



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	51%
Education Minimum Conditions	30%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	100%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	45%
Educational Performance Measures	52%
Health Performance Measures	54%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	39%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	10%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding in FY2019/20 are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s) as per design/profile  Q4 FY2019/20 Budget Performance Report  Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 69 Dormitory constructed at Kacheri SS Ugx 96,242,000</li> </ul> Roads and Engineering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 77 Waterborne toilet completed as planned Ugx 12,980,000</li> </ul> Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 101 Staff house works in Rengen SC HQs completed - Ugx 27,000,000</li> </ul>	4
2	Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	Not Applicable. The assessment system for LLG is yet to be developed.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	The DLG completed 100% (i.e. 7 out of 7) DDEG Projects planned for the FY2019/20.  Workings $7/7 * 100 = 100\%$  Source: Status of DDEG Projects implemented in FY2019/20 in the Annual Performance Report FY2019/20  Local Statutory Bodies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 51 The Council Block Chambers Slabbing works constructed and completed. Ugx 150,000,000</li> </ul>	3

#### Health

- Pg 62 Contractual obligations for Kotido HCIV staff house and fencing done. Ugx 46,000,000
- Pg 63 OPD block Phase II construction Lokiding HC II and at Apalopus HC III completed. Ugx 133,380,000

#### Education

- Pg 69 Dormitory constructed at Kacheri SS Ugx 96,242,000

#### Roads and Engineering

- Pg 77 Waterborne toilet completed as planned Ugx 12,980,000

#### Planning

- Pg 101 contractor paid for completion of Staff house works in Rengen SC HQs- Ugx 27,000,000

#### DDEG Projects in the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20

##### Local Statutory Bodies

- Pg 16 Building Construction – Offices Kotido DLG HQs Ugx 150,000,000

#### Health

- Pg 22 Building Construction - Construction Expenses Kotido HC IV Obligation Ugx 42,000,000
- Pg 23 Building Construction -General Construction Works in Lokiding HC II Ugx 38,000,000
- Pg 23 Building Construction – Hospitals OPD Ugx 95,380,000

#### Education

- Pg 29 Building Construction – Hostels at Dormitory at Kacheri S.S Ugx 96,242,000

#### Roads and Engineering

- Pg 35 Building Construction - Latrines NUSAF Hall Ugx 13,000,000

#### Planning

- Pg 49 Building Construction – Contractor Rengen SC HQs- Ugx 27,000,000

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

DDEG grant, budget and implementation guidelines.

Source:

Status of DDEG Projects implemented in FY2019/20 in the Annual Performance Report FY2019/20

#### Local Statutory Bodies

- Pg 51 The Council Block Chambers Slabbing works constructed and completed. Ugx 150,000,000

#### Health

- Pg 62 Contractual obligations for Kotido HCIV staff house and fencing done. Ugx 46,000,000
- Pg 63 OPD block Phase II construction Lokiding HC II and at Apalopus HC III completed. Ugx 133,380,000

#### Education

- Pg 69 Dormitory constructed at Kacheri SS Ugx 96,242,000

#### Roads and Engineering

- Pg 77 Waterborne toilet completed as planned Ugx 12,980,000

#### Natural Resources

- Pg 90 Outstanding obligation for survey equipment cleared - Kotido DLG HQs Ugx 4,340,000

#### Planning

- Pg 101 Monitoring, Supervision and Appraisal - Allowances and Facilitation- Project sites- Ugx 19,688,000
- Pg 101 contractor paid for completion of Staff house works in Rengen SC HQs- Ugx 27,000,000
- Pg 101 laptop procured for Management of Planning Office- Ugx 2,400,000

#### DDEG Projects in the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20

#### Local Statutory Bodies

- Pg 16 Building Construction – Offices Kotido DLG HQs Ugx 150,000,000

#### Health

- Pg 22 Building Construction - Construction Expenses HC IV Obligation Ugx 4,000,000

- Pg 22 Building Construction - Construction Expenses Kotido HC IV Obligation Ugx 42,000,000
- Pg 23 Building Construction -General Construction Works in Lokiding HC II Ugx 38,000,000
- Pg 23 Building Construction – Hospitals OPD Ugx 95,380,000

Education

- Pg 29 Building Construction – Hostels at Dormitory at Kacheri S.S Ugx 96,242,000

Roads and Engineering

- Pg 35 Building Construction - Latrines NUSAF Hall Ugx 13,000,000

Natural Resources

- Pg 42 Machinery and Equipment – GPS Sets- Kotido DLG HQs Ugx 1,840,000

Planning

- Pg 49 Monitoring, Supervision and Appraisal - Allowances and Facilitation- Project sites- Ugx 18,510,000
- Pg 49 Building Construction – Contractor Rengen SC HQs- Ugx 27,000,000
- Pg 49 ICT – Laptop (Notebook Computer)- Ugx 2,400,000

3

Investment Performance

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0

From the procurement plan for the previous FY dated 03/10/2019, stamped received by the MoLG on 08/11/2019, three projects executed using DDEG were sampled;

1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus HC II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001.Final contract value was UGX 81,753,434.
2. Construction of a Dormitory at Kacheri SS. Ref. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002.Final contract value was UGX 95,400,404.
3. Completion of Council Block Phase II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/18-19/00001. Final contract value was UGX 343,810,132.

