



Local Government Performance Assessment

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	36%
Education Minimum Conditions	15%
Health Minimum Conditions	45%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	24%
Educational Performance Measures	53%
Health Performance Measures	20%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	53%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	2%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The Planner explained that there was only one project, the construction of the administration offices and could not present any written documentation. This was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	<p>Not applicable in the year under review.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>On page 37 of the performance report, Out put 138172: Administrative Capital where =316,164,000 from Government Development Fund was reflected as spent but the project implemented not indicated in the report.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Planner did not provide the list of DDEG projects and this was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	0

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	All DDEG funds for infrastructure investments for FY 2019/20 were used to pay off a debt for the construction of the District administration office block implemented during FY 2018/2019.	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	There was evidence that the staffing was accurate as per the District staff list dated 1st December 2020; Packwach TC staffing list had 23 filled and 23 were at place of work, Panyango S/C staffing list had 14 and at place 14 and Packwach S/C staffing list had 13 and station had 13 staff at place.	2
---	--	--	--	---

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	Infrastructure project report was not presented for review during the assessment. The Planner explained verbally that there was only one project, the construction of the administration block. This was unacceptable and was documented during the exit meeting.	0
---	--	--	---	---

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise; If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs score 4 or else 0	Not applicable in the year under review.	0
---	---	---	--	---

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	Not applicable the year under review.	0
---	---	--	---------------------------------------	---

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

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The district compiled a consolidated staffing requirement and submitted it to MoPS on line dated 28/09/2020 (Ref ARC6/293/05 and copy was seen at the MoPS.	2
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The district conducted the tracking of staff attendance but did not analyze them to produce reports.	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	The LG conducted appraisal of heads of departments, however some were not completed as follows; Dr Ajal Paul not appraised as appointed 30/06/2020, Ag DNRO appraised on 30/06/2020, Ag Planner and appraiser did not sign the performance appraisal report, Ag DCDO not appraised, Ag CFO not fully appraised and performance report not dated, Ag District Engineer appraised on 1/06/2020, DPO appointed 16/03/2020 not due for appraisal and Ag. District Commercial Officer not appraised.	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	The Reward and Sanction Committee was in place and functional headed by Muswa DCAO, Yoango Paul member, Omitto James member, Onyutha John Secretary. There was no case or issue heard in the financial year 2019/2020 as all the documentation provided were for either financial year 2018/2019 or 2020/2021.	1

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The Staff Grievance Consultative Committee was not yet established as per MoPS guidelines.	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	The majority of the new staff recruited in the financial year 2019/2020 accessed payroll within two months except Maditkwo Trinity Parish Chief appointed on 16/03/2020 and had not accessed payroll at the time of assessment 15th December 2020.	0
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	There were 4 retired officers in the financial year 2019/2020 and two officers did not access the pensioner payroll within the mandatory two months i.e. Paskwate Okechagiu Senior Education Officer retired on 21/10/2019 and accessed November 2020 and Ssenoga Grace Head teacher retired 07/05/2020 and accessed August 2020 which was more than the mandatory two months.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	The CFO presented a print out of DDEG transfers to LLGs for only quarter 1 totaling to =220,853,400. The total amount transferred for the three quarters could not be ascertained for comparison with the budget.	0
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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: Score: 2 or else score 0	A review of the print out warrants for direct DDEG transfers to LLGs presented by the CFO showed that warrants were submitted as follows but the CFO could not trace the dates of receipt of the releases and therefore could not determine the timeliness. Quarter 1 warrants were submitted on 13/8/2019 Quarter 2 warrants were submitted on 17/10/2019; Quarter 3 warrants were submitted on 23/1/2020	0

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:	correspondences from CAO on DDEG releases were not presented for review during the assessment and was captured in the exit meeting. The details of invoicing transfers were also not availed.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	Two reports for mentoring and supervision were presented. The one dated 9/6/2019, for training on Programme budgeting held on 14/6/2019 was not signed and the dates showed that it was outside the year of assessment. and the the one dated 10/2/2020 for Back stopping LLG on Planning, the report was signed by the Records Assistant and the Planner explained that he was the one who implemented the activity.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	Routine oversight and monitoring	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:	A review of the TPC minutes dated 28/11/2019; 16/12/2019; 4/1/2020; 28/2/2020 and 3/3/2020 showed that the reports were not discussed in TPC	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:	The assets register presented covered all assets; Land for all LG institutions, Motor vehicles, office equipment, furniture but the Goods Received Note that I should have used to verify if all the items received were recorded in the register was not availed during the assessment. Land size, cost values and type of ownership was not recorded in the register.	0
	Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
		Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0		

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 Board of survey Report dated 12/8/2020 was presented and reviewed. But the recommendations of the report was not used to make assets management decisions. The report recommended disposal of vehicles No LG0113-38 and UG299272M. No evidence was provided to show that the LG took actions to dispose off the vehicles.</p> <p>It also recommended for replacement of 7 mattresses in the female ward, Filling cabinet in the Theater among others but no evidence of implementation of the recommendations was provided during the assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG has a physical Planning Committee and submitted four reports to MoLHUD on the following dates as per the stamps from the MoLHUD 8//7/2019 and 10/12/2019 submitted 3 minutes for meetings held on 6/12/2019/21/5/2020 and 3/6/2020.</p>	2
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 LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner did not provide both the list of DDEG projects and evidence of desk appraisals of the DDEG projects for review during the assessment and this was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of field appraisals was presented for review during the assessment and this was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Planner did not present for review the project profiles for the current financial year and this was documented in the exit meeting.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Civil works projects scheduled for implementation in 2020/21 Financial year had been screened by the time of assessment and Environment and social management plans prepared with mitigation put in place. These included the construction of a VIP latrine at Rural Growth Center in Wadelai Sub-county, and this had an Environment and Social screening form (ESSF) dated 14.07.2020 and this had an Environment and social Management plan (ESMP) costed 750,000 shs dated 31.07.2020.</p> <p>Under review for the 2020/21 FY was also construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Fualwonga Health Center II in Alwi Sub-county, with ESSF dated 14.07.2020 with an ESMP costed 500,000shs, dated 31.07.2020.</p> <p>A screening report for the 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumuvuga primary school in Panyango Sub-county dated 16.07.2020. The ESMP was dated 1,100,000shs, dated 31.07.2020.</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>For the current FY, only one infrastructure project was planned to be implemented using the DDEG and was incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan appearing on page 29. I.e. Construction of administration office block.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	By the time of assessment, there was no project being implemented using DDEG funds for the current FY.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	The LG did NOT establish the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no project implemented last FY using DDEG funds.	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	From the Engineer, a sample of supervision reports availed for review were for Construction of Alwi seed Sec. School dated 11/05/2020 and 15/06/2020, Construction of VIP latrines at Punit and Pacego P/S dated 8/05/2020 and 5/06/2020 respectively but none of the above confirmed that supervision by the other relevant technical officers(Environment officer and DCDO) of those infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works was done.	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	<p>The LG had verified works (certified) but NOT all initiated payments of contractors were within specified timeframes as per contract. For example;</p> <p>Construction of Alwi seed Secondary school (MoES/UgFIT/WRKS/2018-20/00119)</p> <p>Contract period: 20/5/2019 - 20/5/2020</p> <p>Engineer certified on 11/05/2020</p> <p>Amount: UGX 467,948,292</p> <p>Paid on: 28/5/2020</p> <p>Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego P/S (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00001)</p> <p>Contract period: 20/2/2020 - 13/5/2020</p> <p>Engineer certified on 5/06/2020</p> <p>Amount: UGX 14,993,600</p> <p>Paid on: 28/08/2020(Not compliant)</p> <p>Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit P/S (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00040)</p> <p>Contract period: 04/03/2020 – 28/05/2020</p> <p>Engineer certified on:10/05/2020</p> <p>Amount: UGX 1,097,042</p> <p>Paid on: 25/05/2020</p>	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	<p>Bid documents had been prepared and approved during a contracts committee meeting that sat 29/10/2020 (but minutes were not signed by the time of assessment) for education, water and health projects i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of VIP latrines in Omach, P'ovona, Kivuje, Fualwonga, Pumvuga, Ocayo and Alliragem primary schools. • Construction of 2-stance VIP latrine at Wadelai RGC. • Drilling and construction of 2 deep boreholes. • Construction of 2-stance VIP Latrine with bathroom at Fualwonga HC III. 	0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.	The Chief Administrative Officer had appointed the Principal Assistant Secretary as the chairperson of the Grievance Committee with the Senior District Community Development Officer as Secretary. The Environment Officer, Human Resource Manager and Education Officer had been assigned to the committee as Members. All these assignments were issued by the CAO on the 5th of May 2020.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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.	The Grievance file presented during assessment had a grievance registration form, and a log showing how complaints would be captured. This had provision for a date when the complaint was received, mode of receipt, name of complainant a description of the complaint, the type of complaint, action taken, status after 30 days and a status after 60 days.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was no defined complaints path at the time of assessment and no documented grievance mechanism displayed at the District Offices notice board.	
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	The District had not publicized the Grievance redress mechanism to aggrieved parties by the time of assessment. A former worker and neighbor (Mr Sam Opi) to the Alwi Seed Secondary School construction site indicated that he had not been paid for works he completed at the active site. This interaction happened during the field visit at the time of assessment. This issue, had not been captured by the grievance log at the time of assessment and the aggrieved didnot know how to get redress from District through the Grievance Committee.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the DDP showed that environment & climate change had been integrated in the development plan on page 146 but this could not be traced to particular investment projects in the AWP and budget.	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure			

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Planner did not provide evidence to prove that the enhanced DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>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:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the Environment Officer, One project qualified for the category of DDEG financed projects that weren't in Health, Education, Water or Irrigation, and that was the Construction of the the flash toilet at the Administration Block of the District Headquarters. The facility had an Environment and Social Screening form dated 23.07.2019, with a costed Environment and Social Management plan, worth 1,500,000shs, dated 30.07.2019. However, the Bill of Quantities contained in Bidding document for PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/0004 dated 8.11.2019, belonging to Rivershore Trade-links, did not incorporate the costed ESMP.</p> <p>However, the list of projects indicating funding source was not provided by the Planner, therefore the assessment could not substantiate this infrastructure as one funded by DDEG</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>No projects were costed for additional financing from Climate change impact.</p>	0

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 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>Proof of land ownership for projects implemented by District included;</p> <p>Fualwonga Health Center II, which had a freehold title for 1.059ha in Jonam County Nebbi District at plot 6 Block 3, Pokworo Panyango REGD 16.9.2011. INST 455339 dated 26.09.2011.</p> <p>At the time, Pakwach Health Center IV had a freehold offer dated 9.07.2012 for land at Kapita Village, in Pakwach Town Council, measuring 659m x 192m. Minute No. NDLB/34/48/7/12</p> <p>A land transfer agreement for a piece measuring 10*20 meters was signed between Mr. Odongo Leonard and Alwi sub-county on 12th/03/2020 for water infrastructure.</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>Monthly Monitoring was undertaken and reports produced for projects that had civil works being completed within 2 months. Under review was the Mukandwa Borehole in Wadelai Sub-county, with 2 monitoring records, one dated 15.05.2020, and another dated 11.06.2020.</p> <p>Monitoring record for Kwiaakuru Borehole in Panyango Sub county was dated 13.05.2020 and another report for the same dated 12.06.2020.</p> <p>Monitoring for Okuma borehole in Wadelai Sub county was 14.05.2020 and another monitoring report dated 11.06.2020.</p> <p>The Borehole drilling project started on 13.03.2020 and ended on 15.06.2020 according to the District Engineer's Completion certificate. Therefore the Environment officer and Community development officer prepared monitoring reports to cater to the period for installation of boreholes, under the water department.</p>	1

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

All sampled projects had Environment and Social certificates prepared by the Environment and Community Development Officer, dated before issuing of contractor's payment certificates as below;

For the Construction of the flash toilet at District Headquarters, interim payment certificate dated 15.6.2020 for 26,999,996shs was paid on the 31.08.2020, via payment voucher 30488248. The Environment and Social Certificate for the works was prepared by Environment Officer and Community Development Officer, with document dated 20.08.2020.

