



LGMSD 2021/22

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	44%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	60%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	30%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	74%
Educational Performance Measures	73%
Health Performance Measures	57%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	21%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>Evidence from the physical verification and verification of documents for the 4 DDEG infrastructure projects indicate that the projects are functional and utilized as per the purposes of the projects.</p> <p>Amuria had 4 infrastructure projects for FY2020/21 as follows:</p> <p>1- Construction of Council Chambers for UGX 212,400,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 42 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>2- Renovation of the Council Hall for UGX 35,000,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 136 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>3- Constructing Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 (Page 54Annual Workplan, Page 20 Approved Budget Estimates and Page 61 LG Annual Performance report); and</p> <p>4- Supply of Survey Equipment for UGX 82,000,000 (Page 139 of the Annual Workplan, Page 49 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 101 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p>	4

2	Service Delivery Performance	a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :	This is not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	o by more than 10%: Score 3		
		o 5-10% increase: Score 2		
		o Below 5 % Score 0		
2	Service Delivery Performance	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.	There was evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per the Annual Performance report page 3. Amuria had 4 DDEG projects for FY2020/21 as follows:	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3	1- Construction of Council Chambers for UGX 212,400,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 42 of the LG Annual Performance report);	
		• If 80-99%: Score 2	2- Renovation of the Council Hall for UGX 35,000,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 136 of the LG Annual Performance report);	
		• If below 80%: 0	3- Constructing Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 (Page 54 Annual Workplan, Page 20 Approved Budget Estimates and Page 61 LG Annual Performance report); and	
			4- Supply of Survey Equipment for UGX 82,000,000 (Page 139 of the Annual Workplan, Page 49 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 101 of the LG Annual Performance report);	

3	Investment Performance	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:	There was evidence from the Annual Budget Performance Report (ABPR) of FY 2020/21 (Page 3) that the LG spent all the DDEG of the previous FY year on eligible projects as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines as follows:	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	Score 2 or else score 0.	<p>1- Construction of Council Chambers for UGX 212,400,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 42 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>2- Renovation of the Council Hall for UGX 35,000,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 136 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>3- Constructing Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 (Page 54 Annual Workplan, Page 20 Approved Budget Estimates and Page 61 LG Annual Performance report); and</p> <p>4- Supply of Survey Equipment for UGX 82,000,000 (Page 139 of the Annual Workplan, Page 49 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 101 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p>	
3	Investment Performance	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,	The contracts were awarded as follows:1) Council chambers at Ugx. 411,997,137 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 412,400,000, giving a cost variation of +0.1%; completion of wera livestock market awarded at Ugx. 184,867,473 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 226,720,000, giving a cost variation of +18.5%;) and supply of motorized pumps and kroilers to production awarded at Ugx. 29,984,000 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 29,984,000, giving a cost variation of 0%; It was observed that all the cost variations were within the eligible range of +/-20%. The computation was based on agreements dated 3rd November, 2020; 3rd November, 2020 and 11th January, 2021 for council chambers, completion of live stock market in wera and supply of motorized pumps and kroilers to production department respectively. The estimated amounts were as stated in procurement plan1 dated 3rd September, 2020.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 2 or else score 0		

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The staffing levels for sampled LLGs was found to be as summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kuju SC had 12 staff member staff members as provided in the District HR records. • Willa SC had 9 staff members staff members as provided in the District HR records. • Amiria TC had 26 staff members staff members as provided in the District HR records. 	2
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the sampled DDEG projects were completed as reported in the reports as follows:</p> <p>1- Phased Construction of Council Chambers for UGX 212,400,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 42 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>2- Renovation of the Council Hall for UGX 35,000,000 (Page 16 of the Annual Workplan, Page 9 of the Approved Budget Estimates, and Page 136 of the LG Annual Performance report);</p> <p>3- Constructing Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 (Page 54 Annual Workplan, Page 20 Approved Budget Estimates and Page 61 LG Annual Performance report).</p>	2

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>HR staffing plan for 2022/2023 was not submitted</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District used to capture staff arrival and departure times in the attendance register and analyse the information on a monthly basis however since the Covid pandemic in 2020 this activity was suspended.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Most of the HoDs were appraised with the exception of District Community Development Officer and Ag. District Health Officer. Below is a summary of HoD appraisal dates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Production Officer – Dr. Acheli Peter. Appraisal completed on 5th August 2021 • District Education Officer – Ms. Acom Kelen. Appraisal completed on 16th August 2021 • District Planner – Mr. Akelem Emmanuel. Appraisal completed on 11th May 2021 • District Engineer – Mr. Julius Eonya Elolu. Appraisal completed on 17th August 2021 • Ag. District Commercial Officer – Mr. Okodel Francis. Appraisal completed on 26th August 2021 • Ag. Natural Resources Officer – Mr. Ekosile Deogratius. Appraisal completed on 17th August 2021 	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Rewards and Sanctions committee was created and is active. It sits quarterly and whenever there are urgent matters which cannot wait. Some of the Minutes reviewed included minutes of 16th June 2021. In this sitting the committee invited six (6) members of staff to answer various cases relating to abscondment, absenteeism, not reporting for duty after transfer, domestic violence, child neglect and bribery.</p>	1

7

0

Performance
management

Maximum 5 points on
this Performance
Measure

iii. Has established
a Consultative
Committee (CC) for
staff grievance
redress which is
functional.

The Consultative Committee has not been
formed.

Score 1 or else 0

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

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

Score 1.

The District recruited 12 staff and all of them accessed payroll within 2 months as indicated below:

- Florence Acharit – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Nabukeera Jamidah – Physical Planner, was recruited on 26th June 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Okiring Christopher – Communications Officer, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Jesca Mudodo – Hospital Administrator, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Ongora Godfrey – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Alejo Alice – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Kabonessa Margaret – Stenographer/ Secretary, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Eselu Moses – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Epuru Thomas – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Immaculate Atekit – Laboratory Technician, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020
- Elizabeth Isiku – Parish chief, was recruited on June 26th 2020 and accessed payroll in August 2020

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.	Some pensioners did not access payroll within two months. This was due to inconsistencies in information between their personnel file and national. Below are two pensioners who did not access payroll within two months. • Ekwasu Timothy – Education Assistant had inconsistencies with his date of birth • Ekibu Fastino – Teacher, had inconsistencies with his date of birth.	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	There is evidence that the direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as follows: UGX 291,758,054 was transferred in Q3 as per Declaration of Release for the third quarter dated 8th January 2021; UGX 291,758,055 was transferred in Q2 as per Declaration of Release for the third quarter dated 15th October 2020; and UGX 293,515,335 was transferred in Q1 as per Declaration of Release for the third quarter dated 15th July 2020.	2
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: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED): Score: 2 or else score 0	The evidence indicates that the LG warrant/ verification for the previous FY releases of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs was done on: 1. Quarter 1 DDEG warranty for UGX 1,171,136,307 was dated 3rd August 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 9th July 2020. (25 days) 2. Quarter 2 warranty for 1,173,005,467 was dated 17th October 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 6th October 2020. (11 days) 3. Quarter 3 warranty for UGX 1,169,267,149 was dated 22nd January 2021. The MoFPED Circular date was 8th January 2021. (14 days) The LG did not submit warrants in time for DDEG transfers to LLGs.	0

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

c. If the LG
invoiced and
communicated all
DDEG transfers for
the previous FY to
LLGs within 5
working days from
the date of receipt
of the funds
release in each
quarter:

Score 2 or else
score 0

The CAO issued quarterly Declaration of Releases of all funds (including DDEG funds) to the LLGs copied to the RDC, DEC Members, District Speaker, District Councilors, District Internal Security Officers, all HODs, Sub-county Chairpersons, Town Clerk, Senior Assistants to the CAO, Health Units and Notice Boards. The quarterly correspondence was as follows:

Quarter 3 Releases dated 8th January 2021 for UGX 4,976,528,987. Funds release circular date was 8th January 2021 (1 day);

Quarter 2 Releases dated 15th October 2020 for UGX 5,541,775,018. Funds release circular date was 6th October 2020 (9 days); and

Quarter 1 Releases dated 15th July 2020 for UGX 5,200,353,793. Funds release circular date was 9th July 2020 (6 days).

However, the releases to LLGs were not within 5 working days from the receipt of the release date.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the LG supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines. The following monitoring reports were availed.

1. Technical Monitoring of Government Projects dated 30th September 2020;
2. Technical Monitoring Report on Implementation of Government Projects dated 15th November 2020;
3. Quarter Three Technical Monitoring Report on Implementation of Government Projects by both HLG and LLGs dated 30th March 2021; and
4. Quarter Four Monitoring Report on emptying twenty-two pit latrines in both primary and secondary schools in Amuria District (Environmental Compliance Report dated 24th June 2021).

The Mentorship Reports availed included:

5. Mentorship Report dated 7th July 2021 for Community Development Officers; and
6. Mentorship Report dated 20th September 2021 for Community Development Officers

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:

Score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the Monitoring reports were discussed in two of eight the TPC meetings of FY2020/21 as follows:

1. District TPC Meeting held on 19th November 2020 – Minute 4/11/2020 discussed the 1st Quarter Joint Monitoring Report
2. District TPC Meeting held on 7th October 2020 – Minute 3/10/2020 discussed the Joint Monitoring Report.

Other TPC Meetings discussed several project issues and were held as follows:

1. District TPC Meeting held on 23rd April 2021 – discussed the UWEP and YLP Projects
2. District TPC Meeting held on 3rd March 2021 – Discussed Budget estimates
3. District TPC Meeting held on 16th December 2020 – Discussed the DDEG Allocations
4. District TPC Meeting held on 16th September 2020 – Disseminated the LG Performance Assessment for FY2019/20.
5. District TPC Meeting held on 19th August 2020 – Discussion of several district projects
6. District TPC Meeting held on 21st July 2020 – Discussed Audit issues

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>The Asset Register was available and provided. The register detailed the Asset categories and amounts of the assets. However, dates of purchase and total costs of each category of asset were missing, and the LG did not confirm the date when the Asset Register was last updated.</p>	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 LG has a Board of Survey Report for FY2020/21 that was submitted on the 18th October 2021 after year end. There was no evidence availed to indicate that the LG used the Board of Survey Report as a source of guidance on procurement, maintenance, and disposal of assets during the year of assessment FY2020/21.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

There is evidence that the District has a functional physical committee in place. The committee consists of:

1. District Deputy CAO
2. Physical Planner
3. Town Clerk
4. District Health Officer
5. District Engineer
6. District Environment Officer
7. District Works Officer
8. District Educational Officer
9. District Agricultural Officer
10. District Community Development Officer
11. Surveyor

The Committee does not have a Development Plan in place.