**There were no Priced BOQs for projects executed in FY 2019/2020 in the Engineering Unit. LG Engineer Estimate was not available. Variation was impossible to calculate.**

0

<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, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was accuracy of information in staffing lists as obtained from the HRM division and what was found in the LLGs.</p> <p>Three Sub counties of Rengen Sub county, Panyangara Sub County and Nakapelimoru Sub county were visited and information received from the HRM division on staffing matched with what was found in the LLGs.</p> <p>1. In Regene Sub County there was: Otim Dennis Dias (SAS), Illukol Dennis (AO) and Dodoi Janet Loluk (AAHO)</p> <p>2. In Panyangata SC, there was Aleper Christine Nagira (SAS), Lopera David (CDO), Ocen Tonny Mark (AO), Ajok Janet (AAHO)</p> <p>3. In Nakapelimoru SC, there was Lokol Rebecca (SAS), Acheng Josephine a (CDO), Ogwang Emmanuel Okol (Vet Officer), Okello Godfrey Ewol (AO).</p>
---	--	--

<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> <p>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</p> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>The DLG provided information on infrastructure constructed using DDEG in annual budget performance report FY2019/20 and this information reflected the status of the infrastructure on ground.</p> <p>Annual Budget Performance Report FY2019/20</p> <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 62 Contractual obligations for Kotido HCIV staff house and fencing done. Ugx 46,000,000</li> <li>• Pg 63 OPD block Phase II construction Lokiding HC II and at Apalopus HC III completed. Ugx 133,380,000</li> </ul> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 69 Dormitory constructed at Kacheri SS Ugx 96,242,000</li> </ul>
---	---	--

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;  If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs  score 4 or else 0	Not Applicable, LLG Assessment has not yet started	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.  Score: 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable, LLG Assessment has not yet started	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable, LLG Assessment has not yet started	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.  Score 2 or else score 0	Kotido District Local Government consolidated and submitted the staffing requirement for the coming FY to MoPS on 14th September 2020 (Ref ARC 6/293/05)	2
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance for the period of July –December 2019 as per guidelines by MPS and submitted to the PS on a quarterly basis. In the period under review, the quarterly submissions were done on 15th December 2019 and received by MPS on 20/10/2020</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that in the FY 2019/20, all HODs were appraised as follows ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Chief Finance Officer - was appraised on 2/7/2020</li> <li>2. There was no evidence of appraisal of Ag. District planner Diko Anna Regina on file.</li> <li>3. The Ag. District Engineer – Logole Paul Bertrand was appraised 27/10/2020</li> <li>4. There was no evidence of appraisal of Ag. District Natural Resources Officer- on file</li> <li>5. The Ag District Production Officer Okuda Robert Kennedy was appraised on 21/9/ 2020</li> <li>6. The Ag. District Community Development Ogwaria Lawrence was appraised on 10/9/2020</li> <li>7. The Ag. DEO Lowari Anjello Marx was appraised on 10/7/2020</li> <li>8. The DHO Achar Cerino was appraised on 01/7/2020</li> <li>9. There was no evidence of appraisal of the District Commercial Officer Muria Tadeo Lodioki on file at the time of assessment</li> </ol>	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>There was evidence of an established and functional rewards and sanctions committee with a membership of DCAO as the Chairperson, CFO, DHO, DEO, DE and HRO.</p> <p>The committee is functional; for instance members met on 7/6/2019 to handle disciplinary issues relating to the misbehavior of the Senior accountant who was recommended for caution.</p>	1



7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	The consultative committees for staff grievances is not established although staff report their grievances to the HR division which are recorded.	0
8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	In the FY 2019/2020, there was no new recruitments made because of the Covid 19 lockdown which affected the planned activities for recruitment	1
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	There were no retirements of any staff in the FY 2019/2020	1

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

Effective Planning,  
Budgeting and  
Transfer of Funds for  
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to  
LLGs were executed in  
accordance with the  
requirements of the budget in  
previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

The DLG transferred DDEG for FY2019/20 to LLGs  
in full as per allocation in the approved budget.

Page 55-9 LG Approved Budget Estimates  
FY2019/20

#### DDEG Budget to LLGs

- Kacheri SC                      Ugx 190,212,000
- Kotido SC                        Ugx 81,606,000
- Nakaperimoru SC              Ugx 172,564,000
- Panyangara SC                Ugx 128,669,000
- Rengen SC                      Ugx 199,263,000

Releases made to LLGs (Source: Bank Statement)  
in UGX

	Q1	Q2
Q3		
• Kacheri SC	63,404,128	63,404,128
63,404,128		
• Kotido SC	27,201,930	27,201,930
27,201,930		
• Nakaperimoru SC	57,521,271	57,521,271
57,521,271		
• Panyangara SC	42,889,549	42,889,549
42,889,549		
• Rengen SC	66,420,978	66,420,978
66,420,978		

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not make timely warranting of DDEG grants to LLG in FY2019/20.</p> <p>PS/ST communication of expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 9 July 2019</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 on the 2 October 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 8 January 2020</li> </ul>	0
			<p>Warrants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 27 July 2019</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 on the 15 October 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 15 January 2020</li> </ul>	
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of invoicing and communication from CAO made on the release of funds to the LLGs within the 5 working days in the FY 19/20, only declaration of funds to the LC III chairpersons was seen in the sub counties.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG presented information that the DLG had supervised and mentored all LLGs in three quarters, and not quarterly in FY2019/20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on mentorship of Health Workers on IMAM and IYCF in the context of Covid-19 conducted from 26 June- 3 July 2020.</li> <li>• Activity Report for Quarter 3 DDEG compiled on the 17 April 2020- Monitoring Progress of any projects</li> <li>• Activity Report for Quarter 4 DDEG compiled on the 16 July 2020- Monitoring Progress of any projects</li> </ul>	0