Interim Payment certificate for the 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit Primary School, dated 10.05.2020 for 19,668,898 shs was signed by the District Engineer and Chief Internal Auditor on 15.05.2020. The construction works at Pumit Primary school had interim Environment and social certificate dated 22.03.2020.

Payment certificate No.1 for 4 boreholes to Galaxy Agrotech (U) Ltd for 56,835,900 shs was signed by the District Water Officer and Chief Finance Officer on 16.06.2020. This certificate was cleared via voucher no. 30488250 was dated 17.08.2020

The E&S Certificate for boreholes were prepared and dated 15.06.2020.

Financial management

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

a review of the Bank Reconciliation statements
showed that the reconciliations were up to date at
the end of October as shown below:

Bank: Post bank

Account Name: Pakwach DLG UWEP Enterprise
A/C

Account No: 2110049000275

General Ledger Cash balance =1,852

General ledger bank Statement balance =1,852

Bank: Post bank

Account Name: Pakwach DLG General Fund A/C

Account No: 2110049000057

General Ledger Cash balance
=4,790,481

General ledger bank Statement balance
=4,790,481

Bank: Post bank

Account Name: Pakwach DLG YLP Recovery A/C

Account No: 2110049000162

General Ledger Cash balance
=12,185,496

General ledger bank Statement balance
=12,185,496

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

All the four quarterly internal audit reports were
produced as follows:

Quarter 1 on 15/4/2020

Quarter 2 on 15/4/2020

Quarter 3 on 15/5/2020

Quarter 4 on 11/8/2020

The Internal Auditor explained that the quarter 1
report delayed to be written but was done after the
audit for quarter 2 on the same date.

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>There were two letters written by CAO to Ukumu Edimond, the Veterinary Officer for Alwi Sub County dated 24/2/2020, Ref: CR/250/8 to account for 7,131,000 raised in quarter 3 audit report. This letter was not addressed to or copied to the Chair Person LC V and LGPAC. and another letter on the same date & Ref, was written to Cwinyaai, the Records Officer to account for 1,095. The Chair Person LC V and Chair Person LC V was not copied.</p> <p>No information on follow up was provided to Council or PAC on implementation of the audit findings.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The audit reports were submitted as follows to the CAO, LG PAC and CFO</p> <p>quarter 1 on 13/5.2020</p> <p>quarter 2 on 13/5.2020</p> <p>quarter 3 had no stamp from the registry</p> <p>quarter 4 had no stamp from the registry</p> <p>A review of PAC reports dated 8/9/2020 & 4/6/2020 did not indicate that follow ups were made by PAC on the implementation of the recommendations.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of Final Accounts page 14 indicated that:</p> <p>Planned OSR for 2019/2020 was =100,000,000</p> <p>Actual collection was =105,724,100</p> <p>%tage =105,724,100 / 100,000,000x100= 106%</p> <p>105-100 =6% which is within +/- 10%</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% - 10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Actual OSR collected 2019/2020 was 105,724,100 on page 14 of 2019/2020 Final Accounts</p> <p>Actual OSR collected 2018/2019 was 166,637,885 on page 8 of 2019/2020 Final Accounts</p> <p>%tage decrease = 105,724,100-166,637,885 / 166,637,885x100=37%</p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	The CFO did not provide for review the details of mandatory share local revenue to the LLG during the assessment.	0
----	---	---	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	No information regarding procurement plan and awarded contracts with all amounts was seen published on the notice board neither was it seen from the file availed named "Displayed Notices 2020/21"	0
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	The results of the performance assessments and the implications were not publicized as no evidence was provided.	0
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	Baraza report dated 5/12/2019 was reviewed during the assessment, the attachment appendix 1 titled "Report of the movement of the Team " showed that the movements of the team was between 4th February, 2019 to 11th February, 2019, implying the report was for 2018/2019 FY. The report was dated 5/12/2019 but the stamp on the appendix is 3/12/2019.	0
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	The CFO did not provide evidence that the information on tax rates and procedures for collection and appeal was made available to the public. The officer did not even have copies of those rates.	0

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

a. LG has prepared an IGG report 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

A review of the Council minutes for the year under review showed that no IGG issue was discussed in Council and the Clerk to Council explained that the district did not receive any report from the IGG during the year.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The UNEB released PLE results for 2018(Div.1- 111) were; Div.1, 30, Div.11, 609, and Div. 111, 450 totaling 1089 out of 1609 candidates that sat for the exam in that year, translating into; $1089/1606*100 = 68\%$.</p> <p>In 2019 the results were; Div. 1, 46, Div. 11,772, and Div. 111, 469 totaling 1287 out of 1641 candidates that sat for PLE in that year, translating into; $1287/1641*100 = 78\%$. There was therefore an improvement in performance($78\% - 68\% = 10\%$</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The UCE results released by UNEB for Pakwach in 2018 (Div. 1 -111) were; Div. 1, 14, Div. 11, 55 and Div. 111, 138 totaling 207 out of 709 candidates that sat for UCE that year, translating into; $207/709*100 = 29\%$.</p> <p>In 2019 on the other hand, the performance was as follows; Div. 1, 08, Div. 11, 58 and Div. 111, 131 totaling 197 out of 669 candidates that sat for the exam in that year, translating into;$197/669*100 = 29\%$. There was therefore, no imprivement in performance ($29\% - 29\% = 0\%$</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>Not applicable in the FY under review. All LGs to score 0</p>	0

Investment
Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0

A review of the education development grant revealed that it was spent as per the, Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments 2019, that spell out the following activities to be considered; Construction of classrooms and offices, Renovation/Rehabilitation of classrooms, latrine construction, supply of desks, construction of teachers houses, Construction of laboratories and construction of Seed Secondary schools. The following activities were conducted;

Renovation of two (2) classroom blocks of seven(7) classrooms at Pangeit P/S at UGX 102,460,000

Construction of four (4) stance drainable VIP pit latrine at, Pumit P/S at UGX 21,854,331 , four (4) stance at Ley P/S for UGX 19,912,500 and a three (3) stance latrine, at Pacego at UGX 14,993,600 respectively.

Construction of a seed secondary school at Aluui that is on -going.

According to Q4 report dated 24/08/2020 page 64, it was revealed that renovation of classrooms was budgeted at UGX 100,988.000 and UGX 7,552,000 or 12% was spent. On the same page it was revealed that UGX 62,509, 000 was budgeted for latrine construction against expenditure of UGX 7,552,000 or 12%. This scenario probed and it was established that payment for desks had been made 100% vide payment voucher No 31566076 dated 28-Aug-2020, to Leko GL Yesu Nuti, in FY 2020/21 worth UGX 12,338,984. The reason advanced for paying in another FY (2020/21) was, insufficient funds in 2019/20 due to a mischarge of the A/C in the IFMIS system, the assessor was told. The same reason of insufficient funds, hence mischarge for none payment for latrine construction was given and funds to; Riverside Trade Links was paid vide voucher No 30488248 dated 25-jun-2020, worth UGX 3,976,912.

Investment
Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

A review of the payment voucher showed that the Environment Officer and CDO did not certify works before payment were made as shown below:

Payment for the renovation of class room at Pangieth P.7 school by Kris Consult Ltd under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00052. Contract start date was 30/1/2020 and completion indicated as ongoing. Certificate No.2 and requisition was certified by the District Engineer on 14/5/2020 and by the DEO on 15/5/2020 and payment of 50,627,797 made on payment voucher No.29805243 dated 4/6/2020.

Payment for the construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley P.7 school by Onenrwoth & family Enterprises under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00049. Contract start date was 10/2/2020 and completion 2/6/2020. Certificate (interim) and requisition was certified by the DEO and the District Engineer on 8/6/2020 and payment of 17,0109,000 made on payment voucher No.30488246, dated 25/6/2020.

Payment for the construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Punit P.7 school by River Shores Trade Link under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/2018-19/00040. Contract start date was 4/3/2020 and completion 28/5/2020. Certificate No.1 and requisition was certified by the DEO 15/5/2020 and the District Engineer on 8/5/2020. Payment of 1,097,042, then made on payment voucher No.30488248, dated 25/6/2020.

Investment
Performance: The LG
has managed
education projects as
per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

c) If the variations in the
contract price are within
+/-20% of the MoWT
estimates score 2 or else
score 0

The variations in the contract price were within +/-20%
of the MoWT estimates. i.e.;

Construction of Alwi Seed Sec. school.

(MoES/UgFIT/WRKS/2018-20/00119)

Contract sum: UGX 2,079,770,185

Estimated Value: UGX1,958,132,385

$PV=(CS-EV)/EV*100$

PV=6.2%

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit P/S

Contract sum: UGX 21,854,331

Estimated Value: 21,854,331

$PV=(CS-EV)/EV*100$

PV= 0%

Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego P/S

Contract sum: UGX14,993,600

Estimated Value:15,600,000

$PV=(CS-EV)/EV*100$

PV= -3.8%

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley P/S.
(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00049)

Contract sum: UGX 19,912,500

Estimated Value: 23,854,332

$PV=(CS-EV)/EV*100$

PV= -16.5%

Investment
Performance: The LG
has managed
education projects as
per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

d) Evidence that
education projects were
completed as per the work
plan in the previous FY

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

All the sector implemented projects were not
reported/reflected in the LG annual budget performance
report for the FY2019/20. It was therefore not possible to
determine whether implemented projects were complete
by the end of the FY.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>A review of the staffing structure indicated that the LG had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines; a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for 48 , P7 schools, a head teacher and a teacher per class for 13 schools below P7 and extra teachers depending on enrollment using the teacher /pupil ratio of 1: 53. The LG had a staff ceiling of 942 teachers against a staff in position of 585 or 62% of filled staff positions. This was according to the staff lists contained in the Approved Performance Contract generated on 29/06.2020 12:38</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG met the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards(BRMS) set out in the DES guidelines that include; number of classroom blocks and classrooms, number of latrine blocks and stances, number of 3 -seater desks and number of teacher's houses(permanent) for all 63 UPE and seven (7) USE or 100% registered schools, providing input of the asset register to populate the consolidated asset register,</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had accurately reported on 585 or 100% staff in position and where there were deployed; a head teacher and a minimum of seven (7) teachers in the 48, P7 schools, a head teacher and a teacher for each class for 13 schools below P7, and extra teachers depending on enrollment using the teacher/pupil ratio of 1:53. This was according to the staff list, contained in the Approved Performance Contract generated on 29/06/2020 12:38</p> <p>In three sampled schools; Wangkawa P/S (urban) there were 15 teachers with a deficit of seven(7). in Andibo P/S (peri - urban), there were 10 teachers with deficit of four(4) and in Kitawe (rural) there were 12 teachers with a deficit of five(5) teachers respectively. This information was collaborated with; staff lists at DEO and that at school and attendance books and found to be matching.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all 63 or 100% UPE registered primary schools,</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; in Wangkawa there were four classroom blocks with 12 classrooms, three(3) latrine blocks and 15 stances, 148, 3 - seater desks and no teachers house. In Andibo P/S there were three (3)classroom blocks with seven (7) classrooms, three (3) latrine blocks and 10 stances, 148, 3 -seater desks and two (2) teachers housing units for four teachers. In Kitawe P/S there were four (4) classroom blocks with 16 classrooms (only seven classrooms however, were in use), three (3) latrine blocks and six (6) stances (with a pupil /stance ratio of 226:1) and 168, 3 - seater desks and no teachers house. This data was collated and found to be in synch.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had 28 out of 63 or 44% UPE registered primary schools complying with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitted reports to DEO, with; highlights of school performance, a reconciled cash flow statement and Annual budget and expenditure report and asset register. The score below 80% to justify the score of zero awarded.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Wangkawa , Andibo and Kitawe Primary schools, each had a copy.</p>	0

