated in the Annual BPR, thus the percentage = <math>\frac{2}{3} \times 100\% = 67\%</math></p>	0

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 &amp; 2021/2022.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/2021 &amp; 2021/2022 was 79% and 79% respectively.</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 &amp; 2021/2022.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/2021 &amp; 2021/2022 was 95% and 95% respectively.</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p>	<b>0</b>

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The LG reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and their performance as per the list below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 3 stance drainable VIP latrine constructed in Obokolot Market, in Palabek-gem s/c funded under the DWSCG, completed</li> <li>2. Drilling of 2 production boreholes d in Moroto East village Potika s/c and Alur West village in Padibe West s/, completed.</li> <li>3. Design and build of a mini piped water supply scheme in Moroto East village, Potika s/c, was not completed.</li> </ol> <p>Only 2 projects i.e. the drilling and pump testing of 2 production boreholes and the 3 stance VIP latrine were constructed and were functional at the time of the assessment..</p>	<b>3</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The 4 sets of quarterly reports that were obtained from the DWO did not specifically handle issues of functionality of the water facilities, it was only the 4th quarter report that had an attached form giving details of functionality of water facilities including the WSC otherwise other aspects were not specifically mentioned</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO does not update the MIS on quarterly basis it was only done annually and there was no evidence of form 1 for the new sources seen in the reports except only form 4 for the old water sources in the fourth quarter report</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence to the effect that DWO had supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans:</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The District Water Officer had budgeted UGX 44,845,000 for Civil engineer (Water) Assistant Engineering Officer, and Borehole Maintenance Technician on page 50 of the approved budget for 2021/2022</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---



6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff	b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2	The District Natural Resources Officer had budgeted UGX 170,064,000 for District Natural Resources Officer, Senior Environment Officer and, Forestry Officer, on page 55 of the approved budget for 2021/2022	2
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	There was no evidence availed for assessment	0
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>			
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	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	The DWO had no evidence showing that she had conducted a capacity needs identification of the staff from the performance appraisal and conducted training as per the LG Training Plan and documented the training in the database.	0
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>			

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

8	Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>• • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• • If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• • If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• • If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	There was evidence to prove that the DWO prioritized the water stressed sub counties during the budget allocation for the current FY.	2
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>		The DWO allocated 95% of budget for FY 2022/2023 to a sub-county with coverage below the district average (95%). The total water budget was UGX 597,907,791. The allocation to sub counties with safe water coverage below that of the District was UGX 566,707,791 for example Potika s/c with a coverage of 59.4% was allocated a project, designing and building of 1 mini piped water supply scheme.	
			Therefore the percentage allocation to the sub-county with coverage below the district average was;	
			$566,707,791/597,907.791*100\% = 95\%$	

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence of DWO communicating to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY.</p> <p>At the notice board, the DWO on 1st August, 2022 posted the planned projects and their respective locations by sub-county for the FY 2022/2023.</p>	3
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no information available as proof that the DWO monitored each of the WSS facilities on a quarterly basis. The quarterly and monitoring reports seen e.g. quarter 2 report dated 8th October 2021 did not have any information on the facility functionality, environment and social safeguards. The report also lacked a list of facility monitored in that quarter. And similarly other quarterly reports did not have any information.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings during the previous FY. Four sets of minutes were presented and on review, they pointed out pertinent issues that were discussed with actions taken on them e.g. DWSCC meeting held on 15th October 2021, under minute No. Min.4/10/2021, the sanitation situation in the District; pointed out a number of villages that had low latrine coverage among them was Oboko village in Potika s/c which had a latrine coverage of 26%. In the progress report it was mentioned that home improvement campaigns were conducted in that village and others. This was in the 4th quarter report 2021/22 dated 10th July 2022</p>	2