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG TPC discussed the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits making recommendations for corrective actions for two quarterly reports in FY2019/20.</p> <p>Monitoring Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity Report for Quarter 3 DDEG compiled on the 17 April 2020- Monitoring Progress of any projects</li> <li>• Activity Report for Quarter 4 DDEG compiled on the 16 July 2020- Monitoring Progress of any projects</li> </ul> <p>TPC meetings held.</p> <p>1. Meeting held 17 September 2020 presenting and discussing DDEG project Report 2019/20. Min 6/DPTC/SEPT/2020. Planner presented mentoring and monitoring exercise for 2019/20 project implementation.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence that the DLG maintained a register of Motor Vehicles and Heavy Plants, Land and Buildings and other assets as recommended on page 167-8 of the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual, 2007 during the time of assessment.</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 DLG prepared a board of survey report for year ended 30 June 2020 on the 22 September 2020 that was used for providing information for management decisions maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG during the FY2019/20 had a Physical Planning Committee constituting 11 members that held 2 (out of the 4) meetings in the year and submitted minutes of the 2 meetings in the FY2019/20 to Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development</p> <p>Meetings Held in FY2019/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 March 2020 submitted to MoLHUD on the 11 September 2020.</li> <li>• 16 June 2020 submitted to MoLHUD on the 11 September 2020.</li> </ul> <p>Members appointed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uma Charles Chairperson/CAO</li> <li>2. Asekenye Susan Secretary/Physical planner</li> <li>3. Okuda Robert Kennedy Ag District Production Officer</li> <li>4. Kapel Romano Kadiman DEO</li> <li>5. Igena Ann Ag Town Clerk</li> <li>6. Negaga Irene Ag. Town Clerk</li> <li>7. Dr Oming George William DNRO</li> <li>8. Ajusi Fredrick Ochaya SOWs</li> <li>9. Kedi John Paul Water Engineer</li> <li>10. Oyado Sam Okello SCDO</li> <li>11. Eguto Emmanuel Staff Surveyor</li> </ol>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports that showed that the District conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, Environmental and social acceptability, and customized design for investment projects in FY2019/20</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence that project profiles with costing for project investments in FY2019/20 were developed and discussed by TPC.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists</p> <p>Screening for renovation of Rengen subcounty headquarters was on 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for Fencing of Rengen subcounty cattle market was done on 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for renovation of teachers twin staffhouse at Rengen subcounty was conducted on 18/02/2020</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>In the LG approved Procurement Plan for 2020/2021 prepared by the PDU on 20/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 29/10/2020, all projects to be implemented using DDEG were incorporated. These included; Construction of 2 Stance Lined Latrine for Staff at Lokitelaebu P/S budgeted at UGX 13,377,000, Construction of 5 Stance Lined Latrine for pupils at Lokitelaebu P/S budgeted at UGX 30,124,000, Construction of OPD Block at Lookorok Health Centre II budgeted at UGX 177,500,000 and Construction of Council Block Chambers Phase III budgeted at UGX 150,000,000 among others.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>For the three projects that were sampled. They were approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus HC II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001 at a final contract value of UGX 81,752,434, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04i/018/012/2019 held on 18/12/2019 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> <li>2. Construction of a Dormitory at Kacheri SS. Ref. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002 at a final contract value of UGX 95,400,404, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04i/014/012/2020 held on 14/12/2019 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> <li>3. Completion of Council Block Phase II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/18-19/00001 at a final contract value of UGX 343,810,132, was approved under Min.CC/4/5/2018 held on 08/11/2018 before commencement of works on 15/02/2019.</li> </ol>	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	<p>For the three projects sampled for the FY 2019/2020, there was no evidence of the proper establishment of PIT. All that was availed was letter from CAO dated 06/03/2020 appointing the District Engineer, DEO, Environment Officer &amp; SAS as members of the PIT.</p> <p>Apart from the Environment Officer, <b>roles of the other members on this team were not stated. Also, CDO and Labor Officer were not designated as members of the team.</b></p>	0

13	<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>The three sampled projects implemented using DDEG all followed the technical designs as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus HC II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001.Works as per the scope entailed finishes, doors and windows, ceiling, tiling and terrazzo, plumbing and sanitary, solar and rain water harvesting. All works were executed as per the BOQs. Finished OPD block was painted to specification, had tiled floors and terrazzo on work tops, ceiling in place as per the design, plumbing and sanitary works in place as per the design and solar panels on the roof with gutters collecting to the rain water harvesting tank. There were no visible defects on structure thus far.</li> <li>2. Construction of a Dormitory at Kacheri SS. Ref. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002.Construction process followed technical designs from setting out to foundation to superstructure works. No visible defects on structure.</li> <li>3. Completion of Council Block Phase II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/18-19/00001.Scope involved construction from the ground beam, hard-core placement, BRC, DPM, slabbing and Column Reinforcement for the first level. On the site, all this had been executed to plan. Ground floor slab was cast with DPM sheets visible at certain locations. Column starters were in place and reinforcement for the ground floor had been mounted onto these.</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There were records of supervision reports on executed sampled projects from the District Engineer to the CAO. These reports were issued before certification verifying works executed by the contractors and signed by the Clerk of Works on behalf of the District Engineer on 27/07/2019 &amp; 17/12/2019 for the project Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/18-19/00001, 11/06/2020 for the project Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001 and on 07/05/2020 for the project Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002.</p> <p><b>There was however no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO carried out site visits prior to verification and certification of the works. These would only supervise, verify and report for the final payment that would be effected after the Defects Liability Period.</b></p>	0



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

For the three projects that were sampled, recommendations for payment and interim payment certificates were issued as follows;

1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus HC II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001, Interim payment Certificate No.1 was issued on 15/06/2020 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 11/06/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate.

2. Construction of a Dormitory at Kacheri SS. Ref. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002, Interim payment Certificate No.1 was issued on 07/05/2020 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 07/05/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate.

Interim payment Certificate No.2 was issued on 15/06/20. There was no evidence provided to show that the District Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate.

3. Completion of Council Block Phase II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/18-19/00001, Interim payment Certificate No.4 was issued on 02/08/2019 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 27/07/2019. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate.