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that 47 out of 63 or 83% had been supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with school inspection recommendations. the quality of SIPs was good either, since they were tailored towards addressing recommendations from inspection reports, especially so, on the teaching/ learning process.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Wangkawa, Andibo and Kitawe primary schools, each had a copy.</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had collected and compiled EMIS return forms for 63 or 100% registered schools, with an enrollment of 49,915 pupils for the FY 2019/20. This information was collated with data collected from MoES and that in PBS, as per the Approved Performance Contract generated on 29/06/2020 12:38 and found to be in tandem.</p>	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>There was evidence that the LG had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of seven (7) teachers for 48, P7 schools, a head teacher and a teacher per class for 13 schools below P7 and extra teachers depending on the enrollment using a teacher/pupil ratio of 1:53. This was according to the staff list contained in the Approved Performance Contract generated on 29/06/2020 12:38, with a wage bill of UGX 5,526,166,100.</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, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had deployed 585 teachers as per the sector guidelines in FY 2020/21; a head teacher and a minimum of seven (7) teachers for 48, P7 schools, a head teacher and a teacher per class for 13 schools below P7 and extra teachers depending on enrollment using the teacher /pupil ratio of 1:53.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; In Andibo P/S, there were 10 teachers with a deficit of four(4) teachers, in Wangkawa P/S, there were 15 teachers, with a deficit of seven(7), while in Kitawe P/S, there were 12 teachers, with a deficit of five (5). This data was collaborated with, the staff lists at school and the teachers attendance books and found to be in synch.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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 teacher deployment data had been disseminated or publicized on the LG notice board and the school notice boards of; Wangkawa,,Andibo and Kitawe primary schools respectively.</p>	1
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>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>There was evidence that the Senior Assistant Secretaries and Town Clerks appraised all the sampled head teachers as per agreed performance agreements and submitted a copy to HRO as follows; Olama Otam Emmanuel Alliragam P/S (28/01/2020), Kare Nataline Packwach Girls P/S (20/02/2020), Ojok Christopher Owere P/S (21/02/2020), Pithua Jimmy Nyariegi P/S (12/02/2020), Okot John Owiny P/S (10/02/2020), Rwothongeo P/S (03/01/2020), Parmu David Boro P/S (7/03/2020) and Owech Teopista Kitawe P/S (22/02/2020).</p>	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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District had 5 Senior Secondary Schools and only 2 head teachers had been appraised at the time of assessment and these included Candiga Neriah Packach SS appraised on 28/09/2020 (wrong appraisal date as its a Calendar year) and Acayo Christine Panyimur SS appraised on 26/03/2020. Those not appraised were head teachers of Paroketo, Martyrs College and Panyango Secondary Schools.</p>	0
	<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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Education department staff had been appraised as follows; Yoango Paul Senior Education Officer (30/06/2020), Ongeyowum Nassur Education Officer Counselling & Guidance (30/06/20200. The two officers Odongkei Atia Inspector of Schools appointed on 16/03/2020) and Opoti Ciriako Sports Officer appointed on 16/03/2020 were not due for performance assessment at the end of the financial year of 2019/2020.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had developed a training plan for FY 2019/20 to address identified capacity gaps at school and LG levels</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>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>There was no need for the LG to confirm in writing; the list of schools, their enrollment and budget allocation, since what had been sent earlier to MoES, had been correctly captured.</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>There was evidence that the LG had made allocations to the tune of UGX 39,892,000 to inspections and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines that require; conducting three planning meetings(one per term), conducting school inspections once every term for three terms in each UPE registered school, conducting monitoring/follow up inspections to assess corrective actions implementation, disseminating of findings to the education management team and crafting corrective actions, disseminating findings to head teachers and report writing.</p> <p>The Q4 performance report dated 28/08/2020 on page 67 revealed that UGX 48,102,000 was budgeted against expenditure of UGX 1,368,000 or 3% which was surprising. The funds however, had been had been spent, since there was evidence that inspection activities were carried out, as planned and were eligible.</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>A review of the print out of warrants for school capitation grant from IFMS showed that the warrants were submitted after the required 5 days as shown below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrants were submitted on 13/8/2019 against expenditure limit dated 9/7/2019 and this was after 24 days;</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrants were submitted on 25/10/2019 against expenditure limit dated 2/10/2019 and this was after 14 days;</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrants were submitted on 23/1/2020 against expenditure limit dated 8/1/2020 and this was after 10 days;</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>There was no evidence of DEO's communication of releases to the schools and the CFO provided invoicing dates for only quarter 1 for the 3 selected schools as shown below:</p> <p>Ajibu P.7 school invoiced on 21/8/2019</p> <p>Ajiri P.7 school invoiced on 21/8/2019</p> <p>Martyrs College invoiced on 21/8/2019</p> <p>Computation of the timeliness could not be possible without dates of communication to the schools by DEO.</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> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department had prepared an inspection plan and also held planning meetings for school inspections as follows; 2/10/2019, 03/12/2019 and 03/02/2020 respectively</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <p>• If 100% score: 2</p> <p>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>• Below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>Schools were only inspected for two terms instead of three; Term 1 and Term 11 FY 2019/20 for 63 UPE registered schools; $63 \div 93 = 67\%$ and that, they equally submitted two reports to DES</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of only one education management meeting that was held on 20/08/2019, Min.4i (Inspection for Term 11 2019) to discuss inspection reports. There was no evidence that recommendations for corrective actions were followed up.</p> <p>In three sampled schools; Wangkawa P/S there was an inspection that took place on 08/07/2019 by Rupiny Ronald(once, in FY 2019/20). A recommendation that the school should improve teachers arrival time, was made. The school, decided to hire accommodation near the school for some teachers that were coming from far, for two months(settlement allowance equivalent) and later the teachers picked up the bills, till now.</p> <p>In Kitawe P/S, the school was inspected on 15/10/2019 by one, Ajiya Maxwell (only one report for FY 2019/20, was on file). A recommendation was made that the school should use the new tool for inspection. They had started using it since, while doing peer inspection.</p> <p>In Andibo P/S the school had two inspection reports; 19/11/2019 and 05/07/2019. A recommendation to the effect that teachers should come early to school was made. There was however, no action taken to avert this, in the school.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The DIS presented findings from Inspection and monitoring results to respective schools at, Community dialogue meetings at sub-county level, vide a report for the dialogue meetings dated 03/02/2020 and at Pajobi Coordinating Center on 14/10/2019 under Min 4/Oct/2019: Dissemination of Inspection report. These were two, disseminations against the required three.</p> <p>In the sampled schools; In Kitawe P/S there was only one inspection report on file, dated 15/10/2019. In Andibo P/S, one inspection report was on file, dated 19/11/2019. In Wangakawa P/S, there was equally only one report left at school.</p> <p>The LG had submitted two reports to DES instead of three reports and were acknowledged by stamp dated 23/06/2020 and 20/02/2020</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the General Purpose committee, which was the only standing committee in the Interim Council, had sat on 20/02/2020 vide Min. 23/COTE/2020, where the DEO presented the Q2 report for FY 2019/20, specifically presenting PLE, UCE and UACE results for 2019, respectively.</p> <p>In another meeting held on 27/02/2020 under Min.30//COTE//02/2020, the committee discussed a draft of the Pakwach Education Ordinance, which was meant to improve the academic performance of both primary and secondary schools in the district. At the time of the assessment, it had been reviewed and approved by the Solicitor General for final discussion and adoption by the District Council after which, it would be gazetted.</p>	2												
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department had held dialogue meetings in the six sub-counties of Pakwach to mobilize parents about; their role together with schools to improve the teaching/ learning of children, by providing lunch, scholastic materials and ensuring that the children's attendance is constant. The shedule was as follows;</p> <table border="0" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>Wadelai .</td> <td style="text-align: right;">03/01/2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Panyango</td> <td style="text-align: right;">06/01/2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pakwach Town Council</td> <td style="text-align: right;">07/01/2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alwi</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10/01/2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Panyimur</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13/01/2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pakwach</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20/01/2020</td> </tr> </table> <p>A detailed report dated 3rd March 2020 was submitted to CAO</p>	Wadelai .	03/01/2020	Panyango	06/01/2020	Pakwach Town Council	07/01/2020	Alwi	10/01/2020	Panyimur	13/01/2020	Pakwach	20/01/2020	2
Wadelai .	03/01/2020															
Panyango	06/01/2020															
Pakwach Town Council	07/01/2020															
Alwi	10/01/2020															
Panyimur	13/01/2020															
Pakwach	20/01/2020															

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments	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>	There was evidence of an up-to-date asset register for FY 2019/20 that set out school facilities and equipment relative to BRMS; number of classroom blocks and classrooms, number of latrine blocks and stances, number of 3 - seater desks and number of teachers houses(permanent).	2
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>		In the three sampled schools; in Wangkawa P/S there were four classroom blocks with 12 classrooms, three(3) latrine blocks and 15 stances, 148, 3 - seater desks and no teachers house. In Andibo P/S there were three (3)classroom blocks with seven (7) classrooms, three (3) latrine blocks and 10 stances, 148, 3 -seater desks and two (2) teachers housing units for four teachers. In Kitawe P/S there were four (4) classroom blocks with 16 classrooms (only seven classrooms however, were in use), three (3) latrine blocks and six (6) stances (with a pupil /stance ratio of 226:1) and 168, 3 - seater desks and no teachers house.	
12	Planning and budgeting for investments	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; (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>	A review of the DDP showed that the projects were planned for and captured in the DDP as follows: Class room and latrine construction & rehabilitation page 143 of the DDP and 52 of the AWP. All the projects were eligible both under DDEG and Education Sector guidelines. No evidence of desk appraisals was provided during the assessment.	0
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			
12	Planning and budgeting for investments	c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence of field appraisals for the projects below: Renovation of classrooms at Pangieth P.7 school, Construction of 4 stance latrines at Ley P.7 school and another 4 stance latrine at Pumit P.7 school	0
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution	a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The Education sector procurement plan that was submitted by the DEO to the PDU on 04/03/2020, had all infrastructural projects incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. For example; Projects for construction VIP latrines in Omach, P'ovona, Kivuje, Fualwonga, Pumvuga, Ocayo and Alliragem primary schools were all reflected in the procurement plan on pages 26 and 27.	1
	<i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>			

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The school infrastructural projects were approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General for the one project whose contract sum was above threshold. As seen below;

Construction of Alwi Seed Sec. school.

(MoES/UgFIT/WRKS/2018-20/00119)

Contract sum: UGX 2,079,770,185

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:02/04/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 04/02/04/2019

Solicitor General's clearance dated:14/05/2019

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit P/S

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00048)

Contract sum: UGX 21,854,331

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego P/S

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00001)

Contract sum: UGX 14,993,600

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley P/S.

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00049)

Contract sum: 19,912,500

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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*

The Project implementation Team was not officially composed for schools construction projects during in FY 2019/20.

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>The LG constructed Alwi Seed Sec. School and on site were several uncompleted structures but work was still in progress like, Administration block, ICT & Library, multi-purpose hall, three 2-classroom blocks, science laboratory, three twin staff houses with kitchen & drainable toilets, 2 blocks of 5-stance boys/girls drainable toilets and a 2-stance drainable toilet for the administration block.</p> <p>All structures had been well laid in accordance to the approved designs by MoES.</p> <p>The administration block was sampled out and according to designs, it provided for 3 offices, a store, reception and a staff room which were all in conformity with the drawings.</p> <p>Spot measurements were taken and were up to standard as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffroom dimensions: 6.9M/8.8M (plastering accounts for slight variations) • Window: 1.2M/1.5M • Double door:1.2M/2.4M • Apron: 1.5M • Roofing: pre-painted 26-gauge iron sheets. • Metallic trusses and facial boards. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Availed by the district Engineer were only 3 sets of site meeting minutes held at Alwi seed Sec. School dated 16/08/2019, 8/11/2019 and 18/03/2020 implying that site meetings were not conducted on a monthly basis as required.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Apart from the Engineer's records of site meeting minutes availed and reviewed dated 8/11/2019, 16/08/2019,18/03/2020 where the engineer, DCDO and Environment officer were represented at Alwi seed sec. School, the other supervision reports like for the construction of VIP latrines at Pacego and Punit primary schools dated 5/06/2020 and 8/05/2020 respectively did not indicate involvement in supervision activities of the Engineer and the other 2 relevant officers. i.e. DCDO and Environment officer in a joint manner as required.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

A review of the payment voucher showed that the payments were initiated and made as per the contract as shown below:

Payment for the renovation of class room at Pangieth P.7 school by Kris Consult Ltd under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00052. Contract start date was 30/1/2020 and completion indicated as ongoing. Certificate No.2 and requisition was certified by the District Engineer on 14/5/2020 and by the DEO on 15/5/2020 and payment of 50,627,797 made on payment voucher No.29805243 dated 4/6/2020. The contract stated that payments for certificates should be made within 30 working days from the date of issuance of the certificate.