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>Allocations for the projects planned for implementation in the FY 2022/23 was posted on the DWO notice board on 1st August, 2022 as seen on the stamp print on the document,</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the AWP the total NWR was Ugx 98,152,103= and the DWO allocated Ugx 30,141,037= towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The %age = <math>30,141,037/98,152,103 \times 100\% = 31\%</math> which is below the minimum scoring level.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The third quarter report with a submission dated of 11th April 2022 in page 3 of the excel sheet mentioned that the WSC were established but not trained.</p>	3
<b>Investment Management</b>				
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence seen for an updated register for the Water sector for the projects implemented in the previous FY.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS underwent desk review and were captured in both the DDP III page 112 to 113 (3 stance drainable VIP latrine constructed in Obokolot Market, in Palabek-gem s/c funded under the DWSCG and Drilling of 2 production boreholes d in Moroto East village Potika s/c and Alur West village in Padibe West s/c and the AWP on page 67.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>Applications were in place for the two production boreholes that were drilled. For example for the production borehole drilled in Agoro s/c which now falls in the newly created s/c of Potika Mr.Ochola John Sam the community leader and one other community member Mr. Komakech Charles representing the community of Lobule 'A' village; this application was dated 15th January 2021 and it was endorsed by the CDO of Agoro s/c Mr. Arop William on the 19th January 2021</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a field appraisal for the current FY projects that checked on the technical feasibility, environmental, social acceptability &amp; designs. The screening for drilling of a production wells at Alur village, Padibe west sub-county and (ii). At Pawach village, Potika sub-county, prepared on 20th April, 2022</p>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>The screening of all water sector projects for environmental and social risks was conducted prior to implementation like drilling of a production wells at Alur village, Padibe west sub-county.</p> <p>The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for water sector projects prior to commencement of all civil works because at the time of screening the projects fell under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG Procurement plan which presented during assessment was approved on 31st July, 2022 and submitted to PPDA on 19th September, 2022. It had Item No.5 for the Design and Build of water supply system in Pawach in Patika subcounty at a cost of Ugx 566,707,791 under the DWSF incorporated.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There were no files availed to the assessment team. The procurement officer, informed the assessor that the files had been taken to the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There were no files availed to the assessment team to assess the proper establishment of the Project Implementation Team for the water sector projects. The procurement officer, informed the assessor that the files had been taken to the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>Technical drawings were availed and in particular for the three-stance latrine for Obokolot market Contract: LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/0014 was reviewed and the site visit established that the construction works adhered to the standard designs for instance the roof structure was made of timber and gauge 28 iron sheets as required by the drawings and designs.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>Supervision report for Drilling of production 2No. wells by M/S Icon Projects as contractor under Procurement Ref: LAMW585/WRKS/2021-2022/0002 dated:14th July, 2022 was availed. However, there were no minutes for site meetings to determine whether actions between the DWO and the contractor/consultant were implemented by the contractor and Contract management plan was availed.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no procurement files to review if there was verification of works prior to contractor's payment as per the contractual terms. It was alleged that files had been taken to the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no procurement files to review and establish their completeness as per requirement of the PPDA Law. It was alleged that files had been taken to the OAG in Gulu.</p>	0

## Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of an established mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework at Lamwo DLG.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on the dissemination of guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and Natural Resource management to CDOs by the DWO and the Environment Officer during the FY under review.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence provided for the water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY 2021/2022, that is</p> <p>(i). at Moroto east village, Potika sub-county and</p> <p>(ii). at Alur village, Padibe west sub-county prepared on 1st July, 2021</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>All WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent that is consent forms for voluntary land contribution for</p> <p>1). For the production borehole drilled in Padibe West s/c, Madi-kiloc parish, in Alur west village there was a land agreement between Mr. Okongo Marino the land owner and Alur West community, represented by Abayo George. This was signed on the 12th October, 2021.</p> <p>2). For the production borehole drilled in Moroto East village, there was also a land agreement between Mr. Oryem Mathew and the Moroto East community. This agreement was signed on the 10th December 2020.</p>	3

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	E & S certification forms that were issued for the payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of the drilling, test pumping and construction of two production wells that is certificate No. 001, issued on the 14th June, 2022 were not signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	A monitoring report and ESMPs for drilling and construction of deep boreholes prepared on 26th June, 2022 on Environment and Social compliance by the CDO and environmental officer were presented for assessment and were indeed assessed.	<b>2</b>