During the previous FY, the evidence shows that the committee submitted Minutes to the MoLHUD, however the MoLHUD stamp was not clear, and was stamped on only two sets of Minutes as follows:

1. Minutes for the District Physical Planning Committee Meeting held on 22nd April 2021 – Stamped from MoLHUD (date not clear)
2. Minutes for the District Physical Planning Committee Meeting held on 15th December 2020 – Not Stamped from MoLHUD
3. Minutes for the District Physical Planning Committee Meeting held on 8th December 2020 - Not Stamped from MoLHUD
4. Minutes for the Physical Planning Committee Meeting held on 4th August 2020 – Stamped from MoLHUD (date not clear)

12	2	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p>	<p>There is evidence that the District conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget. The desk appraisals availed included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Survey Equipment for Natural Resources dated 29th March 2020, Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer. Page 139 of the Annual Work Plan; 2. Renovation of Council Chambers dated 30th April 2020, Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Environment officer. Page 16 of the Annual Work Plan; 3. Livestock market in Wera SC dated 29th March 2020, Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer. Page 54 of the Annual Work Plan; and 4. Council Chambers Building dated 30th March 2020, Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer. Page 16 of the Annual Work Plan. 		
<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	12	2	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</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>There is evidence that the 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 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Field Appraisal for the Council Chambers renovation for UGX 35,000,000 was dated 30th February 2019. Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer; 2. Field Appraisal for the Council Chambers building construction Phase V for UGX 212,400,000 was not dated. Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer; 3. Field Appraisal for the Livestock Market for UGX 190,000,000 was dated 29th March 2020. Signed by the District Chairperson (DCO), Financial Officer, CAO, Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment officer.
<p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>					

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG prepared Project profiles with costings for its DDEG investments, however there was no evidence that the project profiles had been discussed by the TPC. Project profiles availed included those of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of Council chambers at the District Headquarters for UGX 35,000,000 2. Construction of the Council Chambers Phase V for UGX 212,400,000 3. Construction of a Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the DDEG Funds. The LG had four (4) projects implemented under DDEG in the previous year. Environmental and Social Screening Report Forms for 3 sample projects were available as follows:</p> <p>Renovation of Council chambers at the District Headquarters for UGX 35,000,000 - The form was signed on 30th March 2021 by the Senior Environment Officer, DCDO and District Planner.</p> <p>Construction of the Council Chambers Phase V for UGX 212,400,000 - The form was signed on 30th March 2021 by the Senior Environment Officer, DCDO and District Planner.</p> <p>Construction of a Livestock Market at Wera for UGX 190,000,000 - The form was signed on 8th January 2021 by the Senior Environment Officer, DCDO and DCO.</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>Evidence availed showed that water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the final approved district procurement plan under item S/No. 2 (drilling of deep boreholes) at Ugx. 560,404,000 in a plan dated 3rd/09/2020, prepared by Akol Ann (Procurement Officer and approved by Mr. Opolot Francis (CAO) and received by MoFPED on the 7th/ 09/2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence available shows that DDEG infrastructure projects were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as evidenced by: Minn4/ADCC/9-2/20-21 Approval of evaluation reports (a) open bidding projects and,</p> <p>1) Construction of council chambers, phase VII at ugx. 600,000,000; and 2) construction of maternity ward at Abarilella Health Centre III at ugx. 145,495,770.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence availed that showed an established Project Implementation Team (PIT) consisting of District Engineer and Project Manager (Mr. Eonya Julius Eلولu), District Education Officer (Ms. Acom Kelen), District Health Officer (Dr. Okwi Nick), Environment Officer (Mr. Ekosile Deo), and District Community Development Officer (Ms. Akello Rhoda) in letters dated 20th November, 2020.</p>	1

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From field reviews conducted on 12th/11/2021, there was evidence to show that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: The field observations made on the council chambers include the following:</p> <p>The floor was of sound construction in 450mm*450mm ceramic tiles for two office spaces equivalent to 32m².</p> <p>Stairways have been treated to terrazzo, separated by ebonite strip blocks of 1220mm wide *1320mm long.</p> <p>Structural columns in reinforced concrete, 2800mm high and 250mm in diameter have been constructed to the front porch at first floor of the council chamber.</p> <p>230mm steel fascia has been firmly fixed to the eave end of the tiled roof.</p> <p>All the above observations were compared with the technical design and found to comply with the specifications.</p>
---	--	---

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

Evidence that was availed showed that technical officers including engineers, planner, environmental officer and DCDO supervised projects prior to verification and certification of works. The reports availed and reviewed include the following:

Evidence of participation by Mr. Ekosile Deo (Environment officer) and Ms Akello Rhoda (DCDO) in a report dated 12th May, 2021.

The following inspection and supervision reports indicating participation of the project implementation team were availed for review:

construction of a two classroom block in Aparisa-Asamuk Primary School dated 17th February, 2021,

Construction of a two classroom block in Opam Primary School dated 11th March, 2021,

Construction of Council Chambers, Phase VI, Amuria District Headquarters dated 31st May, 2021.

The assessor also reviewed evidence of site meetings signed including that dated 24th June, 2021 for the construction of Council Chambers, Phase VI, Amuria District Headquarters, signed by the DCDO and the Environment Officer, Mr. Ekosile Deo.

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

The LG executed infrastructure projects and issued payments to contractors within specified time frame as follows:

For the construction of a two classroom block in Aparisa Asamuk primary school (Contract duration: 2nd/11/2020-2nd/03/2021), practical completion certification at 100% was issued on 10th/06/2021 through a payment certificate. While for construction of a two classroom block in Opam primary school (contract duration: 2nd/11/2020-2nd/03/2021, practical completion certification at 100% was issued on 11th/06/2021 through a payment certificate.

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	The procurement file was availed for review which included the following documents for the two contracts procured in the year under review: 1) Minutes of approved evaluation committee report dated 5th/10/2020 signed by: Okim Moses Bunsen (Chairperson), Erumu Simon Peter (Member), Apio Rebecca (Secretary), Obaate Phillip (Member), Akol Ann (Member), Julius Eonya (Member) and Opesa Samuel (Member) 2) Agreements for borehole siting and drilling were signed on the 3rd/11/2020, under procurement reference numbers: (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00012 and (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00013 3) The Contracts committee minute number for approval of lot 1 and 2 for siting and drilling of deep boreholes was Min6/ADCC/10-1/20-21.	1
----	--	---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0	The District has i) designated a person (Focal Person/ Community Development Officer (CDO) with appointment letter issued on 2nd July, 2017 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 committee is composed of District Education Officer (DEO), Principal human resources officer, District Health Officer (DHO), District engineer, District natural resources officer, District community development officer and senior procurement officer ". This established complaints and grievances district committee" was implemented in a meeting held on 1st July, 2017.	2
----	--	---	--	---

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence obtained showed that the local government does not have a formal specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action but has improvised a reporting system which is not regularly followed and implemented.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the district/municipality had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into draft LG Development Plans, Annual Workplan (Page 166), Approved Budget estimates (Page 39, 43, 44, 46 and others) and Annual Budget (Page 117)</p>	1

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management

score 1 or else 0

There was evidence availed on dissemination of the enhanced DDEG guidelines and adaptation and social risk management to LLGs during the mentorship of the community development officers (Report on dissemination of DDEG Guidelines FY 2021 that was prepared on on 28th March, 2021 along with the minute number CR/ADLG/167/1 for the meeting held on 7th July, 2021

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>There was evidence that the local government incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY for example, (i). building construction - storeyed building-256 at Okutoi ward, district headquarters "Item: 312101 non-residential buildings" FY 2020/2021 local government quarterly performance report page 136.</p> <p>(ii). building construction - maintenance and repair-240 of Okutoi ward, Obuku cell administration department "Item: 312101 non-residential buildings" FY 2020/2021 local government quarterly performance report page 136.</p> <p>(iii). construction services - livestock markets-399 at Wera town board "Item: 312104 other structures" FY 2020/2021 local government quarterly performance report page 140.</p> <p>(iv). monitoring supervision and appraisal - allowances and facilitation-1255 of Okutoi ward "Item: 281504 monitoring, supervision and appraisal of capital works" FY 2020/2021 local government quarterly performance report page 135</p> <p>(v). equipment - assorted kits-506 for Okutoi ward headquarters "Item: 312202 machinery and equipment" FY 2020/2021 local government quarterly performance report page 135.</p>
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>There was evidence of projects with additional costing of addressing climate change adaptation that is, the planting of 10 acres of woodlot at the district as a carbon sink (Amuria District LG approved budget FY 2020/21) and River bank and Wetland restoration. (Amuria District LG approved budget FY 2020/21).</p>

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:

Score 1 or else score 0

Below is the list of DDEG projects implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership that is Amuria district local government Certificate of Title Freehold Register, volume HQT1247 FOLIO 11 situate at Block(Road) 1 Plot 86 and 87 at Okutoi, REGD, 12/06/2017 INST. 00030758

Okutoi ward, district headquarters

Wera town board "Item

District Council chambers

Renovation of council hall

Construction of livestock market

Procurement of survey market

Extension of power to DCAO residence

Engraving machine

Procurement of 3 motor cycles

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:	<p>There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conduct support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provide monthly reports for example,</p> <p>(i). a compliance report for the construction of 5 stance pit latrine in Kuju primary school by FOACA enterprises that was prepared on 23rd March, 2021</p> <p>(ii). a field inspection monitoring report on environment compliance for the constructed district infrastructure prepared on 30th May, 2021</p> <p>(iii). an environment compliance report for construction of council chamber phase V by CAB Uganda limited prepared on 30th June, 2021</p> <p>(iv). a report on field inspection of contractors on social and environmental compliance prepared on 28th April, 2021</p> <p>(v). a compliance report on environment and social impact assessment on construction of multi cell culvert at Opot along Amuria-Obalanga-Abim road</p>	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	Score 1 or else score 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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:	<p>There was evidence that E&S compliance certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example,</p> <p>(i). Environmental and Social compliance certificates for the rehabilitation of Amuria town council to Asamuk low cost sealing road issued on 30th September, 2020</p> <p>(ii). Environmental and Social compliance certificates for the rehabilitation of boreholes by ASAPKA Company limited (contractors) issued on 18th June, 2020</p> <p>(iii). Environmental and Social compliance certificates for the construction of OPD block at Amuria hospital issued on 17th June, 2020</p>	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	Score 1 or else score 0		

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the LG prepared monthly bank reconciliations for the period July 2021 to October 2021, and that they were up to-date at time of the assessment.</p> <p>The Bank reconciliations for the period July 2020 to October 2021 were reviewed and assessed for the following accounts.</p> <p>Amuria District General Fund Account</p> <p>Amuria District Treasury Account</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY as follows:</p> <p>1st Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 7th December 2020 CR/ADLG/251/1 and submitted to the Accountant General's Registry at the MoFPED on 11th January 2021.</p> <p>2nd Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 4th February 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 5th February 2021 and submitted to the Accountant General's Registry at the MoFPED on 12th February 2021.</p> <p>3rd Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 18th May 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 20th May 2021 and submitted to the Accountant General's Registry at the MoFPED on 26th May 2021.</p> <p>4th Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 4th May 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 19th and 20th August 2021 and submitted to the Accountant General's Registry at the MoFPED on 24th August 2021.</p>	2

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.