Interim payment Certificate No.5 was issued on 30/12/19 after recommendation by the District Engineer on 17/12/2020. There was no evidence provided to show that the Environment Officer and CDO verified works and recommended payment through this certificate

From these findings, all payments were initiated within specified timeframes but the **Environment Officer and CDO were not involved in the verification and certification of the works.**

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	In the Procurement Plan for FY 2020/2021 dated 20/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 29/10/2020, only one project had been tendered and contract signed, the project of Construction of an OPD Block at Lookorok Health Centre II Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/20-21/00004.  This project Evaluation Report signed by the evaluation committee on 28/08/2020, records of contracts committee meeting Min.CC4/3/8/2020 (V) held on 04/09/2020 and a work contract dated 30/09/2020.  All the other projects were still under tendering and an Invitation to Tenders had just been issued.	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	Mr. Kapel Jonathan was designated as the client charter implementation focal person by the Chief Administrative Officer on 31st May 2018. However, there was no established Grievance Redress committee	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	Kotido DLG had no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.  If so: Score 1 or else 0	Kotido DLG had a schedule for radio talk shows for last financial year on Voice of Karamoja for different departments approved by the CAO on 20th August 2019. Friday 27th May 2020 was allocated to client charter in which the grievance redress mechanism was publicised to the communities	1

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>The DLG planned for Environment, Social and Climate change interventions in the DDP FY2015/16-2019/20, however did not budget for any Environment, Social and Climate change activities other than inland travel in budget estimates of FY2019/20.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Environment, Social and Climate change interventions for FY2020/21 in the DDP FY2015/16-2019/20 page 96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support re- afforestation on both public and private land</li> <li>• Promote tree planting through campaigns</li> <li>• Gazette wetlands to increase acreage</li> </ul> <p>Environment, Social and Climate change interventions for LG Budget Estimates FY2019/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 41 Tree Planting and Afforestation inland travel Ugx 600,000</li> <li>• Page 41 River Bank and Wetland Restoration inland travel Ugx 4,207,000</li> </ul>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence that the District disseminated enhanced DDEG guidelines to LLGs</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costing 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 Kotido DLG incorporated costing ESMPs into BOQs and bid documents for DDEG projects as shown below,</p> <p>Construction of a two stance VIP latrine at Rengen subcounty headquarters was costing at UGX:50,000</p> <p>Completion of Nakapelimoru subcounty subcounty headquarters(fencing and gate) was costing at UGX: 80,000</p> <p>Renovation of two pit latrines at Rengen subcounty headquarters was costing at UGX: 50,000</p>	3
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>After Screening and preparation of costing ESMPs for all projects, Kotido DLG didnot have projects that required costing of additional impact from climate change.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability as thus;</p> <p>Land agreement for Kamaruk borehole between Kotido and the community.Signed by Namulya and L.C 1 chairperson-Lokutan John .</p> <p>Land agreement for Kanoyete borehole in Kotido subcounty .Signed between Lawany Lukwa and L.C 1 Chairperson-Arian Lokodou.</p> <p>Land agreement between Sogol Peter and community of Caicaon community primary school in Rengen subcounty,signed by Longoli Losecha L.C 1 of the area and witnesses on 11/04/2014</p> <p>Land agreement between Lomongo Apanalim and the community of Nabuin p/s Rengen subcounty,signed by witnesses and Chilla Paul -L.C.I chairperson of the area on 23/07/2017</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports: The environment officer and CDO only conducted quarterly monitoring and supervision as per the reports availed during this assessment.	0
----	--	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no 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. The Environment officer and CDO prepared certification forms at the end of the projects and these were not attached to the payment vouchers at all stages of payment.	0
----	--	---	---	---

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	The DLG did not maintain up to date bank reconciliations up to the time of assessment.  Sampled three different bank accounts & three months  Bank reconciliation for Kotido District Treasury SI Bank of Uganda A/c No. 00528052800000 for June 2020 printed on the 2 October 2020. Cash book balance Ugx 0 and bank balance Ugx 0  Bank reconciliation for Kotido District Treasury SI Bank of Uganda A/c No. 00528052800000 for August 2020 printed on the 25 November 2020. Cash book balance Ugx 0 and bank balance Ugx 0  Bank reconciliation for Kotido District Treasury SI Bank of Uganda A/c No. 00528052800000 for October 2020 printed on the 25 November 2020. Cash book balance Ugx 0 and bank balance Ugx 0	0
----	---	--	--	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p>	<p>DLG produced 4 internal audit reports for FY2019/20 as set out in section 90 of LG Act CAP 243 as amended and section 48 of PFMA 2015.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Internal Audit Reports submitted to District Chairperson</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 24 October 2019</li> <li>• Q2 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 21 January 2020</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 28 April 2020</li> <li>• Q4 FY2019/20 Internal Audit Report on the 14 July 2020</li> </ul>	
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p>	<p>The DLG provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of all internal audit findings for FY2019/20.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Management responses providing status of implementation of internal audit reports FY2019/20 addressed to Secretary PAC</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 November 2019. Management Responses to Quarter 1 internal audit report FY2019/20</li> <li>• 17 March 2020. Management Responses to Quarter 2 internal audit report FY2019/20</li> <li>• 20 July 2020. Management Response to Quarter 3 internal audit report FY2019/20</li> </ul>	
			<p>Follow up made by CAO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19 July 2019 to Assistant Animal Husbandry, Parish Chief, Senior Accounts Assistant- unsupported accountability</li> </ul>	

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

The Internal Auditor submitted all the 4 internal audit reports for FY2019/20 to CAO and LG PAC. LG PAC reviewed and made recommendations on the audit findings in these reports.

Report of meeting

- Minutes of Kotido DLPAC Meeting held on 17- 19 March 2020. Min 10/DPAC/03/2020- Examination of Kotido District internal audit reports for the first and second quarters FY2019/20.
- Minutes of PAC Meeting held on the 24 July 2020. Min 18/DPAC/07/2020 Examination of Q3 FY2019/20
- Minutes of PAC Meeting held on the 8 October 2020. Min 5/DPAC/10/2020. Examination of Q4 FY2019/20.

Members of DLG PAC

1. Lobokey Henry Chairperson
2. Lodia Simon Peter Member
3. Nakade John Commiagiaig Member
4. Oyugi Nancy Grace Member

## Local Revenues

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.

The DLG collected 85 % of local revenue budgeted for the FY2019/20 which is outside the +/-10% budget realisation threshold provided.