Payment for the construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley P.7 school by Onenrwoth & family Enterprises under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00049. Contract start date was 10/2/2020 and completion 2/6/2020. Certificate (interim) and requisition was certified by the DEO and the District Engineer on 8/6/2020 and payment of 17,0109,000 made on payment voucher No.30488246, dated 25/6/2020. The contract stated that payments for certificates should be made within 30 working days from the date of issuance of the certificate.

Payment for the construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit P.7 school by River Shores Trade Link under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/2018-19/00040. Contract start date was 4/3/2020 and completion 28/5/2020. Certificate No.1 and requisition was certified by the DEO 15/5/2020 and the District Engineer on 8/5/2020. Payment of 1,097,042, then made on payment voucher No.30488248, dated 25/6/2020. The contract stated that payments for certificates should be made within 30 working days from the date of issuance of the certificate.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, *score: 1, else, score: 0*

The LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30. i.e. submitted on 04/03/2020 and was received on 04/03/2020.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0

The LG had complete procurement files for the school infrastructure contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law. For example;

Construction of Alwi Seed Sec. school.

(MoES/UgFIT/WRKS/2018-20/00119)

Contract sum: UGX 2,079,770,185

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:02/04/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 04/02/04/2019

Contract agreement dated: 7/05/2019

Name of Contractor: Stanhope Construction and General Mechandise.

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit P/S

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00048)

Contract sum: UGX 21,854,331

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:27/01/2020

Name of Contractor: River Shore Trade Links

Construction of 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego P/S

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00001)

Contract sum: UGX 14,993,600

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:20/02/2020

Name of Contractor: Leko GL Yesu Nuti Construction and Engineering Works Ltd.

Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley P/S.

(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00049)

Contract sum: 19,912,500

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:20/01/2020

Name of contractor: Onenwoth and Family Enterprises

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>The Grievance file presented during assessment had a grievance registration form, and a log showing how complaints would be captured. This had provision for a date when the complaint was received, mode of receipt, name of complaint, a description of the complaint, the type of complaint, action taken, status after 30 days and a status after 60 days.</p> <p>While this was in place, the Grievance committee failed to capture a complaint from the Headteacher at Ley Primary school where a 4 stance VIP latrine had been installed with a faulty door. According to the Deputy Headteacher, this issue was raised before construction was completed but no action was taken. This information was obtained from a site visit to the facility at the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had the education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), siting of schools, green schools and energy and water conservation. There was therefore no dissemination done, either.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The Bill of Quantities for construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Pumit Primary School in Wadelai Sub-county, within bidding document dated 8.11.2019 did not explicitly incorporate the costed ESMP measures. Incorporated was Health and safety, worth 150,000 shs, HIV/AIDS 150,000 shs and STD prevention at 80,000.</p> <p>The Bidding document for the construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego Primary School had a BoQ that did not incorporate Environmental measures.</p> <p>The bidding document for renovation of 2 classroom blocks one with 4 and another with 3 classroom with office at Pangieth primary had a Bill of Quantities that did not incorporate ESMP measures in the costing.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>For the schools such as Pumit, Pacego, Ley Primary Schools, Proof of land ownership for Education projects was not presented during the time of assessment.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	No evidence to show that Environment officer together with technical team was presented during the assessment. Monthly monitoring reports were not prepared for ongoing projects in the education sector as required by this indicator.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	<p>Not all E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments, as below;</p> <p>Interim Payment certificate for the 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit Primary School, dated 10.05.2020 for 19,668,898 shs was signed by the District Engineer and Chief Internal Auditor on 15.05.2020. The construction works at Pumit Primary school had interim Environment and social certificate dated 22.03.2020.</p> <p>Payment certificate No.1 for construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Pacego Primary School for 14,993,600 shs was Prepared by District Engineer, signed by District Education Officer, Finance Officer, Internal Auditor and Chief Administrative Officer on 8.06.2020. The works had an Environment and Social Certificate dated 7.07.2020. Payment for this works was initiated before environmental certification was issued.</p> <p>The renovation of classroom block at Pangieth Primary school in Alwi Sub county had a payment voucher (No. 29805243) for 50,627,797 shs dated 10.06.2020. The E&S Certificate was prepared and dated 26.03.2020.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>The local government registered 26% increment in utilization of health care services based on Out Patients Department(OPD) attendance from 34941 Financial year 2018-2019 to 47772 Financial year 2019-2020 with an increment of 12831 OPD attendances based on the three sampled health facilities of Pacego health center II, Panyimur health center III and Paroketo health center II.</p> <p>The annual health HMIS 107 reports of the three sampled health facilities indicated an increment in OPD attendances as indicated below;</p> <p>Pacego health center II increased from 11913 OPD attendances in 2018-2019 to 16639 OPD attendances in 2019-2020 indicated 28%.</p> <p>Panyimur health center III increased from 14804 OPD attendances in 2018-2019 to 18323 OPD attendances in 2019-2020 indicated 19%.</p> <p>Paroketo health center II increased from 8224 OPD attendances in 2018-2019 to 12810 OPD attendances in 2019-2020 indicated 36%.</p> <p>The respective three sampled health facilities were not considered on the deliveries since Paroketo Health center II did not conduct deliveries.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	<p>The LLG tool not yet developed</p>	0
<p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>				

2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Note: To have zero wait for year one

b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:

- Above 75%; score 2
- 65 – 74%; score 1
- Below 65% ; score 0

There was no documentary evidence of District RBF reports and facility assessment records availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment. The DHT claims that they were taken by the RBF West Nile coordinator to Arua during the July-August 2020 RBF meeting. This was also indicated in the exit meeting report form.

0

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

A review of the performance report page 15 showed that development grant of 2,252,423,000 was budgeted but cumulative out turn was **111,944,000**. Page 60 it was stated that **573,000** from Gov. development grant was spent on non residential building for out put 088180 Health Center Construction & Rehabilitation.

Under out put 088182: Maternity Ward Construction, it was stated that no activity took place but **42,303,000** was spent from Gov. Development grant.

Under out put 088182: Non Standard Delivery Capital, it was stated that office equipment and ICT accessories were purchased but how much was spent was not stated and from which funding source.

The cumulative amount spent on page from Gov. Development grant was stated as **49,060,000** yet from the out put above its only **573,000 + 42,303,000 =42,876,000**.

The above analysis indicated that the Performance Report was not accurate and could not be relied up on to determine which activities were implemented.

The status of the performance report was captured in the exit meeting.

0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO did not certify for works before payments were made because all the projects were paid under Force Account. The projects were:</p> <p>The projects were: Roofing of Fualunga HC III maternity ward, Construction of kitchen shed for health department at the district head quarters and construction of Fualunga HC III maternity ward.</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>For one sector implemented project, the variation in the contract price was within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers. i.e.</p> <p>Construction of a placenta Pit at Fualwonga HC II. (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00033)</p> <p>Contract sum: UGX 4,924,529</p> <p>Estimated Value:6,000,000</p> <p>$PV = (CS - EV) / EV * 100 = -17.9\%$</p> <p>Engineer's estimated value could not be determined for the rest of the other sector implemented projects. i.e.</p> <p>Extension of Fualwonga OPD to cater for maternity unit. (Implemented Force on account).</p> <p>Fencing of General waste Placenta pit and Incinerator. (Implemented force on account)</p> <p>Construction of a Kitchen with storage room. (Implemented force on account.)</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"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>All the health sector implemented projects for the FY2019/20 were NOT reported/reflected in the annual budget performance report. It was therefore hard to determine whether by the end of the financial year, these projects were complete.</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>The staffing structure for health workers in health facilities was 234 and filled was 149 equivalent to 63.6%.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The LG had no project to upgrade a HC II to HC III.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The reviewed health facility staff lists for the current financial year from the DHO's office and the current report on facility staffing levels indicated that the information was not accurate. From the 3 sampled health facilities of Amor health center, Pokwero health center and Pakwach Health center indicated the following;</p> <p>At Amor health center II, the deployment list from the DHO indicated 3 staff while the facility staff list was not available. The volunteer found at the facility at 9:32am had nowhere abouts of the staffing as the in-charge had gone for the meeting.</p> <p>At Pokwero Health center III, the deployment list from the DHO indicated 10 staff while the facility staff list indicated 11.</p> <p>At Pakwach health center IV, the DHO's staff deployment list indicated 53 staff while the facility staff list indicated 55 staff.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on the list of upgraded or constructed health facilities was accurate. The list of upgraded facilities indicated that there was no health facility upgraded as reviewed from the DHO</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The health facilities prepared and submitted annual work plans and budgets to the DHO. The three sampled health facilities of Panyigoro HC III, Pagem HCIII, Dei HCII submitted as follows;</p> <p>Panyigoro health center submitted on 20th August 2019, Pagem health center submitted on 11th July 2019 and Dei health center submitted on 11th July 2019.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The health facilities did not prepare Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2019/2020 and submitted them to the DHO.</p> <p>There is no health facility in the entire local government that prepared and submitted a health facility annual budget performance report for the financial year 2019-2020 to the DHO. The sampling of the three health facilities was therefore not applicable since there was no submission. This was also indicated in the exit meeting report form.</p>	0

6

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

Only two health facilities had developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in assessment reports for the current financial year. Pakia health center (12 June 2020), Pokwero health center (10th October 2020) had their submissions. It was only Pokwero's Performance Improvement Plan that had gaps identified during the DHT's monitoring and supervision including utilization of reproductive and maternal services.

Sampling of the three health facilities was not applicable since only two health facilities submitted.

0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• score 2 or else score 0

The health facilities did not submit 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities including Wadelai health center III, Alwi health center III and Amor health center II were not all submitted within 7 days following the end of each month and quarter as evidenced below.

Wadelai health facility submitted on 7th August 2019, 4th September 2019, 5th October 2019, 6th November 2019, 4th December 2019, 5th January, 4th February 2020, 4th March 2020, 4th April 2020, 4th May 2020, 6th June 2020 and 4th July 2020.

Alwi health center submitted on 7th August 2019, 5th September 2019, 10th October 2019, 8th November 2019, 5th December 2019, 10th January 2020, 7th February 2020, 5th March 2020, 7th April 2020, 7th May 2020, 7th April 2020 and 7th July 2020.

Amor health center submitted on 5th August 2019, 8th September 2019, 7th October 2020, 1st November 2019, 7th December 2019, 5th January 2020, 7th February 2020, 6th March 2020, 3rd April 2020, 5th May 2020, 7th June 2020 and 6th July 2020.

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>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 documentary evidence of Facility RBF invoices availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment. The DHT claims that they were taken by the RBF West Nile coordinator to Arua during the July-August 2020 RBF meeting. This was also indicated in the exit meeting report form.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence of Facility RBF invoices availed to the assessment team during the time of assessment. The DHT claims that they were taken by the RBF West Nile coordinator to Arua during the July-August 2020 RBF meeting. This was also indicated in the exit meeting report form.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner did not provide during the assessment evidence to show when the DHO submitted for consolidation health department QBPRs.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) dated 12th February 2020 by the DHO and approved by the DTTC and CAO on 13th February 2020 but it did not cater for the weakest performing health facilities as evidenced.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DHMT did not implement the Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities as it was not incorporated into the approved district performance plan</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</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms. It budgeted for 233 approved staff instead of 157 deployed staff in the health sector.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had not deployed as per guidelines in accordance with staffing norms as evidenced from the three sampled health facilities as indicated below

At Amor health center II, the deployment list indicated 3 staff out of 9 representing 33.3%

At Pokwero Health center III, the deployment list indicated 10 staff out of 19 which represented 52.6%

At Pakwach health center IV, the staff deployment list indicated 53 staff out of 48 which represented 110.4%

The two facilities of Amor and Pokwero did not meet the required standard of 75% and above.