Score 1 or else score 0

There is evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ District 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.

2nd Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 4th February 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 5th February 2021.

3rd Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 18th May 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 20th May 2021.

4th Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 4th May 2021 was disseminated to the CAO, District Chairman and PAC on 19th and 20th August 2021.

1st Quarterly Internal Audit Report dated 7th December 2020 CR/ADLG/251/1 was also disseminated to the Council/ District Chairman and discussed in the PAC Meeting held on 28th and 29th September to discuss all the four Internal Audit Reports. Minutes for the Amuria District Local Government Public Accounts Committee meeting held on 28th and 29th September to review the Internal Audit Reports for the year ended 30th June 2021 were availed. Minute 06/08/2021.

All the Internal Audit Reports also contained a section on the status of audit findings from the previous quarter providing information on audit recommendation follow up.

17

1

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0

There is evidence that the 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.

The reports were disseminated to the:

1. District Chairperson
2. CAO
3. District Office
4. CFO
5. PAC Committee

The PAC had one meeting on the 28th and 29th September to discuss all the four Internal Audit Reports. Minutes for the Amuria District Local Government Public Accounts Committee meeting held on 28th and 29th September to review the Internal Audit Reports for the year ended 30th June 2021 were availed. Minute 05/08/2021 and Minute 06/08/2021 discussed the Internal Audit Reports and follow up recommendations in detail.

The meeting included the PAC and all the Technical Officers.

Local Revenues

18

2

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.

There is evidence that the revenue collection ratio is within +/- 10 %.

Revenue collection as at 30 June 2021 totaled UGX 501,708,201 against the planned Budget of UGX 386,684,000.

Revenue collections exceeded the Budget by 30%.

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>There is evidence that the LG increased its own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one).</p> <p>Revenue collection during the year FY2020/21, amounted to UGX 501,708,201 against the FY2019/20 revenue of UGX 321,410,973.</p> <p>Revenue collections exceed the previous financial year (FY 2019/20) by 56%.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY to the LLG as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remittance of Local Revenue to LLGs dated 24th August 2020 for UGX 29,770,588. CR/ADLG/201/4/3; 2. Remittance of Local Revenue to LLGs dated 21st December 2020 for UGX 13,656,760. CR/ADLG/201/4/3; 3. Remittance of Local Revenue to LLGs dated 26th January 2021 for UGX 24,081,698. CR/ADLG/201/4/3; and 4. Remittance of Local Revenue to LLGs dated 10th May 2021 for UGX 11,383,349. CR/ADLG/201/4/3. 	2

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence on the notice board indicated availability of the pre-qualification list for construction of pit latrines under procurement reference Amun565/works/2020-2021/00003, pre-qualification list for renovation of building under procurement reference number: Amun565/works/2020-2021/00002.</p> <p>Construction of a 2 classroom block at Opam Primary school awarded at Ugx. 67,999,913 and construction of council chambers, phase VI at Ugx. 411,997,137. The best evaluated bidder notice was dated 14th October, 2020.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published. The report was uploaded onto the LG website https://www.amuria.go.ug/opportunitites/amuria-district-local-government-assessment-results-2020</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is 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. The LG conducted discussions with the public on service delivery and got feed back during the Council Meetings. For example Order Paper of the District Council meeting scheduled for 31st March 2021, presented the District Budget limits and provided status on Education, Health and Community Based services.</p>	1

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on all the three documents of i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal at the time of assessment.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the Council maintained and provided a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which included a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status. The Status of Court cases report was not dated.</p>	1

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The PLE pass rate dropped from 66.56% in 2019 to 62.2% in 2020; representing 4.36% drop between the previous school year but one and the previous year.</p>	0
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>UCE pass rate improved from 46.29% in 2019 to 52.87% in 2020; representing 6.58% improvement between the previous school year but one and the previous year.</p>	3

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>According to the Education department, restrictions on people's movements due to Covid-19 lockdowns hampered LLGs from playing their roles as expected. No further evidence was provided to verify LLG performance improvement.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points</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 		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed indicated that development grant was used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines. Among others, the grant was used to:</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>i) Construct classrooms in Opam primary school (PS); Aparisa PS; Ogolai PS; and Otubet PS; each school getting a two-classroom block with an office and a store.</p> <p>ii) Build a 5-stance drainable pit latrine in Kuju PS; Obia PS; Olelai PS; Ogangai PS; and Temele PS.</p>	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was availed at the time of assessment to verify that the DEO, Environment Officer and the CDO certified works on Education construction projects.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The contracts were awarded as follows:1) Council chambers at Ugx. 411,997,137 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 412,400,000, giving a cost variation of +0.1%; completion of wera livestock market awarded at Ugx. 184,867,473 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 226,720,000, giving a cost variation of +18.5%;) and supply of motorized pumps and kroilers to production awarded at Ugx. 29,984,000 against an estimated amount of Ugx. 29,984,000, giving a cost variation of 0%; It was observed that all the cost variations were within the eligible range of +/-20%. The computation was based on agreements dated 3rd November, 2020; 3rd November, 2020 and 11th January, 2021 for council chambers, completion of live stock market in wera and supply of motorized pumps and kroilers to production department respectively. The estimated amounts were as per procurement plan1 dated 3rd September, 2020.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>The project assessed was a seed secondary school. However, Amuria District Local Government did not receive funding for such interventions and the score awarded is as per guidance of the assessment manual.</p>	2

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	According to an updated staff posting list for 2021 for primary school teachers, 38 new teachers were recruited and posted in 2021, representing 4.32% recruitment as per MoES guidelines.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	Lists of registered UPE and USE schools and a consolidated asset register for both UPE and USE schools for the two previous FYs were reviewed.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	There are 68 government-aided and 24 non-government aided primary schools in the LG. There are also 7 government-aided and 8 non-government-aided secondary schools in the LG. None of these schools meets the basic requirements and minimum standards set by the DES guidelines.	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.	a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.	Teacher deployment lists (2020/21 and 2021/22) were obtained from the DEO and verified against the 3 sampled schools: Kuju PS; Abuket PS; and Angorom PS. The verification found out that the LG had accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 		

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>The LG has a consolidated school assets register, which was verified against existence of infrastructure and equipment in a sample of three primary schools namely Kuju PS; Abuket PS; and Angorom PS. The verification established that the LG accurately reported on infrastructure and equipment in all registered primary schools in the LG.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 		
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</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>	<p>For the last two years schools have not complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines of submitting copies of their budgets to the DEO.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 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>According to the information availed, at least 43% of the primary schools were supported by the CCTs, PTAs, and SMCs to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations. Some of the inspections with such recommendations include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Term III 2019 inspection report for compliance of education institutions with Covid-19 SOPs; dated March 29, 2021; - Inspection report for Quarter 3 FY 2019/20; dated March 23, 2020; - Second inspection report on school compliance with Covid-10 SOPs; dated Oct 22, 2020; - Amuria DLG inspection report on compliance of education institutions with Covid-19 SOPs, carried from Feb 19 - March 19, 2021; - Term II inspection report on school compliance with Covid-19 SOPs; dated Dec 17, 2020. 	2
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>EMIS return forms with a compilation of all registered schools from the previous FY was availed for verification, which confirmed that the LG collected and compiled the return forms as required.</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>Evidence (UG Approved Budget Estimates 2020/21 and 2021/22) were obtained for validation, which proved that the Lg budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of 1 teacher per class for schools with less than P7 for the current FY.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>Teacher deployment list for 2021 was availed for validation and was further verified from the sampled schools (Kuju PS; Abuket PS; and Angorom PS) . The validation confirmed that teachers were deployed as per sector guidelines.</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,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed (teacher deployment list 2021) showed that the LG had disseminated deployment data to schools, evidenced by display of the deployment list on the LG notice board and that of the schools.</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</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed for verification (performance agreements and performance reports by head teachers) showed that the primary school head teachers had been appraised by SAS in the previous school year (2020). This was confirmed from the three sampled primary schools (Kuju PS; Abuket PS; and Angorom PS) .</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Copies of appraisals of secondary school head teachers by Deputy CAO for the previous school year and duly submitted to HRM dated Oct 5, 2021 were available for review.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Filled-in appraisal forms obtained from the LG Education department indicated that all staff in the department had been appraised in the previous FY 2020/2021.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>A capacity building plan for FY 2020/21 to address staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level was availed for review and confirmed as appropriate.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>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>Evidence of submissions communicating corrections/revisions of school lists, budget allocations and enrolment numbers for 2020 estimates was availed for review. Submission was made, dated Oct 17, 2021.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</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>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>In the LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2020/201, a sum of UGX 41, 172,000 was allocated to inspection and monitoring functions for Quarter 1, FY 2020/21 in line with sector guidelines.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>		
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the LG warrant/ verification for the previous FY releases for schools Capitation Grants was done on:</p> <p>Quarter 3 Schools Capitation Grants warranty for UGX 323,827,311 was dated 22nd January 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 8th January 2021. (14 days)</p> <p>Quarter 4 Schools Capitation Grants warranty for UGX 114,661,554 was dated 12th April 2021. The MoFPED Circular date was 31st March 2021. (12 days)</p> <p>The LG did not submit warrants for schools Capitation Grants within 5 days.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>		