**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The available irrigation scheme Agoro is managed by Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries. At the time of the LGPA, the scheme was under rehabilitation by the Ministry of Water and Environment. The available data had not been updated since the scheme is still under rehabilitation by Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE). The LG has very low input in the management of the irrigation scheme. There is need for MWE to involve more the LG in order to foster sense of ownership and eventual sustainability</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI activities conducted</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG was not implementing MSI projects</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No funding had been received to this effect by the LG, therefore no procurement has been conducted yet</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	LG was waiting for MSI funds this FY and was not on MSI programme the previous FY	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2  • Between 80 - 99% score 1  • Below 80% score 0	No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI activities conducted. The LG is scheduled to receive Micro irrigation support grant in FY 2022/2023.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2  • If 75 - 99% score 1  • If below 75% score 0	LG never recruited extension workers as per the staff structure during the Previous FY	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI equipment has been supplied. Micro irrigation support grant in FY 2022/2023.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI systems were installed in the previous FY. The LG was scheduled to receive Micro irrigation support grant in FY 2022/2023.	0

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Three LLGs of Lokung and Padibe East Sub counties and Padibe Town Council were sampled for assessment. In all the 3 sampled sub counties and Town Council there was no extension workers at station nor the Senior Assistant Secretary to provide information for verification.</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI system had been installed. Micro irrigation support grant was expected in FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The MSI equipment had not yet been installed because there was no funding during the FY under review. Micro irrigation support grant was expected to start in FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No funding had been received to start MSI activities and to start MIS reporting. Micro irrigation support grant was expected in FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>LG was not yet rolled on to the MSI programme</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The LG had not started implementing MSI activities at the time of the LGPA for the FY under review.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had not started implementing MSI activities at the time of the LGPA for the FY under review.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Evidence was presented to the fact that LG has included in their recruitment plan (7) extension workers	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	The Assessment team sampled Lokung and Padibe East Sub counties and Padibe Town Council. The reviewed staff list indicated extension workers who however were not at station during the Assessment.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assessment team sampled Lokung and Padibe East Sub counties and Padibe Town Council. The reviewed staff list indicated extension workers who however were not at station during the Assessment.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>While on the field visit at Agoro Irrigation Scheme, the Assessment team visited Agoro subcounty and there was no evidence of extension support by the LLG to Agoro irrigation scheme one of the locations where intensive crop production is taking place in the LG</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented that the District Production Officer has conducted appraisal of extension workers during FY 2021/2022. For instance the following Agricultural officers had not been appraised as of 30/6/2022. The staff included Mocrach Obwona Clement-Agoro LLG, oroma Samuel Baker-Padibe West, Komakech Geoffrey-Palabek-Ogili and Nokrac Kassim-Lokung East-LLG</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented in regard to taking corrective actions in respect of appraisal of extension workers by the District Production Officer during FY 2021/2022. For instance there was neither rewards nor sanctions on the files of the following staff reviewed Mocrach Obwona Clement-Agoro LLG, oroma Samuel Baker-Padibe West, Komakech Geoffrey-Palabek-Ogili and Nokrac Kassim-Lokung East-LLG.</p>	0

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	There was no training plan seen at the time of assessment specific for the production department.	0
	Maximum score 4			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of training activities conducted and therefore no training database at Lamwo DLG. However, there was support training offered to the LG by donor agencies. This training is as when available and has not been planned for as required.	0
	Maximum score 4			

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

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

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Co-funding was not reflected in the LG Budget as per the guidelines because the LG was to start receiving MSI funds in FY 2022/2023..</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not receive MSI grant during the FY under review and therefore no Co-funding was applicable.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not receive MSI grant during the FY under review and therefore no Co-funding information to disseminate.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MSI program was non existent during FY 2021/2022 and was yet to be rolled over in the LG.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	The MSI program was non existent during FY 2021/2022 and was yet to be rolled over in the LG.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	The MSI program was non existent during FY 2021/2022 and was yet to be rolled over in the LG.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The MSI program was non existent during FY 2021/2022 and was yet to be rolled over in the LG.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	No record was presented by the LG in regard to conducting farmer's mobilization	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	no records were presented by the LG in regard to training staff and political leader at the District and LLGs about MSI project.	0