Workings:

Collection Ratio= Total local revenue collected/budget\*100=

$174,549,997 / 206,526,000 * 100 = 84.52\%$

Source:

Page 1 LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2019/20

Budgeted Local Revenue for FY2019/20 was Ugx 206,526,000

Page 18-9 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20

Taxes collected for FY 2019/20 was Ugx 23,852,318

Non-Taxes collected for FY 2019/20 was Ugx 150,697,679

Total Local Revenue collected in the FY2019/20 was Ugx 23,852,318+ Ugx 150,697,679= Ugx 174,549,997



19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The DLG increased OSR in FY2019/20 by 47% compared to FY2018/19</p> <p>Workings:</p> <p>Decrease in OSR= (Total OSR FY2019/20- Total OSR FY2018/19)/ Total OSR FY2018/19)</p> <p>= (Ugx 174,549,997 - Ugx 118,488,937)/Ugx 118,488,937 *100= 47.31 %</p> <p>Source:</p> <p>Page 12-13 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20</p> <p>Taxes FY 2019/20 was Ugx 23,852,318</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">FY 2018/19 was Ugx 19,881,823</p> <p>Non-Taxes FY 2019/20 was Ugx 150,697,679</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">FY 2018/19 was Ugx 98,607,114</p> <p>Total OSR collected in FY 2019/20= Ugx 23,852,318+ Ugx 150,697,679= Ugx 174,549,997</p> <p>Total OSR collected in FY 2018/19= Ugx 19,881,823+ Ugx 98,607,114= Ugx 118,488,937</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 DLG provided evidence that the District remitted LST collected on behalf of Kotido Municipal Council, however the DLG did not provide evidence that the District had remitted 65% of LST collected to the other 5 LLGs as stipulated in Section 85 of the LG Act CAP 243.</p> <p>Remittance of 65% LST made on the 5 February 2020 to only Kotido Municipal Council. Amount Ugx 4,755,000 on EFT No. 27836195</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>On the PDU notice Board at the Administration Block, there was no evidence that all awarded contracts and Procurement Plan had been publicized. Procurement only displayed Best Evaluated Bidder notices due to space limitations.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

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>The DLG did not have evidence that the LGPA 2019 results and implications were discussed in the TPC nor published.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG provided program of scheduled talk shows on Voice of Karamoja for different Heads of Department to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation and communication pertinent to public information.</p> <p>CDO on the 11 October 2019</p> <p>DIA on the 18 October 2019</p> <p>DE on the 25 October 2019</p> <p>CTC on the 23 November 2019</p> <p>DHO/HIVFP on the 20 September 2019</p> <p>DPO on the 20 September 2019</p> <p>CAO on the 27 September 2019</p> <p>CFO/Planner on the 4 October 2019</p> <p>DEO on the 23 August 2019</p> <p>CO/TO on the 30 August 2019</p> <p>DNRO on the 6 September 2019</p> <p>DE on the 13 September 2019</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>The DLG provided evidence that the District made public information on tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures of appeal.</p> <p>The DLG provided information on the notice board on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Government Revenue Management Process</li> <li>• Tax rates</li> <li>• Tribunal Appeal Committee</li> <li>• Assessment Committees</li> <li>• Enumeration and Registration Committee</li> </ul>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

The DLG did not provide information on IGG reports.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the PLE pass rate improved by 10.9% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2018 (DIV 1: 05, DIV 2: 146, DIV 3 : 104, TOTAL PASS 255, TOTAL CANDATES 356).</p> <p>2019 (DIV 1: 10 DIV 2: 177, DIV3: 67, TOTAL PASS 254, TOTAL CANDATES 308).</p> <p>Therefore, the calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>255/356 \times 100 = 71.6\%</math> while</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>254/308 \times 100 = 82.5\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>82.5\% - 71.6\% = 10.9\%</math> Improvement.</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the UCE pass rate had improved by 46.7% between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2018 ( DIV 1: 00, DIV 2: 00, DIV 3: 03, TOTAL PASS 03, TOTAL CANDATES 09)</p> <p>2019 ( DIV 1: 00, DIV 2: 15, DIV3: 129, TOTAL PASS 44, TOTAL CANDATES 55)</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was <math>03/09 \times 100 = 33.3\%</math> While</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was: <math>44/55 \times 100 = 80.0\%</math> Improvement.</p> <p>Therefore <math>80.0\% - 33.3\% = 46.7\%</math> Improvement.</p>	3
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This was not applicable, until LLG assessment get started</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

The DLG budgeted and allocated sector  
development grants to eligible activities in the  
FY2019/20.

Budget Estimates FY2019/20

Page 27 2-stance for Trs in Lokiding P/S Ugx  
14,516,000

Page 27 2-stance for Trs in Boys latrine in  
Lokiding PS Ugx 31,124,000

Page 27 2 Trs stances in Losakucha P/S Ugx  
14,516,000

Page 27 2 Tr stances at Rengen P/S staff Qtrs  
Ugx 14,516,000

Page 27 2 Stances in Napumpum P/S Trs  
Qtrs Ugx 14,516,000

Page 27-8 Provision of furniture to 13 primary  
schools Ugx 117,014,000

Page 29 Library at Panyangara SS Ugx  
97,143,000

Page 29 Trs latrine at Panyangara SS Ugx  
15,516,000

Page 29 Library furniture at Panyangara SS-  
Furniture and Fixtures - Assorted Equipment  
Ugx 7,099,000

Page 30 Office furniture for Panyangara SS  
Ugx 36,816,000

Page 30 Science lab furniture for Panyangara  
SS Ugx 22,408,000

Page 30 HT and Deputy Staff house and  
Teacher Staff house for Proposed  
Panyangara SS Ugx 471,749,000

Annual Budget Performance Report  
FY2019/20

Page 67 13 Latrine stances constructed (8 Tr  
latrine stances at Lokiding PS, Rengen PS,  
Napumpum PS and Losakucha) and 5 stance  
for boys in Lokiding Ugx 89,186,000

Page 67 146 Pieces of furniture supplied to  
13 Primary Schools Ugx 108,104,000

Page 70 248 Desks supplied at proposed,  
Panyangara SS, Library furniture supplied at  
Panyangara SS, Office furniture supplied at  
Proposed Panyangara SS, and Science lab  
furniture supplied at Proposed Panyangara SS  
Ugx 141,523,000