0

7

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The health workers were not working in health facilities where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities of Amor health center, Pokwero health center and Pakwach health center as indicated below.

At Amor health center , the deployment list from the DHO indicated 3 staff while the facility staff list and attendance book were not availed during the facility visit.

At Pokwero Health center, the deployment list from the DHO indicated 10 staff while the facility staff list indicated 11 staffs. The DHO's list indicated 2 enrolled nurses while the facility list indicated 3 enrolled nurses

At Pakwach health center, the DHO's staff deployment list indicated 53 staff while the facility staff list indicated 55 staff.

0

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had not publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards as showed below from the facility visit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Amor health center, no staff was on site in the morning as the In-charge had gone to the meeting and only the volunteer was around. No staff list had been posted on the notice board and the attendance book was not available. 2. At Pokwero health center, a July 2020 dated staff list was pinned on the notice board at OPD with 11 staff. 3. At Pakwach health center, the staff list had not been pinned on the notice board, it was extracted from the system and signed by the In-charge (dated 15th December 2020) during the assessment time. It indicated 55 staff 	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>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>There was evidence that the DHO conducted annual performance appraisal for all the In charges as per the 10 sampled and submitted a copy to HRO as follows; Obete Peter Wadelai HC III (22/07/2020), Aliku Hadija Panyigoro HC III (01/07/2020), Otina Cunny John Pokwero HC III (04/07/2020), Okello Ronald Alwi HC III (18/08/2020), Wani Benjamin Panyimur HC III (29/06/2020), Amony Polline Pakia HC III (30/06/2020), Awor Jerodino Fualwonga HC II (30/06/2020), Oryema John Bosco Pacwach HC IV (30/06/2020) and Munguri Believe Dei HC II (07/07/2020).</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>There was evidence that In charges conducted performance appraisal of all the health workers as per the sampled 10 as follows; Odaru Florence Enrolled Nurse (2/07/2020), Oryema Stephen Senior Clinical Officer (2/08/2020), Were Fred Clinical Officer (01/07/2020), Lago Rebecca Enrolled Nurse (29/06/2020), Adiga Florence Enrolled Nurse (10/07/2020), Atuu Vicky Enrolled Midwife (30/06/2020), Milesi Jane Enrolled Midwife (29/06/2020), Olum Fred Enrolled Nurse (03/07/2020), Bithum T Enrolled Nurse (30/06/2020) and Adokorach Elizabeth Enrolled Nurse (30/06/2020).</p>	1

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to prove that In charges took corrective actions as per the gaps identified during the appraisal e.g.; Lago Leah Enrolled Nurse had a gap on Advanced knowledge on Maternal & Child Health, Atuu Vicky Enrolled Midwife Guidance and Counselling, Bithum T Enrolled Nurse Colonic Care and Medicine, Olum Fred Enrolled Nurse Intensive Care Patient management.	0	
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	The LG conducted trainings of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance with the training plan as evidenced from the various training reports. Training on food security and nutrition knowledge sharing report dated 20th May 2020 Regional TOT on Tuberculosis report dated 26th May 2019 Integrated and comprehensive TB and Leprosy report dated 20th May 2019 Quantification dissemination and client engagement report dated 10th June 2020 Mass action against Malaria report dated 15th June 2020	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	The LG had not documented training activities in the training /CPD database as evidenced by the time of assessment.	0
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure					

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>The letter from the CAO notifying the MoH in writing of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants (GoU and PNFP that received PHC NWR grants) for the current FY was not required since all health facilities had not been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous on the list.</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>A review of the Budget Performance report showed that:</p> <p>Out put 0883292: Health Care Services Monitoring & inspection allocation was 197,765,000 on page 61 of the performance report.</p> <p>Out put 088106: district Health Care Management Services was allocated 1,886,560,000 on page 58 of performance report.</p> <p>$\%tage = 197,765,000 / 1,886,560,000 \times 100 = 11\%$ which is below the minimum of 15%</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>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>A review of the print out of warrants for direct grant transfers to health facilities from IFMS showed that warrants were submitted beyond the 5 day limits as indicated below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrants were submitted on 13/8/2019 against expenditure limit dated 9/7/2019 and this was after 31 days;</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrants were submitted on 25/10/2019 against expenditure limit dated 2/10/2019 and this was after 15 days;</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrants were submitted on 23/1/2020 against expenditure limit dated 8/1/2020 and this was after 10 days;</p> <p>Quarter 4 warrants were submitted on 5/5/2020 against expenditure limit dated 14/4/2020 and this was after 13 days;</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>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 funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented for review during the assessment to prove that the CAO communicated releases to PHCs NWR. The CFO could not avail bank statements of the PHCs to verify when transfers were credited to their accounts. The CFO provided invoice dates for only 2 PHCs for only quarter 1 as follows: Alwi HC III was invoiced on 21/8/2019 and Amor HC II on 21/8/2019.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>It was therefore not possible to compute timeliness of the releases to the PCHs.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence availed to confirm whether 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. This was also noted on the exit meeting form signed by the CAO.</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>There was no documentary evidence availed to confirm whether the LG health department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings during the time of assessment. This was indicated on the exit meeting form signed by the CAO.</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>There was no documentary evidence availed to confirm whether the LG conducted quarterly performance review meetings as noted during the assessment time. This was noted on the exit meeting form signed by the CAO</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The LG did not supervise 100% of HC IVs (Pakwach Health center IV) at least once every quarter in the previous FY as reflected from the DHT supervision reports.</p> <p>The support supervision reports indicated that only 2 sets of supervision reports were availed (one dated 29th November 2019 and 13th March 2020). Pakwach health center was supervised in only 2 quarters instead of 4. This was 50% not 100% as required.</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>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>The DHT did not ensure that the Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY. There was no documentary evidence provided during the assessment time. This was also noted on the exit meeting form signed by the CAO.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail any documentary evidence for this indicator as noted in 10d above. Therefore discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits to make recommendations for specific corrective actions was not applicable.</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>The LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2019/2020. This is evidenced by;</p> <p>Medicines management performance report of 2019-2020 signed by the District Medicine Management Supervisor where a total of 19 health facilities were supervised.</p> <p>Medicines management performance dash board of 1st June 2020</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the quarterly budget performance report page 57 showed that =101,759,000 was allocated to Health Promotion, out put No.088105</p> <p>Allocation to District Health care management Services, Out put 088106 was =1,866, 560,000 on page 58 of the performance report</p> <p>%tage =101,759,000 / 1,866, 560,000x100=5%, which less than 30% minimum</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 DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities were conducted as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY. This was evidenced from the health promotional reports as established below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dialogue meeting in schools dated 21st February 2020 2. Orientation of community resource persons on Ebola and COVID-19 dated 12th June 2020 and 30th April 2020 3. Radio talk shows on Malaria upsurge on Pakwach FM dated 14th , 16th and 29th July 2019 4. Dissemination of the national framework for HIV rapid testing dated 14th June 2019 	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was no documentary evidence whether the DHT followed up actions taken by the DHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues as evidenced during the assessment time.</p>	0

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have an updated asset register. The general inventory-asset register was availed for assessment. It did not spell out health facilities assets and medical equipment.</p> <p>During the review, it was established that the presented general inventory Asset register did not detail health facilities and equipment in the LG, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (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)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The TPC minutes reviewed did not have discussions on prioritized health investments. There are also no reports to show that any health projects were implemented even in the performance report. TPC minutes included for meetings held on 28/11/2019; 16/12/2019; 4/1/2020; 28/2/2020 and 3/3/2020. Eligibility could not be determined since there were no records of projects implemented although in the Performance Report page 15 showed cumulative receipt of development grant of 111,944,000.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented for review during the assessment to show that desk appraisals were conducted for any project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented for review during the assessment to show that field appraisals were conducted for any project.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using checklists. Under review was the Environment and Social Screening form for renovation of Jonam County offices at District headquarter in Pakwach Town Council, dated 23.07.2019, and an Environment and Social Management Plan worth 700,000 shs.</p> <p>Construction of a Kitchen for the maternity ward at Kapita had a screening form dated 23.07.2019. The ESMP for this works had 664,620 shs costing and was dated 30.07.2019.</p> <p>The Rehabilitation of Out Patient Department at Fualwonga Health center II had a screening form dated 22.07.2019. Construction of the placenta pit at Fualwonga Health Center II was screened, with form dated 22.07.2019. This also had a costed ESMP for 1,470,463 shs, dated 20.07.2019.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>From the PDU, it was established that the health sector submitted their procurement plan timely on 14/04/2020 and received in PDU on same date.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The health sector submitted the procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY. i.e. received in PDU on 31/08/2020 for the construction of 2-stance VIP Latrine with bathroom at Fualwonga HC III.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Out of the 4 health infrastructural projects implemented last FY, only one had procurement file and was approved by contracts committee. Others were not approved as seen below;</p> <p>Construction of a placenta Pit at Fualwonga HC III. (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00033)</p> <p>Contract sum: 4,924,529</p> <p>Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019</p> <p>Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019</p> <p>Contract agreement dated:11/02/2020</p> <p>Contractor: Wuna and Julia Enterprises</p> <p>Extension of Fualwonga OPD to cater for maternity unit. Implemented Force on account.</p> <p>Fencing of General waste Placenta pit and Incinerator. Implemented force on account</p> <p>Construction of a Kitchen with storage room. Implemented force on account.</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>The LG did not establish a Project Implementation team for the health implemented projects.</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>Not all implemented health infrastructures followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH. i.e.</p> <p>Construction of a placenta Pit at Fualwonga HC III.</p> <p>Facility was constructed according to the Engineer's standard designs with a reasonably wide ditch (not measurable) covered with concrete slab providing for disposal and ventilation holes.</p> <p>A ventilation plastic pipe was installed in the ventilation hole and the disposal hole covered with a locable metallic cover as provided for in design.</p> <p>Extension of Fualwonga OPD to cater for maternity unit. (Force on account).</p> <p>Structure was constructed NOT according to MoH standard technical designs of an OPD. i.e. it was an ordinary structure with room sizes not catering for standard sample room, laboratory and an existing OPD.</p> <p>Construction of a Kitchen with storage room. (Force on account)</p> <p>The Engineer's technical designs were not accessed to ascertain compliance. Nevertheless, the structure was constructed with a cement floor creed with a pre painted 28-guage iron sheets open shed.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no clerk of works deployed to any of the implemented projects last FY.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no site meeting conducted during implementation of the sector projects.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p>	<p>To all the sector projects visited, there was no site instruction book accessed for review apart from the visitor's book reviewed at Fualwonga HC II where it was established that the Engineering Assistant regularly visited the site during the construction the placenta pit and CDO visited only once on 05/12/19 to screen the project but never did the Environment officer and DCDO carry out technical supervision of works to all health infrastructure projects at least monthly as a requirement.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The projects were implemented through Force Accounts and there were no contracts and as such the time frame for completion of the projects were not stated. The projects were the construction of Fualwonga HC II maternity ward and construction of kitchen shed for health department at the district head quarters in kapita.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0

Out of the 4 implemented health infrastructural projects implemented last FY, only one had a complete procurement file with all records as required by the PPDA Law as seen below;

Construction of a placenta Pit at Fualwonga HC III. (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00033)

Contract sum: 4,924,529

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:11/02/2020

Contractor: Wuna and Julia Enterprises

Extension of Fualwonga OPD to cater for maternity unit. Implemented Force on account.

Fencing of General waste Placenta pit and Incinerator. Implemented force on account

Construction of a Kitchen with storage room. Implemented force on account.

0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

The Grievance file presented during assessment had a grievance registration form, and a log showing how complaints would be captured. This had provision for a date when the complaint was received, mode of receipt, name of complaint, name of complainant, a description of the complaint, the type of complaint, action taken, status after 30 days and a status after 60 days.