## Investment Management



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MSI program was non-existent during FY 2021/2022 and therefore no updated register of MSI equipment supplied to farmers during FY 2021/2022 could be found.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MSI program was non-existent during FY 2021/2022 and therefore no up-to-date database of applications at the time of conducting the LGPA.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The MSI program was non-existent during FY 2021/2022 and therefore no farm visits could have been carried out.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG had no District Agricultural Engineer and publicization of eligible farmers at the District and 5 LLGs could not be traced at the Notice boards.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>From the available information there was an approved procurement plan by the CAO for Lamwo, Alex Felix Majeme on 31st July, 2022 and sent to the PPDA on 19th September, 2022, there is no activity planned for under MSI equipment incorporated.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of requesting for quotation from Irrigation equipment suppliers. The Assessors were informed that this was to commence after MSI grant is received.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There were no Contracts Committee minutes indicating selection of irrigation equipment for the FY under review. The LG is not yet rolled on to the MSI program.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	MSI activities were yet to start in the LG and therefore no Contracts Committee minutes were in place for reviewing.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	MSI activities were yet to start in the LG and therefore no contracts were signed during the FY under review.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	No MSI prequalified list was available during the FY under review since the program had not yet been rolled out in the District.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	No MSI activities were in place during the FY under review and therefore no technical supervision was conducted by the relevant technical officers.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	No equipment was supplied during the FY under review.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	There was no equipment supplied and handed over during FY 2021/2022.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	MSI activities were yet to start in the LG and therefore no payments had been made for reviewing.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	MSI activities were yet to start in the LG and therefore no procurements were made during FY 2021/2022 to check on the completeness of the File.	0

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence to this effect since program was yet to be rolled out	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to this effect since program was yet to be rolled out	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to this effect since program was yet to be rolled out	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to this effect since program was yet to be rolled out	0

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:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to this effect since program was yet to be rolled out	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.	Sector guidelines have not been disseminated. LG still waiting for program implementation to commence	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6	score 2 or else 0		

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.	The LG never produced evidence for Environment, Social and Climate Change screening, developed ESMPs for MSI projects prior to installation of equipment. LG was still waiting for program implementation to commence	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6	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 agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There was no monitoring Irrigation impact since the MSI project was non-existent in FY 2021/2022.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

15	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 score 1 or else 0	No evidence to the effect of completing E&S certification forms prior to payment because during the FY under review, the LG never implemented MSI project.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

15

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0

There was No evidence of CDO signing E&S certification forms prior to payment because during the FY under review, the LG never implemented MSI project.

**0**

**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer	The position was vacant at the time of the LGPA	<b>0</b>
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>	<i>score 70 or else 0.</i>		
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening	There was no environmental and Social screening for MSI projects the previous FY. No funding had been received to this effect by the LG and therefore no MSI activities conducted. The LG is scheduled to receive Micro irrigation support grant in FY 2022/2023.	<b>0</b>
	<i>Maximum score is 30</i>	<i>score 30 or else 0.</i>		

**Water & Environment  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The position of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled.  Ms Acayo Grace was appointed on 12th July, 2012 as was directed by DSC Min No. 21/2012 vide letter Ref. LDLGCR/160/1	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The Position of Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was substantively filled.  Mr. Aube Benson Labayi was appointed probation as assistant Engineering Officer on 14th February, 2020 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 104/2020 and confirmed in service on 1st April, 2022 as per DSC Min. No. 9/2022	<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.	The position of Borehole maintenance Technician was substantively filled.  Mr. Longol Robert was appointed on 13th September, 2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 19/2022 (iii)	<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.	The position was vacant at the time of the LGPA	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had a substantively appointed Environment Officer.  Mr. Ociti Richard was appointed on probation on 10th June, 2019 vide DSC Min. No. 85/2019 and confirmed in service on 6th October, 2020	<b>10</b>