Page 70 Teacher houses constructed (HT  
and Deputy block and 2 Twin staff houses)  
Ugx 468,451,000

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

b) If the DEO, Environment Officer  
and CDO certified works on  
Education construction projects  
implemented in the previous FY  
before the LG made payments to the  
contractors score 2 or else score 0

Sample of 3 requests for payment to  
suppliers/contractors showed that  
Environment Officer and CDO did not certify  
works on Education construction projects  
implemented in FY2019/20 before the LG  
made payments to the contractors

Request for payment of Ugx 12,734,106 by  
M/s Otonoro Investments for Construction of  
2 stance lined pit latrine for teachers at  
Renegen PS was made on the 3 April 2020.  
The DEO forwarded the payment request on  
the 20 April 2020. Payment certificate No 01  
was prepared by the DE and signed off by  
DEO on the 20 April 2020.

Request for payment of Ugx 5,299,024 by M/s  
Iwonpei General Hardware Ltd for completion  
of a 3 classroom block at Kanair PS was  
made on the 9 April 2020. The DEO  
forwarded the payment request on the 18 May  
2020. Payment certificate No 11 was  
prepared by the DE and signed by DEO on  
the 11 May 2020.

Request for payment of Ugx 95,400,404 by  
M/s Miraculous Limited for construction of  
boy's dormitory in Kacheri SS was made on  
the 4 June 2020. The DEO forwarded the  
payment request on the 16 June 2020  
Payment certificate No 2 was prepared by the  
DE and signed by DEO on the 16 June 2020.

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

Three projects executed in the FY 2019/2020  
under Education by the DLG were sampled;

1. Construction of a SEED SS in Panyangara  
Sub County. Ref. MOES/WRKS/19-  
20/00042. MOES Estimate was UGX  
2,164,934,015 against a Final contract value  
was UGX 1,944,615,522. Variation was -  
10.18%.

2. Construction of Dormitory at Kacheri SS.  
Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002. **LG  
Engineer's Estimate was not available.**  
Final contract value was UGX 95,400,404.  
Variation was impossible to calculate.

3. Construction of 4 Stance Lined Latrine for  
Boys at Lokiding P/S. Ref.  
KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00009. **LG  
Engineer's Estimate was not available.**  
Final contract value was UGX 95,400,404.  
Variation was impossible to calculate.

Variation for the project Ref.  
MOES/WRKS/19-20/00042 was within +/-  
20%. **For the other projects, no records  
were available for the LG Engineer's  
Estimate.**

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

According to the Contractor's Proposed Work Schedule where timelines were provided in months after contract signature date, Proposed start date was 25/02/2020 and finish date was 25/08/2021. Tasks under construction/civil works were scheduled as follows:

1. Substructure Works which were divided into Planting trees, Excavation, Foundation concrete, Plinth walls plus Columns, Over-site Slab and Slab Column plus Base. All these were completed as per schedule apart from planting of trees which was yet to begin.

2. Superstructure works which were divided into DPC, Walling to wall plate, Columns plus ring beam, Gable ends and Openings (windows and doors fabrications). All tasks were executed on schedule. Remaining works were Openings (windows and doors fabrications) which had only been fit on the science block. These works were however still on schedule

3. Roofing which entailed Roof Frame, Covering and Ceiling. Roof framing and covering works including mounting of the trusses and tap screwing of sheets had been completed for all structures except the teachers' houses and VIP Stance Latrines. Ceilings works were yet to start in all structures. Fascia boards and gutters had not yet been mounted. These works were however still on schedule.

4. For finishes, electrical installations had started as per schedule with fitting of ducts in the walls. Wall and floor finishes were yet to start.

5. External works including landscaping and paving works had not yet started as per the schedule.

From these findings, reasonable overall progress was made. Progress would be reported at 100% for works executed during the previous FY.



4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	The structure provides an establishment of 210 staff in 14 primary school and a total of 171 staff are in place which makes an 81% filling.	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG education department maintained a consolidated schools asset register as of FY 2019/20 that captured the number of classrooms, number of latrines, number of desks and teacher accommodation.</p> <p>The review of the consolidated schools asset registers for FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 revealed the following;</p> <p>FY 2018/2019:</p> <p>11 out of 14 (78.6%) registered UPE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards.</p> <p>0 out of 02 (0%) registered USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards.</p> <p>On average, 39.3% (both UPE and USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards for FY 2018/19.</p> <p>FY 2019/20:</p> <p>11 out of 14 (78.6%) registered UPE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards.</p> <p>0 out of 02 (0%) registered USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards.</p> <p>On average, 39.3% (both UPE and USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards for FY 2019/20.</p> <p>Overall, 39.3 % of schools (UPE+USE) met the prescribed minimum standards for FY 2018/19 and 2019/20.</p> <p>However this was below the 50% Minimum standard.</p>	0

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

As per teachers list and the sampled school's deployment was done with no variation between School lists (SL) and physical variation (PV).

For example:

Nakapelimoru P/S had 11 teachers.( including head teacher deputy and teachers)

Maaru P/S had 12 teachers.( including head teacher deputy)

Kalasarich P/S had 11 teachers including the head teacher and deputy.

Also the schools sampled for visiting to verify deployment as seen below; (Key: - SL- Staff List, and PV- Physical verification of deployment on ground)

Nakapelimoru P/S - SL- 11, PV-11.

Maaru P/S SL-12, PV- 12.

Kalasarich P/S SL- 11, PV-11.

As observed from the 3 sampled schools, it was noted that teachers as indicated on the DEO's deployment list were the same teachers indicated on school staff lists.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that infrastructure and equipment was in place.

However verification in the 3 sampled UPE schools showed variation between LG consolidated asset register and school inventory book for the 2 UPE schools as indicated below:

Nakapelimoru P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 08 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 135 desks and 15 teacher houses while the school asset register had 08 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 135 desks, 15 teachers' houses.