However, with this in place, no grievance from Fualwonga Health Center II was recorded by the time of assessment. The In-charge at Fualwonga Health Center II informed the assessment that there were risks with having an open pit for burning medical waste, however no record of this issue was captured by the Grievance redress committee and the grievance log presented was empty at the time of assessment.

0

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	Health Care waste management guidelines were not disseminated to personnel of Fualwonga Health Center II. There was no follow up on implementation of the health care waste management guidelines at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	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	There was no dedicated budget for management of health care waste at the facility visited during field work. However, the In-charge at Fualwonga Health Center II informed the assessment that 10,000 shs is set aside for paraffin to burn wastes every month. The Facility didnot have an incinerator and practiced open burning in a pit that was not fenced and was located on a village path to a neighboring village in Jupaliga. However, a newly constructed placenta pit was on site during the field visit, at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
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	The In-charge at the Fualwonga Health Center II informed the assessment that mentorship in Infections Prevention and Control, was undertaken the staff from Alwi Health Center III, however a record of this was not on site at the time of Field visit. There was no record to show that training was undertaken for waste management at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	The Rehabilitation of Out Patient Department at Fualwonga Health center II had a screening form dated 22.07.2019 and Construction of the placenta pit at Fualwonga Health Center II was screened, with form dated 22.07.2019. This also had a costed ESMP for 1,470,463 shs, dated 20.07.2019. The Bill of Quantities for construction of placenta pit contained in Bidding document for Ref: PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00033 had not incorporated aspects of ESMP at the time.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	Proof of land ownership for projects implemented by District included; Fualwonga Health Center II, which had a freehold title for 1.059ha in Jonam County Nebbi District at plot 6 Block 3, Pokworo Panyango REGD 16.9.2011. INST 455339 dated 26.09.2011. At the time, Pakwach Health Center IV had a freehold offer dated 9.07.2012 for land at Kapita Village, in Pakwach Town Council, measuring 659m x 192m. Minute No. NDLB/34/48/7/12 .	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	Monthly reports were not prepared for health facilities were not prepared. However, an environment and social monitoring report was presented for review, dated 20.08.2020 for the construction of the placenta pit at Fualwonga Health Center II. From the visitor's book found on site, the Senior District Community Development Officer visited the facility for screening on 5.12.10. After that, there was no additional record of CDO or Environment Officer's visits to the facility during construction.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	Construction works for Health projects were mainly paid through force on account, except that for construction of the Placenta Pit at Fualwonga Health Center II. The payment certificates and vouchers for the placenta pit construction were not availed for review during assessment, however Environment and social certificates were prepared, dated 20.08.2020.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	According to the Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information Systems (MIS) water database Packwach District report, the Local Government had a 73% rural sources' functionality in Financial Year 2020/2021 hence the awarded score.	0
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Review of the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS water supply data base, it was reported that Packwach District had 123 Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) established of which 118 were functional. This accounted for 96% functionality in Financial Year 2020/2021.	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	During the Local Government Performance Assessment (LG PA) exercise verified sub-counties' water and environment performance results were not reviewed. It was established that by the time of the exercise, the Lower Local Governments (LLGs) performance assessment framework was still under design by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)	0

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

According to the Ministry of Water and
Environment MIS water supply database,
Pakwach District report, the LG had a safe
water coverage of 58% in Financial Year
2019/2020. Sub-counties below district
average included Alwi at 53%, Panyango at
51% , Wadelai at 49% and Panyimur at 44%
From the Annual Work Plan 2019/20
Ref:CR/103/4 dated 6th/08/2019 budgeted
water infrastructures in underserved sub-
counties included;

Drilling and construction of four (04) deep
boreholes in the sub-counties of Alwi (01),
Panyaango (01), Wadelai (02) at a cost of
UGX100,000,000 and

Construction of Phase I piped water supply
system at Boro Rural Growth Center (RGC) at
a cost of UGX159,482,030 in Panyimur sub-
county.

Review of Annual Progress Report 2019/20
Ref:CR/103/4 dated 6th/07/2020, it was
reported that out of the budgeted four (04) deep
bore holes only two (02) were successfully
implemented in the sub-counties of Alwi and
Wadelai. It was again established that the
budgeted construction of Phase I piped water
supply system at Baro RGC in Panyimur sub-
county was not implemented due to effects of
Covid-19 pandemic (mobilizing work force was
challenging). This accounted for only 40%
implementation of budgeted projects in Lower
Local Governments below district average.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

During assessment, three contracts were
sampled to establish price variations between
contract prices and engineer's estimates.
These included;

Drilling and construction of four (04) deep
boreholes which according to the annual
budget had UGX100,000,000 as the engineer's
estimates. According to the reviewed contract
agreement signed between Pakwach District
LG and Galaxy Agrotech (U) Ltd contract
No:PKCH/618/wrks/19-20/00061 dated
30th/01/2020 the contract price was
UGX88,000,000. The project had a price
variation of -12%

From the Annual Work Plan & Budget 2019/20,
the engineer's estimates for the construction of
a two stance VIP pit latrine at Akella RGC in
Pakwach sub-county was UGX15,000,000.
From the reviewed contract agreement signed
between Pakwach District LG and KRIS
Consult Ltd dated 29th/01/2020,
UGX14,943,900 was the contract price. The
price variation was therefore 0

According to the annual budget 2019/20, the
engineer's estimates for rehabilitation of eleven
(11) deep boreholes was UGX53,511,909. The
contract agreement signed between Pakwach
District LG and Pakwach Pump Mechanics
Association dated 30th/01/2020 had
UGX50,804,276 as the contract price. This
accounted for -5% price variation. All the three
sampled projects/contracts were within the
range of +/-20% hence the rewarded score.

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> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>Review of Pakwach District Annual Work Plan 2019/20, the LG Water sector planned and budgeted for;</p> <p>-Drilling and construction of four (04) new deep boreholes</p> <p>-Construction of Phase 1 Piped water supply system at Boro Rural Growth Center and</p> <p>-Construction of a 2-stance VIP pit latrine at Akella Rural Growth Center.</p>	0
<p>From the annual budget performance report, it was established that out of the four budgeted boreholes, only two (02) were successfully completed. Two sites in Panyango and Wadelai sub-counties had very low yields therefore not completed. The construction of Phase I piped water supply system at Boro RGC was equally not completed sighting mobilization challenges as a result of Covid-19 pandemic. In nut shell, the only completed project was the construction of a 2-stance VIP latrine in Akella RGC. This represented 33% project completion in FY 2019/2020. The justification given was very low yield water potential and effects of Covid-19 for boreholes and piped water system construction respectively.</p>				
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: 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>Data from the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS water supply data base, Packwach District Local Government had a 72% rural water sources functionality in 2018/2019. The same information source reported 73% of water supply facilities functioning. It was therefore noted that there was a percentage increase across the two Financial Years reviewed.</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>Data from the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS report indicated that the Local Government had 123 established Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) accounting for 96% in Financial Year 2019/2020. It was also revealed that in FY 2018/2019 the LG had 137 established WSCs of which 121 were functional representing 88%. The increase in percentage of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees was 8% hence the score awarded.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The LG Water Office accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in Financial Year 2019/2020 and performance of each respective facility. Review of the annual performance report, the DWO reported about the successfully drilled and constructed facilities at Okema central village in Wadelai sub-county, Nyamucar East water source in Alwi sub-county and the constructed 2-stance pit latrine at Akella Rural Growth Center in Pakwach sub-county. Equally the failed sources in Panyango and Wadelai due to poor yields and the uncompleted construction of Phase 1 piped water supply system at Boro RGC was captured in the annual performance report narrative.

Field visits to the sampled facilities including Okuma water source DWD-56810, Nyamucar East water source DWD-56808 and 2-stance pit latrine at Akella RGC confirmed accuracy and consistency of reported information in the performance report as facilities were found in existence and fully functional.

3

5

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG 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

Reviewed were quarterly reports detailing sub-county safe water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and Water and sanitation committees(WSCs) however, the reviewed reports were not comprehensive enough to capture issues of safe water storage and community involvement as required by the assessment indicator.

0

5

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0

The LG water office updated the MIS (WSS data) using the standard Ministry of Water and Environment rural water supply database-Form1 (data collection for new water points) for the sources of Okuma central water source in Wadelai and Nyamcar East village source in Alwi sub-county. Information on estimated numbers of users, operational status, water source location and operations & management arrangements was captured. The data collected informed updating of sub-county safe water coverage figures that were used to inform allocation of WSS facilities in FY 2020/21. All seemed to have been done right however, the update was done annually as opposed to the quarterly requirement by the indicator hence loss of score.

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>During the Local Government Performance Assessment (LG PA) exercise, Lower Local Government water and environment assessment reports were not reviewed. Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) and reports not presented for review. It should however, be noted LLGs performance assessment framework was still under design by the Office of the Prime Minister.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG as budgeted 1 Civil Engineer (Water), 1 Assistant Water Officer, (Mobilization) 1 Borehole Technician as per the approved structure dated 31/01/2018 (Ref ARC/135/306/01) in the performance contract 2020/2021).</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Environment and Natural Resource officer had budgeted for the District Natural Resource Officer (Not cleared by Central Government). The two officials budgeted for were Environment and Forest Officer.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that District Water staff had been appraised; Oweknimungu Benedicto Civil Engineer (Water) appraised on 30/06/2020. The borehole Technician Okello Haruni appointed on 16/03/2020 thus not yet due for performance appraisal.</p>	3

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3

The LG Water office had three (03) staff by the time of the assessment. These included the LG Water Officer who was duly appraised by the District Engineer using the Staff Performance appraisal forms for public service (PS Form5). The assessment indicator calls for the DWO to appraise and identify capacity needs of line staff in the sector however, it was discovered that both staff were not eligible as one (Assistant Water Officer-Mobilization) was on contract basis and the Borehole Technician was recruited after FY 20219/20. Therefore conducting capacity needs assessment, developing of training plans was not applicable in the period under review.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

According to the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS report, Packwach had a safe water coverage of 55%. The sub-counties of Alwi at 53%, Panyango at 51%, Wadelai at 49% and Panyimur at 44% were ranked below district average as of financial year 2020/2021.

Review of the annual work plan and budget FY 2020/2021 Ref:CR/103/4 dated 10th/07/2020 the LG Water sector had a total grant of UGX603,693,462 of which UGX543,984,018 was sector development grant. According to the sector funding guidelines 2020/21, at least 75% must be allocated to capital development infrastructures, 15% rehabilitation, 10% investment service costs and source protection and catchment area management. From the reviewed budget, the allocation for capital development intervention was UGX446,648,728.

According to AWP&B the LG had allocated UGX335,178,525 towards construction of Boro RGC piped water supply scheme in Panyimur sub-county ranked at 44% safe water coverage.

The budget also had an allocation of UGX25,000,000 for drilling and construction of a deep boreholes in the sub-county of Alwi.

The LG Water Office allocated a budget of UGX15,000,000 for construction of a 2-stance pit latrine at Ragem RGC in Wadelai sub-county and

Design extension of piped water supply system (GFS,borehole,surface) feasibility studies and tender documentation at at a cost of UGX38,660,713 in Panyango sub-county. From computation, a total of UGX413,839,238 was allocated to LLGs below district average in FY 2020/2021 representing 92% of the capital infrastructure development budget.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence the LG Water Office communicated to Lower Local Governments their respective budget allocations in FY 2020/2021. Reviewed during assessment was a letter dated 29th/09/2020 addressed to Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS) of Pakwach, Alwi, Panyimur, Wadelai and Panyango sub-counties regarding WSS projects to be constructed and budgeted estimates for each. For instance it was observed and reviewed from the pinned circular that the sub-county of Panyimur was allocated UGX335,178,525 for construction of a GFS at Boro, Wadelai allocated UGX41,750,000, Alwi sub-county allocated UGX35,700,000, Packwach sub-county was allocated UGX41,050,000 and Panyango UGX26,750,000.

3

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

According to Pakwach District Local Government Water and Sanitation situation report as at 30th June 2020, the LG had a total of 3,705 water sources of which 2,939 were functional and 766 non-functional. The LG had a total of 277 boreholes, 300 shallow wells with pump, 200 protected springs and 164 Gravity Flow Scheme Yard taps & PSPS.