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Evidence was availed for review, which indicated that the LG invoiced and the DEO communicated capitation releases to schools within the stipulated timeframe as indicated by the following release letters by the CAO and disbursements:</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disbursement of 4th Quarter release of non-wage recurrent capitation grant of UGX 671,308,484/=; dated May 28, 2021. - Additional release of non-wage recurrent capitation grant for semi-candidates, maintenance and inspection of UGX 114,661,553/=; dated April 8, 2021. - Additional expenditure cash limit of UGX 323,827,311/= for non-wage recurrent education capitation grant for opening of candidate classes for 3rd term; dated Feb 2, 2021. - Transfer of UGX 272,597,090/= for non-wage recurrent capitation grant for safe reopening and operation of schools for beneficiaries; dated Oct 8, 2020. 	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>Inspection work plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School inspection schedules for Q1, 2020/21; Q2, 2020/21; Q3, 2020/21; and Q4, 2020/21 are available; indicating that the education department has a school inspection plan in place. <p>Minutes of meetings to prepare inspection plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Term III, 2020:Inspection/monitoring panning meeting, dated July 30, 2021; - Joint monitoring/inspection planning meeting; dated Oct 4, 2021. 	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>100% of schools were inspected and monitored in 2020; and 35 schools (30 primary and 5 secondary) representing 44.87% were inspected and monitored in 2021.</p> <p>Among others, the following school feedback reports from DES serve to confirm that the exercise was carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback report on Angorom PS; gated March 22, 2021; - Feedback report on Akisim-Kuju PS; dated March 22, 2021; - Report on Jehiel Christian PS; dated March 15, 2021; - Report on Abuket PS; dated March 1, 2021; and - Report on Kuju PS; dated March 10, 2021. 	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The following minutes of meetings were availed as evidence that inspection and monitoring reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective action and that the actions were followed up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Min 5/Educ/April/2021 of meeting held on April 7,2021; - Min 5/Educ/Oct/2020 of meeting held on Oct 12, 2020; and - Min 4/Educ/Oct/2020 of meeting held on Oct 12, 2020. 	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Inspection and monitoring feedback were given to schools and acknowledged by DES on the following dates, among others:- Oct 6, 2021; March 23, 2021; Dec 15, 2020; and Sept 15, 2020.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes of the District Council Meeting dated 17th August 2020; 2. Minutes of the District Council Meeting dated 23rd December 2020; 3. Minutes of the District Council Meeting dated 31st March 2021; 4. Minutes of the District Council Meeting dated 10th May 2021. 	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>Evidence was availed indicating that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school. Most of the mobilization was done during school AGMs, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Min 4/Educ/Oct/2020 on preparations for school reopening and observation of SOPs. This was done through 3 radio talk shows - Radio talk show held Aug 23, 2021 on Youth Radio, Amuria. 	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>An up-to-date school asset register (2020) is in place with clear information on school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There were no desk appraisals for the education sector projects availed at the time of assessment. The LG had however conducted desk appraisals for their DDEG funds projects. (None in Education).</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is evidence that the 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>The LG conducted a field appraisal and produced the Quarter 4 Monitoring Report on emptying of twenty two pit latrines in both primary and secondary schools in Amuria District (Environmental Compliance Report) dated 24th June 2021 CR/ADLG/167/1</p> <p>13 Schools were appraised.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The project assessed was a seed secondary school. However, Amuria District Local Government is not to receive funding for such intervention under current year and the score has been awarded as per guidance of the local government assessment manual 2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Documents reviewed avail evidence of contracts committee minute number: Min5/ADCC/12-1/20-21, page 5 of 10 and 7 of 10, (construction of a two classroom block in otubet PS, and construction of a 5 stance pit latrine in Kuju PS) and the contracts committee approval of evaluation reports was 7th Dec, 2020 for the previous FY.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence availed that showed an established Project Implementation Team (PIT) consisting of District Engineer and Project Manager (Mr. Eonya Julius Eloy), District Education Officer (Ms. Acom Kelen), District Health Officer in letters dated 23rd October, 2020.</p>	1
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 project assessed was a seed secondary school. However, Amuria District Local Government did not receive funding for such interventions and the score awarded has been as per guidance of the assessment manual, 2020.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The project assessed was a seed secondary school. However, Amuria District Local Government did not receive funding for such interventions and the score awarded has been as per guidance of the assessment manual, 2020.</p>	1
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>From documents reviewed, inspection, supervision report, attendance lists and minutes involving the participation of the district engineer, environment officer and DCDO were available including that of 11th/03/20 and 31st/05/2021.</p>	1

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*

There is evidence that the education sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as per the following sampled contracts:

Payment to Clabos (U) Ltd for construction of a 2 classroom block at Opam P/S for UGX 28,759,814 were certified by the DEO, Internal Auditor, Environment Officer and District Engineer on 12th March 2021. Request for payment from the contractor was dated 26th February 2021 to the CAO through the DEO and District Engineer. Payment voucher 35410629 was paid on 30th March 2021. Contract AMUM565/WRKS/2020-21/00015;

Payment to Frahah Amuria Enterprises Ltd for Construction of a two-classroom block at Otubet P/S for UGX 17,242,044 were certified by the DEO, Internal Auditor, Environment Officer and District Engineer on 19th February 2021. Request for payment from the contractor was dated 17th February 2021 to the CAO through the DEO and District Engineer. Payment voucher 34854309 was paid on 26th February 2021. Contract AMUN565/WRKS/2020-21/00016; and

Payment to Jefel Contractors for construction of a five stance pit latrine at Abia P/S for UGX 14,286,487 were certified by the DEO, Internal Auditor, Environment Officer and District Engineer on 26th May 2021. Request for payment from the contractor was 5th May 2021 to the CAO through the DEO and District Engineer. Payment voucher 37236559 was paid on 23rd June 2021. Contract AMUN565/WRKS/2020-21/00021.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence availed for Education department revealed that submission was made for incorporation by PDU into the approved LG annual work plan under LG PP form 1 dated 28th/04/2020 (construction of a classroom block at opam primary school and otubet primary school), originated by Acom Kelen (District Education officer) and approved by CAO, Mr. Opolot Francis, on 7th/08/2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>The project assessed was a seed secondary school. However, Amuria District Local Government did not receive funding for such interventions and the score awarded has been as per guidance of the assessment manual, 2020.</p>	1

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, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The local government education grievances framework has not been formalized to effectively enable the recording, investigating and responding to complaints/grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence from Aparisia, Abia and Otubet primary schools that the local government had disseminated the education guidelines to provide for access to land as captured in the "minute 4 09/03/2021 - dissemination of circular, guidelines for phased re-opening of schools under covid 19 standard operating procedures" in a meeting for the headmasters held at Amuria district headquarters on 9th March, 2021.</p>	3

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, *score: 2, else score: 0*

There was evidence that safeguard requirements within the education sector for the costed ESMP for the construction of 2 classroom block at Aparisia primary school prepared on 22nd December, 2021 were incorporated in LG departmental approved budget estimates and quarterly performance report FY 2020/2021 Item: 312101 No-Residential buildings (Building Construction - schools-256) page 139.

Safeguard requirements within the education sector for the costed ESMP for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Ogolai primary school prepared on 23rd December, 2020 were incorporated in LG departmental approved budget estimates and quarterly performance report FY 2020/2021 Item: 312101 No-Residential buildings (Building Construction - schools-256) page 130.

Safeguard requirements within the education sector the costed ESMP for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kuju primary school were incorporated in LG departmental approved budget estimates and quarterly performance report FY 2020/2021 Item: 312101 No-Residential buildings (Building Construction - Latrines - 257) page 126.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence availed to show proof of ownership. The land where school construction projects are implemented is administered under the religious ownership (Catholic, Muslim and or Church of Uganda) with no memorandum of understanding between the religious institutions and LG but thus local government only allowed to provide supervisory roles.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, *score: 2, else score:0*

There was evidence availed that showed that the environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs as below,

- a. Field report on the inspection and backstopping of contractors on social and environmental compliance prepared on 26th March, 2021
- b. Monitoring report on environmental and social compliance of district projects prepared on 28th February, 2021
- c. Monitoring report on field inspection of contractors on social and environmental compliance prepared on 28th April, 2021
- d. Environment compliance report for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kuju primary school prepared on 23rd March, 2021
- e. A monitoring report for field inspection on environmental compliance for constructed district infrastructure prepared on 30th May, 2021
- f. Environmental, social and health safe guards compliance report on emptying of twenty two pit latrines in both primary and secondary schools and other district infrastructure prepared on 30th June, 2021

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence to show that the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments as below,

Environment and Social certificate for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Aparisia primary school issued on 24th May, 2021

Environment and Social certificate for the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Temele primary school issued on 20th May, 2021

Environment and Social certificate for the construction a 5 stance pit latrine at Kuju primary school issued on 10th May, 2021

Environment and Social certificate for the construction of a 2 classroom block with office at Opams primary issued on 13th March, 2021

Health Performance Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score															
Local Government Service Delivery Results																			
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>Three Health facilities were sampled and their respective deliveries were as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>19/20</th> <th>20/21</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asamuk</td> <td>550</td> <td>567</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wera</td> <td>346</td> <td>627</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Abarilela</td> <td>673</td> <td>817</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>1,569</td> <td>2011</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>2,011 - 1,569 X100=28%</u></p> <p>1,569</p>		19/20	20/21	Asamuk	550	567	Wera	346	627	Abarilela	673	817	Total:	1,569	2011	2
	19/20	20/21																	
Asamuk	550	567																	
Wera	346	627																	
Abarilela	673	817																	
Total:	1,569	2011																	

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.