Maaru P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 08 classrooms, 15 latrines, 143 desks and 08 teacher houses while the school asset register had 08 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 132 desks, 08 teachers' houses.

Kalasarich P/S: The LG consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/2020 indicated that the school had 08 classrooms, 20 latrines, 92 desks and 10 teacher houses while the school asset register had 08 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 92 desks, 10 teacher's houses.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

- Between 80 – 99% score: 2

- Below 80% score 0

The LG had 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.

However:

Out of 14 primary schools, 08 (57.1%) primary schools submitted Annual School Reports and budgets covering a reconciled cash flow statements, annual budget and expenditure. Though were non-compliant to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guideline.

The 3 sampled UPE schools that included Nakapelimoru P/S, Maaru P/S and Kalasarich P/S a review of their annual budget reports were not compliant with MOEs budgeting guidelines.

6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:  • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0	There was no evidence to show the schools that were supported to implement SIPs from the DEOs office.  Verification from the 3 sampled UPE schools that included Nakapelimoru P/S, Maaru P/S and Kalosarich P/S had SIPs in place.	0
6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:  • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0	There was evidence that LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year.  For Example:  The list of 14 UPE primary schools captured in Kotido DLG Performance contract FY 2019/20 was consistent with the number of schools 14 in excel data sheet OTIMS for FY 2019/20.	4

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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:  Score 4 or else, score: 0	The LG Education department Kotido DLG budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school or a teacher per school in all the 32 Government aided primary schools as per the staff list for the FY 2020/21. The total wage bill provision for teachers was UGX2,332,914,000 as per the Approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2020/21. The budget covers salaries for 160 primary teachers in the 14 primary schools as per approved education work plan and budget FY2020/2021.  In the 3 sampled UPE schools a review of staff list confirmed that LG had budgeted for head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers as per staffing norms/guidelines as follows: Nakapelimoru P/S 11, Maaru P/S 12 and Kalosarich P/S 11.	4
---	---	--	--	---

7

3

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

b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,

Score 3 else score: 0

The list of primary school teachers FY 2020/2021, obtained from the DEO's office revealed that a total of 160 teachers were deployed in 14 UPE schools in FY 2020/21

Verification in the 3 sampled UPE schools revealed that the deployment of teachers was in line with sector guideline and staffing norms as seen below:

Nakepelimoru P/S in Nakepelimoru Sub county number of teachers deployed was 11 and the number of teachers on the staff list was 11 for FY 2020/21.

Maaru P/S in Rengen Sub county number of teachers on deployment list was 12 and number of teachers on staff list was 12 for FY 2020/21.

Kalosalich P/S in Panyangara Sub county number of teachers on deployment list was 11 and number of teachers on staff list was 11 for FY 2020/21.

Therefore the teachers were deployed as per sector guideline.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

7

1

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

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

There was evidence that teacher deployment data was publicized on School noticeboard.

For example:

In the three UPE sampled schools, the list of teachers deployed were found displayed on the Head Teachers notice board as indicated below:

Nakapelmoru primary school in Nakapelimoru Sub county 11 teachers were displayed on the head teacher's notice board 07 males and 04 females.

A list of 12 teacher's that included 6 males and 6 females was displayed on the head teacher's notice board in Maaru primary school in Rengen Sub- county.

Kalosalich Primary School in Panyangara Sub- county a list of 12 teachers was displayed on the head teacher's notice board that included 08 males and 03 female.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

8

2

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Kotido has a total of 14 primary school and 10 of the head teacher files sampled indicated that all of them were appraised as follows;

1. Akullo Molly Teddy of Lopuyo Ps was appraised on 4/2/2020
2. Ghinno Moses of Lokitelaebu PS was appraised on 19/12/2020
3. Owili Quent Ochan of Nakapelimoru PS. Was appraised on 5/1/2020
4. Moding Mathew of Lokiding PS was appraised on 19/12/2019
5. Achan Betty of Losakucha PS was appraised on 9/02/2020
6. Batibua Laloyo Christine of Kacheri PS was appraised on 26/2/2020
7. Akello Secondina of Kalosarich PS was appraised on 3/1/2020
8. Achayo Lucy Grace of Nakwakwa PS 28/12/2019
9. Akot Susan of Rengen PS was appraised on 26/12/2019
10. Auma Santina of Nakoreto PS was appraised on 28/2/2020

8

0

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The LG does not appraise secondary schools and therefore there are no files seen

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>There was evidence that the education department staff were appraised against their performance plans as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SEO was appraised on Katyango Benron Bowg was appraised on 30/06/2020</li> <li>2. Sports officer Auma Margret was appraised on 30/6/2020</li> <li>3. Senior inspector of schools Otim Carl Mark was appraised on 30/6/2020</li> </ol>	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>There was evidence of a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at school and LG level. Evidence of a training plan was in place mainly targeting training of head teachers and teachers on assessment of lessons as a means of improving performance etc. It was signed by the DEO on 17/07/2019.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the DEO noted that the DLG had no issue concerning correcting enrolment thus there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment numbers submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Kotido DLG.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0

The DLG did make allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines (i.e. minimum of Ugx 19,400,000)

#### Minimum Monitoring

Fixed Rate LG Allocations Ugx 4,500,000

Plus Ugx 100,000 X 25 Schools Ugx 2,500,000

Total Monitoring Ugx 7,000,000

#### Minimum Inspection

Fixed Rate LG Allocation Ugx 4,000,000

Plus Ugx 336,000 X 25 Schools Ugx 8,400,000

Total Inspection Ugx 12,400,000

Total Minimum Monitoring and Inspection Ugx 19,400,000

Allocated in Budget Estimates FY2019/20

Page 31 Monitoring and Supervision of Primary and Secondary Education Ugx 20,784,000

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 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0

The DLG created warrants for Quarter three releases for all funds including school capitation grants on the 15 January 2020 which was 5 days after PS/ST communicated (i.e. 8 January 2020) the Q3 FY2019/20 expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.