1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had Mr. Bongomin Michael appointed Forest Officer on Contract.</p> <p>Mr. Bongomin Michael was appointed on 6th August, 2018 as was directed by the DSC Min. No. 4/06/2018 (b). The contract was under a UNHCR Project.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening of all civil works of the water sector projects for Environmental, Social and Climate Change prior to commencement of all civil works that is</p> <p>(i). drilling of production wells at Alur village, Padibe west sub-county and</p> <p>(ii). At Pawach village, Potika sub-county,</p> <p>The screening forms were prepared and endorsed on 20th April, 2022</p>	10
---	--	---	--	----

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The water and sanitation projects implemented but the LG did not require carrying out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works because at the time of screening the projects were under the category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019</p>	10
---	--	---	---	----

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The water and sanitation implemented projects during the FY 2021/2022 never required Abstraction permits. The projects that were implemented were drilling of productive boreholes and the contractor had a drilling permit No. KAN14/DP-00983 issued to M/s Icon Projects Ltd, for a period spanning from 1st July, 2021 to 30th June, 2022</p>	10
---	--	---	---	----

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had no substantively appointed DHO.</p> <p>Dr. Omoya Denish Ochula a medical officer appointed on 16th April, 2014 vide DSC Min. No. 47/2014 (a) was the acting DHO as per the assignment of duty instrument signed by the CAO on 20th July, 2020, letter Ref. CR/D/HRM/163/3</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of conducting the LGPA and there was no officer in acting capacity</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had no substantively appointed Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health at the time of the LGPA.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG has substantively appointed Mr. Arop Wilson Woodford as Senior Environment Officer (Principal Health Inspector) on 30th April 2014 as was directed by the DSC under Min. No. 52/2014 vide letter CR/112/1</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had no substantively appointed Senior Health Educator.</p> <p>Mr. Obote Michael an Assistant Health Educator was appointed on 18th July, 2008 as was directed by the DSC Min. No. 64/2008</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a substantively appointed Biostatistician.</p> <p>Mr. Odokonyero Simon Peter was appointed on 25th June, 2013 as was directed by the DSC Min. No. 14/06/2013</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of conducting the LGPA.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening for Environmental, Social and Climate Change of all health sector projects prior to commencement of all civil works that is</p> <p>(i). Fencing of Pauma health centre II at Palabek Kal sub-county, prepared on 30th May, 2022.</p>	<b>15</b>
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for health sector projects prior to commencement of all civil works because at the time of screening the projects fell under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019</p>	<b>15</b>

**Education Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG had a substantively recruited District Education Officer.  Langoya Barnabas the DEO was appointed on 10th June, 2019 through letter No. CR/156/4 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 85/2019	<b>30</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	According to the approved costed staff establishment for Lamwo education department, the LG had one position of a Senior inspector of Schools. The LG had a substantively recruited Senior Inspector of Schools.  Mr. Joro Ben Washington was substantively appointed on 15th June, 2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 16/2022 Vide letter CR/D/HRM/160/1	<b>40</b>
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence of screening for environmental, social and climate change for all education sector projects that is;  1. the construction of blocks of 5 stance pit latrines and washrooms at  (i). Kangole primary school, Paloga sub-county  (ii). Wanglango primary school at Madi Opei sub-county,  (iii). Layamo Agwatta primary school, Palabek Gem sub-county,  (iv). Logopii primary school, Paaloga sub-county, and  (v). 4 stance pit latrine at Aguu primary school at Lokung sub-county  The screening reports were prepared on 30th May, 2022	<b>15</b>
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

2

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

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

The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for education sector projects prior to commencement of all civil works because at the time of screening the projects fell under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019