There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health sector development grant amounting to UGX 84,023,000 (Budget was UGX 81,171,000) for the year 2020/21 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines (Page 16 of the Annual Budget Performance Report). Some of the projects were:

1. CMEs conducted Minor renovations and repairs done (Page 65 Annual Performance Report)
2. Retention for upgrade of Alere HCII to HCIII construction works paid off (Page 69 Annual Performance Report)
3. Retention for the renovation works involving DVS paid off (Page 69 Annual Performance Report)
4. Retention for phase-1 construction of OPD block in Amuria Hospital paid off (Page 69 Annual Performance Report)

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the DHO, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers as follows:

1. Payment of UGX 32,763,526 to Bygon Enterprises Limited for Retention for construction of OPD at Amuria District Hospital. Request for payment dated 2nd March 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 11th March 2021. Paid on 12th April 2021

2. Payment of UGX 3,212,000 to Todi Investments for Retention for construction of theater at Amuria General Hospital. Request for payment dated 26th February 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 23rd March 2021. Paid on 13th April 2021

3. Payment of UGX 30,440,945 to CAB (U) Limited for Retention for Upgrade of Aler HCII to HCIII. Request for payment dated 21st June 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 21st June 2021. Paid on 29th June 2021.

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The contract for renovation of art clinic, opd and walkways in amuria hospital was awarded to agobi general enterprises Limited at Ugx. 7,332,520, while the cost estimate was Ugx. 7,860,000, giving a cost variation of 6.7% and</p> <p>The contract of emptying pit latrines in Amuria hospital and schools was awarded to tiger international ltd at Ugx. 15,300,000 while the cost estimate was Ugx. 15,300,000, giving a cost variation of 0%. The assessor observed that the cost variations fall within the eligible range of +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The project assessed was an upgrade of Health Centre II to Health Centre III. However, Amuria District Local Government did not receive funding for such interventions and the score awarded has been as per guidance of the assessment manual, 2020.</p>	2
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>Up dated Staff lists from 3 sampled health facilities showed that the positions filled was as shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asamuk HCIII 15/19 2 Abarilela HCIII, 15/19 3. Wera HCIII, 16/19 <p>On average from the above ratios, the positions filled was 80.6% of the total established positions.</p>	1

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> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The project under assessment was an upgrade from HC II to HC III. However, Amuria district Local Government did not receive funds for this intervention. The score was awarded as per the guide in the local government performance assessment manual 2020, page 43.</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>There were staff lists at both the DHOs Office and at the Health facilities and all the Health facilities sampled had arrival books and duty rosters that were used to confirm that the staff who were deployed were at their respective duty stations. Below were the health facilities sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asamuk HCIII 2. Abarilela HCIII 3. Wera HCIII 	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no constructions or renovations done during the previous FY (2020/2021).</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was only one copy of an Annual work plan available at the time of the assessment. Wera HCIII was the only health facility that submitted its annual work plan and was submitted late, on 29/6/2021.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There were no Annual Budget Performance Reports available at the DHOs Office as well as at the 3 sampled health facilities.</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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The Performance improvement plans were the RBF Performance Improvement Plans for FY 2021/2-22 and did not incorporate performance issues raised in the DHMT monitoring and assessment reports.</p> <p>There were no PHC Performance Improvement Plans.</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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The Health facilities submitted all their Monthly and quarterly reports online through the DHIS 2 system and the system did not record dates when reports were submitted but was set in such a way that it shows whether reports were received on time or not. The sampled reports for 3 monthly and 3 quarterly reports for the above sampled Health Facilities were all submitted on time as reflected in the system.</p>	2
<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 Performance implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>All the 3 sampled Health facilities submitted the RBF invoices on time as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Wera HCIII submitted on 6/7/2021 2. Aberlela HCIII submitted on 5/7/2021 3. Asamuk HCIII submitted on 6/7/2/2021 	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>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 evidence of acknowledgement of receipt of RBF invoices by MoH.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the LG did not comply with submitting all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports in time as follows:</p> <p>Q1 – 2nd November 2020 - Late Submission</p> <p>Q2 – 26th February 2021 - Late Submission</p> <p>Q3 – 30th June 2021- Late Submission</p> <p>Q4 – 3rd September 2021 - Submitted late after August 31st.</p> <p>All the quarterly reports were submitted late.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no Performance improvement plans for the poorest performing health facilities</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no Performance improvement reports and implementation reports for the lowest performing Health Facilities</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a performance contract in place VOTE 565, and a communication from the DHO to the CAO, requesting for recruitment of health workers.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The staffing and the percentage of positions occupied were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abarilela HCIII, 15 out of 19 - 79% 2. Wera HCIII, 16 out of 19 - 84% 3. Asamuk HCIII, 15 out of 19 - 79% <p>The average of the positions occupied from the sampled facilities above is 80.6%</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The 3 sampled Health facilities had staff lists displayed on the notice boards, reviewed arrival books and duty rosters to confirm availability of health workers at their respective duty stations. And they were at their stations except for those were on study leave, one approved study leave was sampled, dated 26/6/2020.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 lists of health workers deployed in their respective health facilities were displayed on the notice boards of the 3 sampled health facilities.</p>	2

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

From the sample Health personnel files there was evidence of appraisals of In-Charges having been conducted. For a number of them however there was no evidence of appraisals having been conducted. Below are the files reviewed:

- Kanana Doris – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Alere HCIII. Appraisal completed on 13th September 2021
- Alechu William – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Akereau HCIII. Appraisal completed 26th July 2021
- Olemo Peter – Enrolled Nurse and In-Charge Agonga HCII. Appraisal completed 16th June 2021
- Apio Martin – Clinical Officer and In-Charge Aberilela HCIII. Appraisal not on file.
- Echeru Stephens – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal not on file.
- Nansubuga Dorothy – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Orungo HCIII. Appraisal not on file.
- Olele Alex – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Morungatuny HCIII. Appraisal not on file.
- Okolong Silver – Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge Amusus HCIII. Appraisal not on file.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

From the sample Health personnel files there was evidence of appraisals of Health facility workers having been conducted. Below are the files reviewed:

- Aibo Mary – Enrolled Nurse, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 1st July 2021
- Illakut Joseph – Enrolled Nurse, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 30th June 2021
- Ariokot Rebeccah – Enrolled Nurse, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 6th July 2021
- Omagoro Pius – Enrolled Nurse, Wera HCIII. Appraisal completed on 20th June 2021
- Ekoko Sam – Laboratory Assistant, Orugo HCIII. Appraisal completed on 25th June 2021
- Titin Genevieve – Enrolled Midwife, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 1st July 2021
- Okello Deogratius – Enrolled Nurse, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 01st July 2021
- Amulo Catherine – Enrolled Midwife, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed on 23rd June 2021
- Amiti Catherine Helen – Enrolled Midwife, Akaneau HCIII. Appraisal completed on 20th July 2021
- Outa Robert – Lab Technician, Asamuk HCIII. Appraisal completed 01st July 2021
- Anyaso Christine – Nursing Assistant, Akaneau HCIII. Appraisal completed on 7th July 2021

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that corrective action was taken based on appraisal reports.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no training data base at the DHOs Office, but the 3 health facilities sampled, that is, Wera HCIII, Asamuk HCIII and Abarilela HCIII, had training reports filed at their respective Health facilities, they just did not share with the DHOs by the time of the assessment/</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>DHOs Office did not have a data base for training reports.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a letter and a list of health facilities receiving PHC NWR attached, dated 18/10/2021, sent to MoH, confirming that the list of Health facilities attached were receiving PHC NWR grants.</p> <p>It was submitted late..</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There is evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health Services in line with Health Sector Guidelines.</p> <p>Out of the total Primary Health Care Sector Conditional Grant Non-Wage of UGX 282,084,002 as per the Budget, the District healthcare management services totaled UGX 42,312,600 which makes up 15%.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the LG warrant/ verification for the previous FY releases for PHC NWR grant to facilities was done on:</p> <p>Quarter 1 PHC Non-Wage Grants warranty was dated 3rd August 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 9th July 2020 (25 days)</p> <p>Quarter 2 PHC Non-Wage Grants warranty was dated 17th October 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 6th October 2021. (11 days)</p> <p>Quarter 3 PHC Non-Wage Grants warranty was dated 22nd January 2020. The MoFPED Circular date was 8th January 2021. (14 days)</p> <p>Quarter 4 PHC Non-Wage Grants warranty was dated 12th April 2021. The MoFPED Circular date was 31st March 2021. (12 days)</p> <p>The LG did not submit warrants for PHC Non-Wage Grants within 5 days.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The CAO issued quarterly Declaration of Releases of all funds (including Health funds) to the LLGs copied to the RDC, DEC Members, District Speaker, District Councilors, District Internal Security Officers, all HODs, Sub-county Chairpersons, Town Clerk, Senior Assistants to the CAO, Health Facilities and Notice Boards. The quarterly correspondence was as follows:

Quarter 4 Releases communication was dated 8th April 2021 for UGX 3,943,252,516. Funds release circular date was 31st March 2021 (8 days);

Quarter 3 Releases communication was dated 8th January 2021 for UGX 4,976,528,987. Funds release circular date was 8th January 2021 (1 day);

Quarter 2 Releases communication was dated 15th October 2020 for UGX 5,541,775,018. Funds release circular date was 6th October 2020 (9 days); and

Quarter 1 Releases communication was dated 15th July 2020 for UGX 5,200,353,793. Funds release circular date was 9th July 2020 (6 days).