Review of the Packwach District LG Water and sanitation infrastructural monitoring plan for FY 2019/20 the LG Water office planned to monitor all the WSS facilities within the four quarters with an average of 64 boreholes per quarter.

It should however, be noted that documents presented as monitoring reports were inspection reports for new facilities which again did not capture Environment and Social aspects. There was also no proof that recommended actions identified from monitoring were followed up.

0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three quarterly District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) meetings were conducted according to minutes reviewed. The justification for missing the one DWSCC was the National lockdown as a measure to prevent the Covid-19 pandemic. (directive from Ministry of Health to ensure social distancing as a standard operating procedure)

From the three reviewed DWSCC minutes, key issues identified from monitoring were included on agenda items for example DWSCC minutes dated 4th/10/2019 under MIN:5/1stDWSCC/10/2019: Presentation of report from stakeholders, the LG Water Officer reported among other challenges the poor attitude of community towards contribution of water source maintenance.

Under MIN:5/2ndDWSCC/2020, presentation by the District Water Officer; poor O&M practices in all sub-counties was reported to members and discussed by stakeholders. The DWO also reported about weak and collapsible soils for latrines in Wadelai sub-county.

In the DWSCC meeting conducted in the fourth quarter dated 6th/07/2020 under MIN:5/4thDWSCC/2020, the LG Water Officer reported about the failure to implement the Boro RGC piped water supply scheme due to Covid-19 pandemic lock down. It was therefore clear that the LG Water office managed to itemize issues captured during monitoring to inform discussions in DWSCC meetings as proved from the reviewed minutes.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Observation from both the District central notice board and sampled sub-counties of Wadelai, Alwi and Pakwach, there was evidence that the LG Water office publicized budget allocations for the Financial Year 2020/2021. Specific LLGs projects and itemized project budgets were displayed on notice boards.

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>According to the Annual Work Plan FY 2019/2020 Ref:CR/103/4 dated 6th/08/2019, Pakwach District LG Water Office had a total Non-Wage Recurrent budget of UGX30,862,392. Review of the budget breakdown, it was discovered that UGX12,344,957 was specifically allocated to software/mobilization activities including planning and advocacy meetings, sensitization of communities to fulfill sector critical requirements, establishment and training of WSCs and commissioning of capital projects.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>From the reviewed District software report FY 2019/20, four (04) Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) were established and trained. During LG PA exercise, a report on WSC training for the new water sources for FY 2019/20 dated 2nd/07/202 addressed to Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) was reviewed. The training content included community based management system, roles & responsibilities of water and sanitation committees, operations & maintenance of water sources among others. Among training facilitators were Assistant Water Officer-Mobilization and sub-county Community Development Officers (CDO).</p> <p>During field visits to the sampled sources of Okuma central source and Nyamucar East water source in Wadelai and Alwi sub-counties respectively, it was clear the interviewed WSC members were trained as they could recall some of the themes covered during training especially O&M arrangements.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The Local Government Water Office had an updated water sector asset register that detailed water supply and sanitation facilities per village, parish in each sub-county. The register captured source name, name of funder, DWD number, ownership arrangements, functionality, management and gender issues. The reviewed asset register was last updated on 5th/08/2020.</p>	4
----	--	--	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>b. 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 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>A review of the DDP and AWP showed that all the projects implemented were derived from the DDP and planned for in the AWP except the construction of VIP latrine at Pakwach Sub County as indicated below:</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Construction of VIP toilet at Pakwach Sub County was derived from DDP page 146 but not reflected in the AWP.</p>	
			<p>Borehole drilling and rehabilitation in various location were derived from DDP on page 146 and reflected in the AWP on page 67. All the projects were however, allowable under the DDEG guidelines.</p>	
			<p>But no evidence of desk appraisals for the projects was presented for review during the assessment. This was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>Review of the community application file, there was evidence that all budgeted investments for financial year 2020/2021 had completed application letters from respective beneficiary communities. Application letters from Ayangwa village in Alwi sub-county dated 20th/11/2019, Padyere village in Pakwach sub-county dated 14th/11/2019 were reviewed. All applications were signed by LC1 chairperson, witnessed by five community members of which three were women. The applications equally indicated fulfillment of the six (6) sector critical requirements.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence of field appraisals during the assessment and this was captured in the exit meeting.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>All water infrastructure projects for the 2019/20FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction. However none of the bill of quantities for proposed infrastructure incorporated the costed Environment and Social Management Plans as required.</p> <p>Under review was the Environment and Social Screening form for Kwiaakuru Borehole in Panyango Sub county, dated 22.4.2020. The Environment and Social Management Plan for this facility was costed 1,100,000 shs and dated 27.4.2020.</p> <p>The Borehole in Okuma Central within Wadelai Sub county had a screening form dated 23.4.2020. The Mukandwa Borehole in Wadelai sub county had a screening form dated 23.04.2020 and costed ESMP for 1,100,000 shs, dated 27.04.2020.</p> <p>The screening form for construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Akella Market Rural growth Center in Pakwach Sub county was dated 21.04.2020.</p> <p>There was also a project brief developed for the development of Boro Rural Grown Center piped water scheme in Boro Central Village, Panyimur Sub county. This too had a costed ESMP for 50 million shs. This was contained in the Project Brief dated 27.03.2020.</p> <p>The Bill of Quantities reviewed for drilling and construction of the 4 boreholes presented by Galaxy Agrotech dated 18.11.2019 did not consider any of the costed ESMPs for borehole installation.</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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The water sector procurement plan submitted to PDU on 15/04/2020 had all infrastructure investments incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. i.e.</p> <p>Drilling deep boreholes and construction. Is appearing on page 19.</p> <p>Construction of piped water supply system (solar water powered). Is appearing on page 19</p> <p>Construction of VIP in RGC. On page 19.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction</p> <p>Score 2:</p>	<p>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the FY2019/20 were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. For example;</p> <p>Deep borehole drilling and construction of 4 boreholes (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00061)</p> <p>Contract sum: UGX 88,000,000</p> <p>Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019</p> <p>Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019</p> <p>Construction of 2-stance VIP latrine at Pakwarch.</p> <p>S/C. (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00061)</p> <p>Contract sum: UGX 14,943,900</p> <p>Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019</p> <p>Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019</p>	2
----	--	---	---	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines</p> <p>Score 2:</p>	<p>The District Water Officer did NOT establish the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>According to reviewed standard technical designs and drawings, the borehole pedestal had to be installed with stainless steel hand pump, identical to the stand. The area around the borehole was to have a circular concrete platform of diameter 1700mm with a waste water drain of about 150mm with a 2% slope. The soak away pit was to be covered with hardcore stones. From the sampled source of Okuma central water source-DWD 56810, Nyamucar East source DWD-56808 all the specifications in the designs were adhered to.</p> <p>For the 2-stance pit latrine, the technical specifications had use of Gauge 28 repainted GI sheet on 100*50mm ralter and wall plate, 150mm thick reinforced concrete floor slab, 200mm thick wall plastered and finished smooth. The latrine observed at Akella Market/Rural Growth Center in Pakwach sub-county was as per the designs reviewed.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>According to the supervision and monitoring reports dated 29/06/2020 and 28/05/2020 for the Engineer plus supervision reports dated 15/5/2020 and 15/06/2020 for the DCDO together with the Environment officer, it was evident that relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects. However, there were no site meetings conducted during implementation of the same projects.</p>	0

<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>A review of the payment vouchers showed that not all the payments were made within the time frame stated in the contract as shown below:</p> <p>Payment for the construction of 2 stance VIP toilet for Water sector at Pakwach Sub County by Kris Consult Ltd under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00035. The project start date was 30/1/2020 and completion 9/3/2020. Interim Certificate for payment was certified by the DWO on 20/3/2020 and requisition on 19/3/2020. Payment of 10,714,017 on voucher No..288902215 dated 20/4/2020. Payment was made after 20 working days</p>
---	---	--

Payment for drilling 4 Boreholes by Galaxy Agrotech (U) Ltd under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00061. The project start date was 13/3/2020 and completion 15/5/2020. Certificate No. 1 for payment was certified by the DWO on 16/6/2020. payment of 56,835,900 on voucher No. 3048825 dated 25/6/2020. Payment for certificates should be within 30 working days from the date of the certificate.

Payment was made after 21 working days

Payment for rehabilitation of 12 Boreholes by Pakwach Hhand Pump Mechanic Association under contract No. PKCH/618/Wrks/19-20/00016. The project start date was 6/6/2019 and completion 22/6/2019. Certificate No. 2 for payment was certified by the DWO on 25/9/2019 and payment of 6,024,460 was made on voucher No.26784379 dated 10/12/2019. Payment for certificates should be within 30 working days from the date of the certificate. This payment was made beyond the 30 days stated in the contract

Payment was made after 50 working days

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

Complete procurement files for water infrastructure investments were in place for the contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law as seen below;

Deep borehole drilling and construction of 4 boreholes (PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00061)

Contract sum: UGX 88,000,000

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:30/01/2020

Contractor: Galaxy Agrotech (U) Ltd

Construction of 2-stance VIP latrine at Pakwarch.

S/C.(PKCH/618/WRKS/19-20/00061)

Contract sum: UGX 14,943,900

Minutes of Contracts committee meeting dated:16/12/2019

Evaluation report approval minute No: 4a/16/12/2019

Contract agreement dated:29/01/2020

Contractor: Kris Consult Ltd.

Environment and Social Requirements

13

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

Maximum 3 points this performance measure

Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:

Score 3, If not score 0

A Grievance redress framework was not in place at the time of Assessment. However, presented was a Grievance log that was empty at the time of assessment. There was also no record made by the District water Officer in liaison with the Grievance Redress Committee regarding implementation of water infrastructure.

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 & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The District Water Officer and the Environment Officer did not disseminate guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to Community Development Officers (CDOs). The Water and Environment Officers did not have copies of the guidelines at the time. No meeting was held to disseminate the guidelines to CDOs therefore no minutes were availed for review during the LGPA exercise. There was no record to ascertain that the guidelines had been disseminated to Community Development Officers by the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were not prepared and and therefore were not implemented.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>From the LG Water sector Land/MoU file reviewed, there was sufficient evidence that all Water supply and sanitation services (WSS) projects were implemented on land where Packwach District LG had proof of ownership. The Local Government through sub-county authorities signed land agreements with original land owners where potential water sources were identified during sitting. For example land transfer agreement for a piece measuring 10*20meters was signed between Mr.Odongo Leonard and Alwi sub-county on 12th/03/2020. Another agreement between Agenonga Oledere and Wadelai sub-county for piece of land measuring 10*20 dated 12/03/2020 was reviewed.</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Payment certificate No.1 for 4 boreholes to Galaxy Agrotech (U) Ltd for 56,835,900 shs was signed by the District Water Officer and Chief Finance Officer on 16.06.2020. This certificate was cleared via voucher no. 30488250 dated 17.08.2020 . The E&S Certificate for boreholes were prepared and dated 15.06.2020, a day before the payment certificate was prepared by the Water Officer.</p> <p>The Payment certificate for the Construction of 2 stance VIP Latrine at Akella Market for 13,449,510 shs, was signed by the District Engineer on 19.03.2020 and the District Water Officer on 20.03.2020. The payment was cleared via voucher 28890215 on 2.06.2020. For this work, the Environment and Community development Officer had prepared an Environment and Social Certificate dated 9.03.2020.</p> <p>Therefore, E&S Certification forms for these works were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor certificates.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Monthly Monitoring for boreholes was undertaken and reports produced. However, monthly monitoring records for boro piped water scheme were not presented for review during assessment. Under review was the Mukandwa Borehole in Wadelai Sub-county, with 2 monitoring records, one dated 15.05.2020, and another dated 11.06.2020.</p> <p>Monitoring record for Kwiaakuru Borehole in Panyango Sub county was dated 13.05.2020 and another report dated 12.06.2020.</p> <p>Monitoring for Okuma borehole in Wadelai Sub county was 14.05.2020 and another monitoring report dated 11.06.2020.</p> <p>The Borehole drilling project started on 13.03.2020 and ended on 15.06.2020 according to the Engineer's Completion certificate. Therefore the Environment officer and Community development officer prepared monitoring reports to cater to the months for implementation of boreholes, under the water department.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	Not applicable now.	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 <p>Maximum score 4</p>	Not applicable in the year under review.	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	Not applicable now.	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable now.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable now.	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	Not applicable now.	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	The District Extension staffing structure for LLGs was 31 posts and 15 were filled at the time of assessment equivalent to a 48%.	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	Not applicable now.	0