The Maximum score is 30

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed District Chief Finance Officer..  Lworo Labongo Okakoo the CFO was substantively appointment on transfer of services from Agago DLG on 23rd February, 2022 as was directed by DSC Min No. DSC/156/4/2.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG had no substantively appointed District Planner.  The senior Planner Mr. Onywaronga Albon appointed on 10th January, 2011 under DSC Min. No. 4/1/2010 was the acting Planner and there was no letter assignment him duties of Ag. District Planner	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had no substantively appointed District Engineer.  Mr. Leonard Akena a Superintendent of works appointed on probation on 15th September, 2008 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 153/2005 and confirmed on 10th May, 2022 vide DSC Min. No. 9/4/2012 (ii) was the Acting District Engineer. There was however no letter assigning duties of the District Engineer.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had no substantively appointed District Natural Resources Officer.  Mr. Ociti Richard an Environment Officer appointed on probation on 10th June, 2019 vide DSC Min. No. 85/2019 and confirmed in service on 6th October, 2020 was the Acting DNRO as per the assignment of duty instrument signed by the CAO on 22nd July, 2019.	<b>0</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed District Production Officer.  Mr. Muhenda Patrick Agaba was appointed on transfer of services from Kyenjojo DLG on 23rd February, 2022 as was directed by the DSC Min. No. DSC/156/4/2	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed District Community Development Officer.  Mr. Nyeko Wilfred was appointed on re-instatement as DCDO on 23rd February, 2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. DSC/156/4/3	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed Principal Commercial Officer.  Mr. Kadugu Powel Alex was appointed on 13th September, 2020 as was directed by the DSC Min. No. 19/2022 (ii)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG had no substantively appointed Senior Procurement Officer at the time of the LGPA  Mr. Oyoo Simon Peter a Procurement Officer appointed on probation on 12th July, 2012 was directed by the DSC Min. No. 06/05/2012 (i) and confirmed in service on 28th June, 2013 vide DSC Min. No. 34/2013 (2-b) was the acting Senior Procurement Officer as per assignment of duty letter dated 9th February, 2022	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed Procurement Officer at the time of the LGPA  Mr. Oyoo Simon Peter a Procurement Officer appointed on probation on 12th July, 2012 was directed by the DSC Min. No. 06/05/2012 (i) and confirmed in service on 28th June, 2013 vide DSC Min. No. 34/2013 (2-b).	2



1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer at the time of the LGPA  Ms. Okeny Harriet Charity was appointed on 8th July, 2017 was directed by the DSC Min. No. 16.9	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position was vacant at the time of conducting the LGPA	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The position was vacant at the time of conducting the LGPA	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The LG had a substantively recruited Senior Accountant.  Mr. Kadugu Powel Alex was appointed on 30th April, 2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 68/2019	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The LG had a substantively recruited Principal Internal Auditor.  Mr. Nyeko Geoffrey Job was appointed on 23rd February, 2022 as was directed by DSC Min No. DSC/156/4/3	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of conducting the LGPA</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Lamwo District Local Government had 19 LLGs that were fully operational.  8 LLGs of the 19 had started operations at the start of FY 2022/2023.  LLGs that were operational included; Palabek Gem, Palabek Town Council,  From the reviewed appointment letters from Human Resource office, not all the LLGs had positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries substantively filled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Palabek Gem Sub County had Mr. Ocan Jolly Joe Deyork a Parish Chief appointed on 21st October, 2002 as was directed by DSC Min No. 145/2002 as the Acting SAS. On review of the personnel file, there was no assignment of duty as Ag. SAS instrument on file.</li> <li>• Palabek Town Council had Mr. Oroma Godfrey Benaiza a Parish Chief appointed on 21st October, 2002 as was directed by DSC Min No. 145/2002 as the Acting SAS. On review of the personnel file, there was no assignment of duty as Ag. SAS instrument on file. He had however earlier on 8th April, 2013 been assigned duties of Ag. Sas Padibe East Sub county with effect from 8th April, 2013.</li> </ul>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG never fully presented appointment details of the Community Development Officers at the time of the LGPA and not all the positions of the CDO were not substantively filled.  Lamwo District Local Government had 14 Sub counties and 4 Town Councils.  The LLGs included: Lokung, Pedibe West, Pedibe East, Madi Opei, Palabek Gem, Agoro, Abera, Nymur, Aceba, Katum, Paloga, Ogili, Potika, Palabek S/C and 4 Town Councils of Madi Opei, Padibe, Lamwo, and Palabek Kal  For example Sub Counties of Padibe East, Potika, Katum, Nymur, Lokung, had Parish Chiefs caretaking as Community Development Officers and ACDO</p>	0