The LG did not invoice and communicate all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter,

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>LG did not publicize Health facilities receiving NWR grants on the notice boards.</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 were support supervision reports present at Amuria Health Center IV, sampled 2 of them dated 21/3/2021 and 30/6/2021, but none of them reported on implementation of actions that arose in the quarterly review meetings.</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>Quarterly review meetings took place and there were attendance lists attached for review meetings dated 26/2/2021 and 10/5/2021.</p>	1
	<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 PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were quarterly support supervision reports available dated; 30/6/2021 and 21/3/2021.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were support supervision reports at the HSD, the sampled reports were dated 30/6/2021 and 21/3/2021 but they were not shared with the DHOs Office and there was no documented feedback from LG health department to HSD.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were support supervision reports present at the DHOs Office with clear recommendations but there was no documented evidence that implementation of the actions recommended by the DHMT took place.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was guidance given to Health facility in charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies. These were found in super model monthly facility assessment activity reports dated 30/6/2021 and 31/7/2021</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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>There is evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of District Health Office budget specifically to health promotion and prevention activities. Of the UGX 42,312,600 District Health Office budget, UGX 4,000,000 was allocated to Advertising and public relations, and UGX 21,632,000 was allocated to Travel Inland for health promotional activities. This makes up 61% of the budget.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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>There were Quarterly Health Promotion Activity reports on Radio talk shows on HIV dated 16/12/2020, another radio talk show on Sexually Transmitted Infections in a report dated 11/2/2021 and social mobilization on COVID-19 reported on 18/12/2020. All the radio talk shows were on Youth Radio FM.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that there were follow up actions on Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization aspects.</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>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an asset register which set out Health Facility and equipment and other assets varied according to the level of the facility.</p> <p>The information in the register was broken down as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buildings 2. Furniture 3. ICT Equipment 4. Land 5. Medical Equipment 6. Transport 7. Office Equipment 	1
----	--	--	--	---

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);

(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

There was evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines (Page 16 of the Annual Budget Performance Report). Some of the projects were:

1. CMEs conducted Minor renovations and repairs done (Page 65 Annual Performance Report)
2. Retention for upgrade of Alere HCII to HCIII construction works paid off (Page 69 Annual Performance Report)
3. Retention for the renovation works involving DVS paid off (Page 65 Annual Performance Report)
4. Retention for phase-1 construction of OPD block in Amuria Hospital paid off (Page 65 Annual Performance Report)

However, there were no desk appraisals availed at the time of assessment.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

No field appraisals were availed for the health investments at the time of assessment.

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction. For example the environmental and Social compliance certificates for the construction of an OPD block at Amuria hospital were dated 17th June, 2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Evidence availed by the LG Health department showed that the department submitted infrastructure request (construction of maternity ward at Abarilela Health centre III) to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG work plan and procurement plans using LG PP form dated 14th/07/2021, which was later than 30th/04/2021.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed showed that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form to PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY for the construction of maternity ward at Abarilela Health centre III at Ugx. 145,495,770 using LG PP form dated 14th/07/2021.</p>	1

13	1	<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>Evidence availed showed that the contracts committee approved health infrastructure investments under minute: Min4/ADCC/9-220-21 Approval of evaluation reports (a) Open bidding projects item 3 construction of maternity ward at abarilela Health centre III at Ugx. 145,495,770</p> <p>Evaluation report was availed and it was dated 6th/09/2021.</p> <p>However, solicitor General approval was not sought as the contract amount (Ugx. 145,495,770) was less than PPDA thresholds.</p>
13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence availed that showed an established Project Implementation Team (PIT) consisting of District Engineer and Project Manager (Mr. Eonya Julius Eلول), District Education Officer (Ms. Acom Kelen), District Health Officer (Dr. Odeke Francis), Natural Resource Officer (Mr. Opio Sam), and District Community Development Officer (Mr. Okalebo Echodu Samuel) in letters dated 23rd October, 2020.</p>

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

From field inspection conducted on 12th/11/2021, it revealed the following:

4mm clear glass (280mm*440mm, each) has been fixed on the window casements of the Amuria general ward as per the specifications

All damaged casement window fasteners and stays to The ART clinic had been replaced

4 flood lights that measured 220mm*180mm have been fixed at entrances of the wards to provide lighting, of commercial name 100W, IP67, Mimi.

At the main gate, plain concrete cast of 8000mm long * 6800mm wide has been laid to appropriate gradients on either side of the gate.

Functional water extension pipe network was done to a draw-off tap point using 3/4" pipe.

The assessor noted that the above observations for the contract executed at Amuria general hospital were as per the technical designs.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

The project assessed was an upgrade from Health centre II to Health centre III. Weekly reports could not be consolidated from daily site reports since Amuria district local government did not receive funds for this intervention during the year under review and therefore the score was awarded as per the guidance of the local government assessment manual, 2020.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The project assessed was an upgrade from Health centre II to Health centre III. Weekly reports could not be consolidated from daily site reports since Amuria district local government did not receive funds for this intervention during the year under review and therefore the score was awarded as per the guidance of the local government assessment manual, 2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The project assessed was an upgrade from Health centre II to Health centre III. Weekly reports could not be consolidated from daily site reports since Amuria district local government did not receive funds for this intervention during the year under review and therefore the score was awarded as per the guidance of the local government assessment manual, 2020.</p>	1

13	0	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The sample of 3 contracts to review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time, were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment of UGX 32,763,526 to Bygon Enterprises Limited for Retention for construction of OPD at Amuria District Hospital. Request for payment dated 2nd March 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 11th March 2021. (Certified within 9 days after Letter of Request) 2. Payment of UGX 3,212,000 to Todi Investments for Retention for construction of Theatre at Amuria General Hospital. Request for payment dated 26th February 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 23rd March 2021. (Certified within 25 days after Letter of Request) 3. Payment of UGX 30,440,945 to CAB (U) Limited for Retention for Upgrade of Aler HCII to HCIII. Request for payment dated 21st June 2021. Certified by the District Engineer, DHO, DCDO, and Environment officer on 21st June 2021. (Certified within 1 day after Letter of Request) <p>2 of the sampled payments were certified on time, and one was certified after 25 days.</p>
13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Contracts committee approval of health infrastructure investments was under minute: Min7/ADCC/3-1/20-21: /2/3/20-21/DCC for renovation of ART Clinic, OPD and walk ways in Amuria hospital procurement reference: AMUN596/WRKS/2020-2021/000033</p>

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The local government has not established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the local government had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management to health facilities.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence availed shows that the local government has a registered service provider (green labels limited) that was contracted by the ministry of health to collect, store, transport, dispose/treatment of health care waste. There are also incinerators for burning non decompose-able medical waste and coded waste bins for all assortment of medical waste.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no records on training and awareness raising on health care waste management</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	No evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY:	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	Amuria district local government Certificate of Title Freehold Register, volume HQT1247 FOLIO 11 situate at Block(Road) 1 Plot 86 and 87 at Okutoi, REGD, 12/06/2017 INST. 00030758	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.	The LG Environment Officer and CDO carried out support supervision and monitoring of the construction of OPD block at Amuria hospital on 14th August, 2020 since this was the only health project implemented in the FY 2020/2021	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO for health infrastructure projects for the construction of OPD block at Amuria hospital on 17th June, 2020

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>Information from the Ministry MIS gives the functionality of WSS facilities as 93% for FY 2020/21</p>	2
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>Information from the Ministry MIS gives the functionality of WSCs as 85% for FY 2020/21.</p>	1
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>The LLG assessment has not started therefore this indicator is not applicable.</p>	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>The rural water coverage for Amuria is 74% as per the MWE MIS. The following sub counties are below average: Akeriau sub county (54%), Orungo subcounty (59%), Wera subcounty (67%) and Willa subcounty (66%).</p> <p>The following 7 projects out of the 27 projects were implemented in the sub counties with below average water coverage: Akeriau (3), Wera(2), Orungo (3), and Willa(0).</p> <p>Twenty six percent of the projects were implemented in sub counties with water coverage below average.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>The contract for siting, drilling and construction of deep boreholes lot 1 was awarded at Ugx. 240,847,199 while cost estimate for the LG Engineer was 240,847,199, giving cost variation of 0%. For siting, drilling and construction of deep boreholes lot 2 was awarded at Ugx. 287,897,580 while cost estimate for the LG Engineer was 287,897,580, giving cost variation of 0%. The observed cost variation was within +/-20% score range.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>The LG Approved Budget FY 2020/21 planned for 27 borehole drilling projects (page 44-46).</p> <p>The local government quarterly performance report-Quarter 4 FY 2020/21 gives the completed number of boreholes as 26. Which is 96% of the planned projects.</p>	1

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, the WSS facilities functionality was provided as 93% for both FY 2020/2021 and FY 2019/2020. There was no increase in the WSS functionality.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, the WSCs functionality was given as 83 % for FY 2020/2021 and 70% for FY 2019/2020. There was an increase in the WSCs functionality of 13%.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The local government quarterly performance report-Quarter 4 gives the completed number of boreholes as 26. The following villages had planned boreholes: Okokorio, Napak, Awojakwap-Asigei, Aakum, Apuuton, Alira-Aligoi, Aperiocuc, Morupus Maara, Owaya, Agule, Okekai-Atwar Ijaka, Ocor-Omekenyin, Arubela-Angopet, Apodoi-Amaa, Atapar, Orungo, Okude, Ateuso-Obuga, Otatai, Aboke-Aboke, Obangin-obangin, Ongaroi-Odomai, Apuuton-Ojareta, Oriebu, Ocakai-Aitaku, and Alira-Aligoi.

The hydrological survey report titled "Hydrological survey report for 14 deep well site investigations in Orungo S/C, Morungatuny S/C, Wera S/C, and Abarilera S/C in Amuria District" prepared by Mama Borehole Africa Ltd indicates the following villages: Angoro, Abutaka, Olijai in Abia sub county; Olekai, Aperoicuc, Ojibai, Amieli in Asamuk sub county; Aoja-kwap, Abuloit-Akure, Ooloi in Kuju sub county; Dokoro in Wera sub county; Oyamai in Ogongora sub county, Omoratok in Olwa sub county and Oodoi in Amuria TC. These villages are different from the villages mentioned in the budget.

The sampled boreholes that were completed in FY 2020/21 were in the following villages: Asingei in Kuju sub county, Golokwara borehole DWD 64717 in Apeduru sub county, and Ojibai village borehole DWD No. 73578 in Asama subcounty. The villages where the boreholes were drilled are different from the villages where they were planned in the FY 2020/21.