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The information on staffing of Extension workers was accurate at 2 out of the 3 LLGs as per the staff list i.e. Pakwach Town Council 1 on staff list 1 at station, Panyango S/C staff list had 3 and station 3. However, there was disparity at the Pakwach Sub county; staffing list had 3 and station had 4 the extra staff was Vermin Hunter.	0
---	---	---	--	---

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

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

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

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

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The District Production Officer had not budgeted for all the extension workers as the budget line was inadequate for the financial year 2020/2021 (Ref Performance Contract 2020/2021).	0
---	--	---	--	---

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 deployment of Extension workers was not as per the guidelines as there were vacant posts in LLGs sampled e.g.; Pakwach Sub county the posts of Veterinary Officer was vacant, Panyongo Sub county the post of Veterinary Officer , Agricultural Officer and Fisheries Officer were still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the Extension officer deployed as per the staffing list were working at their station e.g.; Pakwach TC Assistant Animal Husbandry (Mungu -Acel Wilfred) was at the station, Panyango Sub county Assistant Animal Husbandry (Pikwo James), Assistant Fisheries Officer (Kumakech Walter) and Assistant Agricultural Officer (Okrumu Edmond) and Pakwach Sub county Agricultural Officer (Olum Chris), Fisheries Officer (Adongo Richard) were at the station.	2
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	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	There was no evidence of display of the deployed extension workers in LLGs except Pakwach Town council.	0
Maximum score 6				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	There was no evidence that the District Production Coordinator had conducted appraisal of Extension Workers as per the agreed performance plans. The following were sampled and had not been appraised; Otika Tonny Vermin Hunter, Pikwo James Assistant Animal Husbandry, Jakony Norman Assistant Animal Husbandry, Nyeko Osman Fisheries officer, Kumakech Casto Agricultural Officer, Opio Emans Assistant Fisheries Officer, Adongu Richard Fisheries Officer, Wanguich Godwin Assistant Animal Husbandry and Enyanga Faustine Fisheries Assistant.	0
Maximum score 4				

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was no appraisal conducted by the District Production Officer so as to identify corrective actions.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	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>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</p>	Not applicable now.	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	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>	Not applicable now.	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>	Not applicable now.	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	Not applicable now.	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>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</p>	Not applicable now.	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>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</p>	Not applicable now.	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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	0

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 4			

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	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	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 8			

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:</p> <p>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>	Not applicable now.	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>	Not applicable now.	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>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	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>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	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>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</p>	Not applicable now.	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>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	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>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable now.	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>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</p>	Not applicable now.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable now.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Not Applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	Not Applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	Not Applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of the Senior Agricultural Engineer was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	Not Applicable	0
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	Not Applicable	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The post of DWO was substantively filled by Owekni Mungu appointed on 28/06/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/047/2019).	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The post of the Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization had not been filled at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of a Borehole Maintenance Technician was substantively filled by Okello Haruni appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/09/2020).	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	The post of Natural Resource Officer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Oweka Jenifer appointed on 09/05/2017 (Ref DSC/NBB/078/2017).	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Forest Officer was substantively filled by Picho David appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/09/2020).	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	All water infrastructure projects for the 2019/20FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction. Under review was the Environment and Social Screening form for Kwiaakuru Borehole in Panyango Sub county, dated 22.4.2020. The Borehole in Okuma Central within Wadelai Sub county had a screening form dated 23.4.2020. The Mukandwa Borehole in Wadelai sub county had a screening form dated 23.04.2020. The screening form for construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Akella Market Rural growth Center in Pakwach Sub county was dated 21.04.2020. However, climate change risk was not incorporated during screening for any water infrastructure by the time of assessment.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Schedule 4 of the National Environment Act 2019, part 4 requires a project brief to be developed for projects utilising water resources and water supply. Therefore a project brief was developed for the development of Boro Rural Grown Center piped water scheme in Boro Central Village, Panyimur Sub county. This had a costed ESMP for 50 million shs. This was contained in the Project Brief dated 27.03.2020.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	A drilling permit was issued on 16.05.2019 for drilling and installation of the 4 boreholes, Permit No. DP 12505/DW 2019.	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of DHO was substantively filled by Dr Ajal Paul appointed on 14/05/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/022/2020)</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The post of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal was substantively filled by Draru Jessica appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018).</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Principal Health Inspector was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Senior Health Educator was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The post of Biostatistician was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of District Cold Chain Technician was substantively filled by Wabinano John appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018).</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

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

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

If the LG carried out:

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

Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using checklists. Under review was the Environment and Social Screening form for renovation of Jonam County offices at District headquarter in Pakwach Town Council, dated 23.07.2019,

Construction of a Kitchen for the maternity ward at Kapita had a screening form dated 23.07.2019.

The Rehabilitation of Out Patient Department at Fualwonga Health center II had a screening form dated 22.07.2019. Construction of the placenta pit at Fualwonga Health Center II was screened, with form dated 22.07.2019.

However, none of the documents reviewed for screened incorporated climate risk as required.

0

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

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

The Implemented Health facility investments had mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using checklists. Of these was the Environment and social Management Plan (ESMP) for renovation of Jonam Offices to create office space and Hall in Pakwach Town council, costed 1,750,000 shs and dated 31.07.2020.

Construction of a Kitchen for the maternity ward at Kapita had an ESMP for this works costed 664,620 shs and was dated 30.07.2019.

The Rehabilitation of Out Patient Department at Fualwonga Health center II and construction of the placenta pit at Fualwonga Health Center II had a costed ESMP for 1,470,463 shs, dated 20.07.2019.

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of the DEO was still vacant at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The district strict staffing structure had two posts of Inspectors of schools i.e. Senior Inspector and Inspector of schools. The LG had filled the Inspector of schools and that of Senior Inspector was still vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p><i>The Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Projects implemented within the education department were screened for environment and social aspects, except that of climate change.</p> <p>Reviewed was an environment and social screening form (ESSF) for renovation of 2 blocks of 3&4 classroom at Pangieth Primary School in Alwi Sub county, dated 20.07.2019</p> <p>There was also a screening form reviewd for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Ley Primary School dated 20.07.2019</p> <p>The screening form for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Pumit Primary School was dated 21.07.2019 and construction of a 3 stance VIP Itrine for Pacego primary School dated 21.07.2019.</p> <p>None of these screening documents considered climate risk at the time.</p>	0

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.

Environment and social Impact Assessments were not undertaken for any of the Education infrastructure implemented in 2019/20 FY. However, Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMP) were developed.

The Maximum score is 30

Reviewed was an ESMP for renovation of 2 blocks of 3&4 classroom at Pangieth Primary School in Alwi Sub county, costed 5,123,000 shs, dated 30.07.2019

The ESMP for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Ley Primary School was costed 995,625 shs dated 30.07.2019

The ESMP for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Pumit Primary School was dated 30.07.2019, costed 1,092,716 shs and that for construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine for Pacego primary School dated 30.07.2019, costed 749,680 shs..

The Environment and Community Development Officer prepared Environment and social Monitoring forms to check on compliance with mitigation for each education infrastructure implemented.

The monitoring records were dated as below;

For renovation of 2 blocks of 3&4 classroom at Pangieth Primary School in Alwi Sub county, the monitoring report was dated 25.03.2020

That for construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine for Pacego primary School in Panyango sub county was dated 6.07.2020.

The monitoring report for Construction of a 4 stance VIP latrine at Ley Primary school in Alwi Sub county was dated 27.02.2020

The one for Construction of 4 stance VIP latrine at Pumit Primary School in Wadelai sub county was dated 21.03.2020.

The ESMP for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Ley Primary School was costed 995,625 shs dated 30.07.2019

The ESMP for construction of a 4 stance VIP for Pumit Primary School was dated 30.07.2019, costed 1,092,716 shs and that for construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine for Pacego

primary School dated 30.07.2019,
costed 749,680 shs..

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of the CFO was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The post of the District Planner was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Engineer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Natural Resource officer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of the District Production Officer was substantively filled by Abaja Samuel appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/10/2020).	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The post of Of District Community Development Officer was not substantively filled at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Commercial Officer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	The post of the Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Onyutha John appointed on 16/10/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/062/2019).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	The post of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mungudit Faith appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/09/2020).	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of PHRO was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of a Senior Environment Officer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of a Senior Land Management Officer was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the post of a Senior Accountant had been filled substantively by Alirch Wilfred appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The post of Principal Internal Auditor was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The post of PHRO (Secretary DSC) was still vacant at the time of assessment.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of: a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0	The LG had filled only 5 out of the 6 posts of LLGs Senior Assistant Secretaries and Town Clerk.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of: b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS score 5 or else 0.	The district had filled only 5 out of the 6 posts of CDOs in LLGs. The vacant post of CDO was in Wadelai Sub county.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of: c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	There were evidence that the district had filled all the posts of Senior Accounts Assistant or Accounts Assistant in LLGs. The filled posts were as follows; Ogwang Stephen (SAA) Wadelai S/C appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018), Jakisa Gabriel (Accounts Assistant) Panyango S/C appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/010/2020), Abalo Alice (Accounts Assistant) Alwi S/C appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/09/2020), Odoma Frank (SAA) Packwach S/C appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018), Okech Onega Charles (SAA) Panyamur S/C appointed on 14/01/2019 (Ref DSC/PAK/038/2018) and Ouch Alex (Senior Town Treasurer) appointed on 16/03/2020 (Ref DSC/PAK/010/2020).	5

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	A review of page 14 of the Final Accounts showed that: Allocation to Natural Resources was =152,245,000 Warranted during the year was =34,536,533 Actual release during the year was =34,536,533 %tage =34,536,533 /152,245,000 = 23%	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0		
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	A review of page 14 of the Final Accounts showed that: Allocation to Community Based services was =1,055,254,000 Warranted during the year was =578,877,810 Actual release during the year was =578,877,810 %tage =578,877,810 / 1,055,254,000=55%	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	From the Environment Officer, One project qualified for the category of DDEG financed projects and that was the Construction of the the flash toilet at the Administration Block of the District Headquarters. The facility had an Environment and Social Screening form dated 23.07.2019, with a costed Environment and Social Management plan, worth 1,500,000shs, dated 30.07.2019. However, the list of projects indicating funding source was not provided by the Planner, therefore the assessment could not substantiate this infrastructure as one funded by DDEG.	0
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>No project requiring an Environment and social Impact assessment was implemented by the District using the DDEG.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The Construction of the the flash toilet at the Administration Block of the District Headquarters. The facility had an Environment and Social Screening form dated 23.07.2019, with a costed Environment and Social Management plan, worth 1,500,000 shs, dated 30.07.2019. The size of the development minimal in size therefore a comprehensive ESMP was sufficient to cater to all anticipated impacts arising from the construction.</p> <p>While the Environment Officer Presented this project, the assessment could not ascertain from the Planner's list whether or not this was funded by DDEG. The Planner's list showing funding for projects implemented in 2019/20 FY was not availed for review during assessment.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The report has not yet been released by the OAG</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),	Action to address Internal Auditor General's findings was submitted on 13/2/2020 as per the schedule of submission of reports from the MoFPED.	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.		
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The performance report was submitted on 29/6/2020 as per the schedule of submissions of reports from the MoFPED.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		
8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The performance Report was submitted on 28/8/2020 as per the schedule of submissions of reports from the MoFPED.	4
	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 QBPRs were submitted as shown below as per the schedule of submission of reports from the MoFPED.	4
	Maximum score is 4	score 4 or else 0.	Quarter 1 on 9/1/2020 Quarter 2 on 3/2/2020 Quarter 3 on 12/5/2020 Quarter 4 on 28/8/2020	