2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	From the reviewed appointment letters and staff list from the HRM office  All LLGs had positions of Senior Accounts Assistant/Accounts Assistant substantively filled  Some of the Staff substantively filled included;  1.Alimocan Gladys (Accounts Assistant) Lokung sub county was appointed on 14/9/2017 under DSC Min No 19/2017 (a)  2.Can Peter Kembo (Accounts Assistant) Agoro sub county was appointed on 22/10/2012 under DSC Min no 4/09/2012	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:  a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0	From page 11 of the final accounts, the allocation to the Natural Resources department was as follows,  Original budget = UGX172,226,214  Revised budget = UGX176,399,250 Warrants = UGX176,399,250 Actuals =UGX136,117,776  There is a variation of UGX40,281,474 between warrants and actuals. Therefore the LG did not release 100% of funds allocated Natural Resources department.	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

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.	From page 11 of the final accounts, the allocation to the Community Based Services departments was as follows,  Original budget = UGX1,166,970,754  Revised budget = UGX1,480,172,503 Warrants = UGX713,306,000 Actuals =UGX963,973,293  The LG spent a lot more than warranted by UGX252,667,293. Therefore LG released more than 100% of funds allocated to Community Based Services department in the previous FY.	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

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

There was evidence availed on environmental, social and climate change screening for all DDEG projects for the FY 2021/22 prior to the commencement of all projects' civil works. ESMPs were costed indicating the environmental issues, mitigation measures, and means of verification, budget and responsible person.

The Example of projects;

- Construction of 1 block of 5-stance drainable latrines and washrooms at (i). Kangole Primary School in Paloga sub-county (ii). Wanglango Primary School at Madi Opei sub county, (iii). Madi Opei sub-county, (iv). Layamo Agwatta Primary School at Palabek Gem sub-county, (v). Logopii Primary School at Paaloga sub-county. Impacts were identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations, screening forms were signed by Environment officer and DCDO on 30th May, 2022.

- 4 stance pit latrine at Aguu primary school at Longlung sub-county, Impacts were identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations, screening forms were signed by Environment officer and DCDO on 30th May, 2022.

- 3 stance pit latrine with washroom at Palabek Kal sub-county prepared on 30th May, 2022, Impacts were identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations, signed by Environment officer and the DCDO on 30th May, 2022.

. The projects for fencing of the sub-county administration headquarters at Agoro sub-county, fencing of Pauma health centre II at Palabek Kal sub-county, construction of a market stall at Anaka central, Palabek Gem sub-county prepared on 30th May, 2022.

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

All of the infrastructural projects did not require ESIAs because in the National Environment Act 2019, they are categorized under schedule 4 part 2 which consist of projects with simple environment and social measures and the minimal level of impacts and require screening. The LG therefore did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) because at the time of screening all DDEG civil works projects fell under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of costed ESMPs for all the projects implemented using the DDEG during the previous FY, examples included;</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX 560,000 for the construction of 5-stance pit latrines and washrooms at Kangole primary school in Paloga sub-county, was considered by the Environment officer and DCDO on 30th May, 2022 and incorporated into the Bills of Quantities.</p>	4
---	---	---	---	---

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG audit opinion on the financial performance for the FY 2021/2022 was unqualified.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to confirm that the LG 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 2022</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Contract was submitted on 16th August, 2022. This submission was within the required timeframes of August 31st</p>	4

8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The LG submitted the Annual Performance for the previous FY on 7th September 2022. This submission was outside the required timeframe of August 31st 2022.	0
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year	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,	The LG never complied with the Submission timelines because the 4th Quarter report was submitted after 31st August, 2022	0
	Maximum score is 4	score 4 or else 0.	<p>The District submitted the four quarterly budget performance reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter one. 14th December 2021</li> <li>• Quarter two. 28th January 2022</li> <li>• Quarter three. 2nd May, 2022</li> <li>• Quarter four. 07th September 2022</li> </ul>	