Therefore, information is not accurately reported.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The following WSS quarterly reports were provided: (i) Quarter One Water and environment report for Amuria District for FY 2020/2021 dated 2/7/2021; (ii) Quarter two Water and Environment report for Amuria District for FY 2020/2021 dated 4/01/2021; (iii) Quarter three Water and Environment report for Amuria District for FY 2020/2021 dated 2/4/2020 and stamped by CAO on 2/4/2020 and permanent secretary on 18/4/2020; (iv) Quarter for Water and Environment report for Amuria District dated 2/7/2021.</p> <p>The reports did not contain information on functionality of facilities and WSCs, and safe water collection and storage hygiene.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the MIS was updated quarterly as information from the FY2020/2021 could not be seen on the MIS.</p>	0

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>This criterion is applicable where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In this case there is no previous assessment.</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>DWO budgeted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Civil Engineer(Water) – position is currently held by Eng. Obaate Phillip; <p>The positions below were not budgeted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Assistant Water Officers; and • 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician. 	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The department budget for critical staff was found as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Environment Officer – position is vacant • 1 Forestry Officer – position currently held by Ogwal Moses. <p>The position of Natural Resources Officer was not budgeted for.</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>Civil Engineer (Water), Mr. Obaate Phillip had no appraisal on file.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The Capacity Needs Assessment reports, training database and training reports for the DW office staff were not availed.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The LG Approved Workplan FY 2021/2022 generated on 02/07/2021 page 126 indicates that 11 boreholes will be constructed in Ajesa and Apaasi (Ogongora SC), Orwadai (Orungo SC), Omaratok (Orungo TC), Ojama and Bishop Odongo Kosea Odongo (Ogolai SC), Ominate (Kuju SC), Ojesai and Opauiyeng (Abia SC), Apeduru Irrigation scheme (Apeduru SC) and Onino (Wera TC).

The rural water coverage for Amuria is 74% as per the MWE MIS. The following sub counties are below average: Akeriau sub county (54%), Orungo subcounty (59%), Wera subcounty (67%) and Willa subcounty (66%).

Three out of the eleven new borehole projects, Orungo (2) and Wera (1), are in the sub counties below average water coverage. The cost of each borehole is not presented but it is assumed to be constant for each borehole by looking at the budget for the FY 2020/2021. Therefore, twenty seven percent of the projects' budget was provided for sub counties below average.

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

The Local government quarterly performance report for FY 2020/21- Quarter 4, page 90, under output 098104 -Promotion of community based management shows that there was no advocacy conducted in FY 2020/21.

There was no information about LLG allocations per source on the notice boards.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p>	<p>The complete list of water and sanitation projects in the LG was not availed.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>Monitoring plans and reports for the previous FY were not availed.</p> <p>There was no evidence to show that the WSS facilities were monitored at least quarterly.</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>The Local government Quarterly performance report FY 2020/21– Quarter 4 page 88 , “Output 098102 supervision, monitoring and coordination “ indicates that the cumulative number of DWSCC meetings held in the FY 2020/21 is one. Therefore, DWSCC meetings were not held quarterly.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that allocations for the FY 2021/2022 to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average had been displayed on notice boards or websites.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>Local Government quarterly performance report for FY 2020/21 gives the non-wage bill as seventy million and thirty eight thousand shillings for water (page 93). The budget for mobilization activities as follows: supervision, monitoring and coordination was allocated ten million shillings, and promotion of community-based management was allocated five million eight hundred thousand Uganda shillings. This totalled to fifteen million eight hundred thousand Uganda shillings.</p> <p>Twenty three percent of the non-wage bill was allocated to facilitate community mobilization activities.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The Local government Quarterly performance report Quarter 4, FY 2020/21, Output 098104: Promotion of community-based management on page 90 reports that 27 WSCs were established but no WSC was trained under the district water grant.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

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 Asset register was not availed.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP/III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>No desk appraisals were availed for the WSS projects at the time of assessment.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The LG Approved Workplan page 126 indicates that 11 boreholes will be constructed in Ajesa and Apaasi (Ogongora SC), Orwadai (Orungo SC), Omaratok (Orungo TC), Ojama and Bishop Odongo Kosea Odongo (Ogolai SC), Ominate (Kuju SC), Ojesai and Opaiyeng (Abia SC), Apeduru Irrigation scheme (Apeduru SC) and Onino (Wera TC).</p> <p>Community application files for any of the above-mentioned projects were not availed.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>No field appraisals were availed for the WSS investments at the time of assessment.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>There was no evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY 2021/2022 were screened for environmental and social risks because no projects have been approved for construction.</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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the final approved district procurement plan under item S/No. 2 (drilling of deep boreholes) at Ugx. 560,404,000 in a plan dated 3rd/09/2020, prepared by Akol Ann, Procurement Officer and approved by Mr. Opolot Francis, CAO and received by MoFPED on the 7th/ 09/2020.</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 Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the contracts committee on 6th/10/2020 approved the contract for construction of deep boreholes lot 1 and lot 2 (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00013 at Ugx. 240,847,199 and for construction of deep boreholes lot 2, (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00012 at Ugx. 287,897,580; approved by solicitor general on 3rd/11/2020.</p> <p>The contracts committee minute number for lot 1 and 2 for the contract of siting and drilling of deep boreholes: Min6/ADCC/10-1/20-21.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to show that the LG had properly established Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	<p>.</p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>The boreholes in the following villages were sampled: Borehole DWD No. 73581 in Asingei village, Kuju sub county; Borehole DWD No.64717 in Golokwara village, Apeduru sub county; and Borehole DWD No. 73578 in Ojibai village, Asamo Sub county.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	<p>The sampled projects were constructed as per standard designs in the “Manual for borehole drilling and supervision” published by the Ministry of Water and Environment, dated January 2019.</p>			
	<p>.</p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water office prepared a contract management plan.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
	<p>Evidence of involvement of the PIT was not availed to the assessor. However, the DWO prepared a supervision report dated 16th June, 2021. The conclusion of the assessor is that the requirements of the indicator were not fully met.</p>			
	<p>.</p>			

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

There is evidence that the DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors with specified time frames in the contracts. Contract AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00013 for UGX 287,897,580. For the sampled contract, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames in the contracts.

Payment of UGX 245,932,848 to Mama Bore Wells Africa Ltd for sitting drilling and construction of 14 deep boreholes Lot 2. The request for payment was dated 10th May 2021. The payment was certified by the DWO, District Auditor, DCDO, Health Officer and Environment officer on 16th June 2021. Paid on 29th June 2021 Receipt no 010.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The procurement file was availed for review which included the following documents for the two contracts procured in the year under review:</p> <p>1) Minutes of approved evaluation committee report dated 5th/10/2020 signed by: Okim Moses Bunsen (Chairperson), Erumu Simon Peter (Member), Apio Rebecca (Secretary), Obaate Phillip (Member), Akol Ann (Member, Julius Eonya (Member) and Opesa Samuel (Member)</p> <p>2) Agreements for borehole siting and drilling were signed on the 3rd/11/2020, under procurement reference number: (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00012 and (AMUN565/WRKS/2020-2021/00013</p> <p>3) The Contracts committee minute number for approval of lot 1 and 2 for siting and drilling of deep boreholes was Min6/ADCC/10-1/20-21.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The local government does not have an established mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The DWO and the Environment Officer have not disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs</p>	0

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects were not prepared and implemented.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	<p>There was evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent that is,</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Acia community borehole prepared on 1st April 2021</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Tukum community borehole prepared on 10 December, 2020</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Akure borehole prepared on 25th July, 2021</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Aparisa borehole prepared on 22nd July, 2021</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Oburaaka bore prepared on 5th August, 2021</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Olijai borehole prepared on 5th August, 2021</p> <p>Agreement for offer of a piece of land to drill Obongo B borehole prepared on 6th July, 2021</p>	3
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	There were no environment and social certification forms availed for the WSS investments at the time of assessment.	0

15

0

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

d. Evidence that the CDO and
environment Officers
undertakes monitoring to
ascertain compliance with
ESMPs; and provide monthly
reports:

There was no evidence that the
CDO and environment Officers
undertook monitoring to ascertain
compliance with ESMPs; and
provide monthly reports:

Score 2, If not score 0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

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

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 		

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6			

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 4			

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

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	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	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 4				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 4				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.</p>	0
Maximum score 4				

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 10			

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 10			

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

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

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 to Amuria District Local Government.	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 8			
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
	Maximum score 8			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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.	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

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

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	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 agrochemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Amuria District Local Government.	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	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 to Amuria District Local Government.	0

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The indicator is not applicable to Amuria district</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The indicator is not applicable to Amuria district</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	There is a substantive Civil Engineer (Water), Mr. Obaate Phillip, however there was no record on file regarding his appointment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Position of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization is vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Position of Borehole Maintenance Technician is vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Natural Resources Officer position is vacant.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Environment Officer position is vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Forestry Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Ogwal Moses, was appointed on 09th May 2019 under minute 30/ADSC/2019	10

Environment and Social Requirements

6 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.

10
• All the six civil works projects in the water sector that were implemented in the previous financial year as listed below were screened for Environmental, Social and Climate Change.

a. the drilling of Obingio borehole where screening was conducted on 27th May, 2021

b. the drilling of borehole at Alokodum village where screening was conducted on 28th May 2020 and ESMP prepared on 25/3/2020

c. the drilling of borehole at Acia-Alioka where screening was conducted on 28th March, 2020 and ESMP prepared on 26th March, 2020

d. the drilling of Apericuc borehole where screening was conducted on 27th March, 2021

e. the drilling of borehole at Acomai village where screening was conducted on 28th February, 2020 and ESMP prepared on 28th March, 2020

f. the drilling of borehole for Akure and ESMP prepared on 25th April, 2020

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.	All water projects for the previous financial year did not qualify for full environment and social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The district local government did not get abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM.	0

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>District Health Officer position is not substantively filled. Dr. Okwii was assigned the roles of District Health Officer by CAO in a letter dated 01st July 2021. His substantive position is Senior Medical Officer.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing is vacant</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health is vacant</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>District Education Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Opolot Godfrey, was appointed on 1st March 2021 under minute 7/ADSC/March/2021 (vii) (e)</p>	10

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator is vacant</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Position of Biostatistician is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Eyattu Jude, was appointed on 05th June 2012 under minute 174/2012 (c)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>District Cold Chain Technician is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Esemu David, was appointed on 12th December 2007 under minute 37/2007</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

1 New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

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

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

No evidence was availed to show if the local government had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening of civil works for all Health sector projects because they were not planned for.

Maximum score is 30

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

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

There were no environment and social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) undertaken because no projects in the health sector had been approved.

Maximum score is 30

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	District Education Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Ms. Acom Helen, was appointed on 27th May 2008, minute 71/2008	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Position of Senior Inspector of Schools and Inspector of Schools are substantively filled. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Inspector of Schools - Mr. Okilla Paul, was appointed on 19th September 2019 under minute No. 9/ADSC/2019/34 • Inspector of Schools – Mr. Erumu Simon Peter, was appointed on 9th May 2019 under minute No. 38/ADSC/2019 	40
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				

Environment and Social Requirements

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

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence that the local government carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education projects for the previous FY as indicated below;

The Maximum score is 30

(i). Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Otubet primary school prepared on 15th October, 2020 and ESMP prepared on 7th January, 2021

(ii). Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a classroom block with office at Ogolai primary school prepared on 16th October, 2020 and ESMP prepared on 23 December, 2020

(iii). Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opams prepared on 2nd February, 2021 and ESMP 3rd March, 2021

(iv). Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Aparisia primary school prepared on 16th October, 2020 and ESMP 22nd December, 2021

(v). Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Abia primary school prepared on 30th February, 2021 and ESMP 8th March, 2021

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

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

The local government has not carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they did not comply for full ESIAs assessment after the screening stage.

The Maximum score is 30

Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Chief Finance Officer position is not substantively filled. Mr. Okwii Patrick was assigned the roles of Chief Finance Officer by CAO in a letter dated 01st July 2021. His substantive position is Senior Finance Officer	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	District Planner position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Akileem Emmanuel, was appointed on 27th May 2008, minute 71/2008(21)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	District Engineer position is not substantively filled. Mr. Eonya Julius Elalu was assigned the roles of District Engineer by CAO in a letter dated 01st July 2021. His substantive position is Senior Assistant Engineering Officer	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	District Natural Resources Officer position is not substantively filled. Mr. Ekosile Deogratus was assigned the roles of District Natural Resources Officer by CAO in a letter dated 01st July 2021. His substantive position is Senior Environment Officer.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	District Production Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Cheli Peter, was appointed on 19th September 2019, minute 59/ADSC/2019/30	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	District Community Development Officer position is not substantively filled. Ms. Akello Rhoda was assigned the roles of District Community Development Officer by CAO in a letter dated 24th November 2020. Her substantive position is Senior Community Development Officer.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	District Commercial Officer position is not substantively filled. Mr. Okode Francis was assigned the roles of District Commercial Officer by CAO in a letter dated 01st July 2021. Her substantive position is Senior Commercial Officer.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Senior Procurement Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Ms. Akol Anne, was appointed on 06th January 2018, minute No. 5/ADSC/June/2020	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Procurement Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Igelat Raphael, was appointed on 01st June 2018, minute No. DSC/AMUR/05/05/2018	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Ejupu Martin Opaga, was appointed on 24th July 2018, minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Environment Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Ekosile Deogratus, was appointed on 19th September 2019, minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/23.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Land Management Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Acanit Etanu Betty, was appointed on 10th September 2009, minute No. 116/2009</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Accountant position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Alungat Petua, was appointed on 19th September 2019, minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/ 1 (II)</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Internal Auditor position is substantively filled. The position holder, Mr. Osuku Julius, was appointed on 24th September 2018, minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (10 (1))</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer position is substantively filled. The position holder, Ms. Onanyang Martha, was appointed on 24th July 2018, minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (i) (ii)</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Originally Amuria had nine (9) Sub Counties and two (2) Town Councils. These were increased by four (4) Sub Counties and three (3) Town Councils. Of the 11 LLGs, not all Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS) positions are filled. Below are the substantive Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apeduru Sub county – Eumu David Michael – Mr. Eumu was appointed SAS on 24th July 2018 under minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (2) (iv) • Morungatuny Sub county – Akello Stella – Ms. Akello was appointed SAS on 24th July 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/05/2018 a (2) (iv) • Asamuk Sub county – Atiang Winnfred. Ms. Atiang was appointed SAS on 24th July 2018 under minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018. • Wera Sub county – Asello Okello Jessica – Ms. Asello was appointed SAS on 27th September 2008 under minute No. 71/2008 (13) • Willa Sub county – Abuto Sarah. Ms. Abuto was appointed SAS on 27th May 2008 under minute No. 71/2008/ (13) • Kuju Sub county – Opio Joseph. Mr. Opio was 	0

appointed SAS on 27th May 2008 under minute No. 71/2008 (13)

- Akeriau Sub county – Asekenye Martha. Ms. Asekenye was appointed SAS on 24th July 2018 under minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (12) (i)

- Ogolai Sub county – Akurut Martha. Ms. Akurut was appointed SAS on 24th July 2018 under minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (2) (iii)

- Amuria Town Council – Onyait Ochan Silver. Ms. Onyait was appointed Town Clerk on 19th September 2019 under minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/29 (a)

- Olwa, Abia, Amolo, Ogogora Sub counties and Asamuk, Wera, and Orungo Town councils do not have substantive SAS and Town Clerks respectively.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Originally Amuria had nine (9) Sub Counties and two (2) Town Councils. These were increased by four (4) Sub Counties and three (3) Town Councils. Of the 11 LLGs, not all Community Development Officer (CDO) positions are filled. Below are the substantive CDOs:

- Willa Sub county – Epechu Martin. Mr. Epechu was appointed CDO on 26th June 2020 under DSC minute No. 5/ADSC/2020

- Morungatuny Sub county – Okanyo Bernard Mr. Okanyo was appointed CDO on 24th July 2018 under minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018

0

- Wera Sub county – Oonyu Gilbert. Mr. Oonyu was appointed CDO on 27th July 2018 under DSC minute No. 137/2010
- Apeduru Sub county – Amuge Evelyn. Ms. Amuge was appointed CDO on 20th March 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/AMUR/04022018 (i) (c)
- Orungo Sub county – Olungura Agalo Agnes. Ms. Olungura was appointed CDO on 24th July 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/02/2018 a (17) (ii)
- Ongolai Sub county – Amuge Elizabeth. Ms. Amuge was appointed CDO on 26th June 2020 under DSC minute No. 5/ADSC/June/2020 (i)
- Kuju Sub county – Akol Jane Frances. Ms. Akol was appointed CDO on 24th July 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018 a (17) (iv)
- Abarilela Sub county – Akol Felix. Mr. Akol was appointed CDO on 24th July 2018 under DSC minute No. DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018.

Olwa, Abia, Amolo, Ogogora Sub counties and Asamuk, Wera, and Orungo Town councils do not have substantive CDOs.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Originally Amuria had nine (9) Sub Counties and two (2) Town Councils. These were increased by four (4) Sub Counties and three (3) Town Councils. Of the 11 LLGs, not all Senior Accounts Assistant/Accounts Assistant positions are filled. Below are the substantive Senior

0

Accounts Assistants:

- Ogolai Sub county – Ocan Emmanuel. Mr. Ocan was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/36 (36).
- Asamuk Sub county – Ekisu Moses. Mr. Ekisu was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/36 (a).
- Wera Sub county – Ouni Morish. Mr. Morish was appointed Sen. Accounts Assistant 19th September 2019 under DSC minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/36 (e).
- Kuju Sub county – Okello Paul. Mr. Okello was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/36 (g).
- Apeduru Sub county – Apio Marion. Ms. Apio was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute No. 59/ADSC/2019/36 (L).
- Akeriau Sub county – Isamat Simon Peter. Mr. Isamat was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute 59/ADSC/2019/36 (d).
- Amuria Town Council – Akede Bena. Ms. Akede was appointed Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute 59/ADSC/2019/36 (b).
- Morungatuny Sub county – Amoding Rose. Ms. Amoding was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute 59/ADSC/2019/35 (h).
- Willa Sub county – Okwii

Moses Ilukor. Mr. Okwii was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute 59/ADSC/2019/35 (b).

- Abarilela Sub county – Yachesikor Rose Mary. Ms. Yachesikor was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant on 19th September 2019 under DSC minute 59/ADSC/2019/35 (e).

- Orungo Sub county – Byansi Ben. Mr. Byansi was appointed Senior Accounts Assistant on 24th July 2018 under DSC minute DSC/AMUR/04/06/2018/22 (vii).

- The new Sub counties of Olwa, Abia, Amolo, Ogogora and Town councils Asamuk, Wera, and Orungo do not have substantive CDOs.

Environment and Social Requirements

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department,
score 2 or else 0

The evidence indicates that the LG budgeted UGX 303,663,000 for Natural Resources. (FY2020/21, Annual Performance Report, Page 2). According to the FY 2020/21 Annual Performance Report, UGX 272,166,000 was released (Page 2). Therefore 90% was released.

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:	The evidence indicates that the LG budgeted UGX 953,700,000 for Community Based Services. (FY2020/21, Annual Performance Report, Page 2). According to the FY 2020/21 Annual Performance Report, UGX 485,432,000 was released (Page 2). Therefore, 51% was released.	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	<p>There was evidence that the local government had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all civil works projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY, as listed below</p> <p>(i). a 2 classroom block with an office at Opams primary school prepared on 2nd February, 2021,</p> <p>(ii). construction of council chambers Phase V screening form prepared on 30th March, 2021 and ESMP prepared on 31st March, 2021</p> <p>(iii). construction of a classroom block at Otubet primary school prepared on 15th October, 2020</p> <p>(iv). construction of a classroom block at Ogolal primary school prepared on 16th October, 2020</p> <p>(v). construction of Wera market infrastructure improvement ESMP prepared on 27th September, 2021</p>	4
	Maximum score is 12			

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.	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),	The local government did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant because they did not qualify.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 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.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	The evidence availed showed that the local government had a Costed ESMPs for only two out of the five projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) as below;	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0	The council chambers Phase V screening form prepared on 30th March, 2021 and ESMP prepared on 31st March, 2021 The construction of Wera market infrastructure improvement and ESMP prepared on 27th September, 2021	

Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	The evidence from the Auditor General's Report for the financial year 2020/21 indicated that the LG had an unqualified audit opinion for the previous FY.	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p>	<p>The LG did not provide evidence that it had 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) by the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>		
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>The evidence from the MoFPED inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, indicates that the LG submitted its annual performance contract on <u>2nd July 2021</u>.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the LG did not submit its Annual Performance Report on or before August 31st of the current Financial Year.</p>	0
	<p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on <u>3rd September 2021</u>.</p>	
			<p>The late submission was caused by the Electronic system from the MoFPED that kept on rejecting the report.</p>	

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

Maximum score is 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

The evidence from the MoFPED/BPED official record/ inventory of LG submissions of QBPRs to MoFPED indicates that the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports were submitted as follows:

Q1 – 2nd November 2020 - Late Submission

Q2 – 26th February 2021 - Late Submission

Q3 – 30th June 2021- Late Submission

Q4 – 3rd September 2021 - Submitted late after August 31st.