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>The DLG did not make timely communications of capitation grants to schools.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Warrants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 27 July 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 15 January 2020</li> <li>• Q4 FY2019/20 on the 17 April 2020</li> </ul> <p>CAO Declaration to District Chairperson, RDC, Noticeboard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 FY2019/20 on the 2 August 2019</li> <li>• Q3 FY2019/20 on the 27 January 2020</li> <li>• Q4 FY2019/20 on the 28 April 2020</li> </ul>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the education department held meetings for planning inspection and monitoring meeting for the two previous three school terms:</p> <p>Term I Inspection plan meeting that was held on 21/02/2020. Under MIN04/02/2020 talked about inspection plan. 7 people attended including DIS, IS and 5 Associate Assessors.</p> <p>Term II Inspection plan meeting that was held on 11/07/2019. Under MIN04/07/2019 talked about inspection budget and under MIN 05/07/2019 inspection plan. 8 people that attended that included DIS, IS and 6 Associate Assessors.</p> <p>Term III Inspection plan meeting that was held on 11/10/2019. Under MIN05/07/2019 discussed inspection plan. 8 people attended that included DIS, and 7 Associate Assessors.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of UPE registered schools inspected and monitored. The total number of 14 UPE schools were inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the MEO monitoring report as it was observed on the inspection and monitoring reports as indicated below:</p> <p>Term I out of 14 schools 14(100%) UPE registered primary schools were inspected and monitored on 10/02/2020 and 19/02/2020 and report produced by the DIS on 20/02/2020.</p> <p>Term II out of 14 schools 10(71.4%) UPE registered primary schools were inspected and monitored on 14/07/2019 and 18/07/2019 and report produced by the DIS on 22/07/2019.</p> <p>Term III out of 14schools 14(100%) UPE registered primary schools were inspected and monitored on14/10/2019 and 14/10/2019.</p> <p>Thus, the number of schools inspected/monitored were <math>14+10+14=38</math>  <math>38/42 \times 100 = 90.5\%</math> .</p> <p>Thus 90.5% Minimum standard.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up.</p> <p>From the 3 sampled schools there was no evidence of inspection feedback reports as indicated below:</p> <p>Nakapelimoru primary school in Nakapelimoru Sub county was inspected but had no inspection follow up reports.</p> <p>Maaru primary school in Rengen Sub-county was inspected though inspection feedback report was not in place.</p> <p>Kalasarich primary school in Panyangara Sub-county was inspected but there was no evidence of inspection feedback reports.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education department had submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) during FY 2019/20 as shown below:</p> <p>However it was established during the school visits that the schools had no evidence of inspection reports during FY 2019/20:</p> <p>Nakaperimoru primary school in Nakaperimoru Sub-county was inspected twice by DEO on 25/11/2019, SEO on 24/11/2019, and DIS on 04/08/2019 28/01/2020.</p> <p>Maaru primary school in Rengen Sub-county was inspected on 27/06/2019 and 13/03/2019 by SEO, DIS on 17/03/2020.</p> <p>Kalosarich primary school in Panyangara Sub- county was inspected by DIS on 14/02/2020, DIS on 08/09/2019, 16/09/2019 and 16/10/2019.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Meeting of Social Services Committee held meetings in FY2019/20 to discuss service delivery issues in education sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC meeting held on the 21 February 2020 Min.09/SSC/02/2020 discussing poor performance, new curriculum, Kotido SS issue update, new board members for Kotido SS, construction of Panyangara SSS ground breaking ceremony, construction of girls dormitory in Kacheri SSS, UCE Performance</li> <li>SSC meeting held on the 16 October 2019.Min.03/SSC/10/2019- Discussion of DEO Q1 Progress Report, status of projects, routine departmental activities, key challenges and recommendations</li> </ul>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school. They Included radio talk show that was done on 12/03/2020 that involved 02 education officers, DEO, RDC and LC5 that targeted improvement in enrollment and attendance.</p>	2

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of an Up-to-date LG Assets register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards at.</p> <p>Review in the 3 schools sampled that included Nakapelimoru P/S, Maaru P/S and Kalosarich P/S, there was evidence of an up-to-date asset register in (1) school.</p>	0
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; (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>The DLG did not provide desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the sector was derived from the LG Development Plan and eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The DLG did not field appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 were appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the LG approved Procurement Plan for FY 2020/2021 dated 20/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 29/10/2020, there were no SEED SS Projects incorporated.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The three sampled projects executed under Education by the DLG during FY 2019/2020 were approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a SEED SS in Panyangara Sub County. Ref. MOES/WRKS/19-20/00042 at a final contract value of UGX 1,944,615,522, was approved under Min.CC/04/04/012/2019 held on 04/12/2019 before commencement of works on 25/02/2020. Solicitor General gave clearance through a letter dated 17/01/2020.</li> <li>2. Construction of a Dormitory at Kacheri SS. Ref. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00002 at a final contract value of UGX 95,400,404, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04i/014/012/2020 held on 14/12/19 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> <li>3. Construction of 4 Stance Lined Latrine for Boys at Lokiding P/S. Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00009 at a final contract value was UGX 95,400,404, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04vii/018/012/2019 held on 18/12/2019 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> </ol>	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 no evidence of proper establishment of PIT for all school infrastructure projects executed in the last FY.</p> <p>All that was provided was a letter from the CAO dated 19/06/2020 designating the District Engineer as the Project Manager, DEO as the Contract Manager, DCDO, Environment Officer, Clerk of Works and Sub County Chief as members of the PIT for the project Ref. MOES/WRKS/19-20/00042,</p> <p>For all the other projects under Education, CAO issued a letter on 06/03/2020 appointing the District Engineer, DEO, Environment Officer and SAS as members of the team.</p> <p><b>Apart from the Environment Officer, roles of the other members on this team were not stated. Also, CDO and Labor Officer were not designated as members of the team.</b></p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES  <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	According to the Contractor's Proposed Work Schedule where timelines were provided in months after contract signature date, Tasks under construction/civil works were provided as follows:  1. Substructure Works which were divided into Planting trees, Excavation, Foundation concrete, Plinth walls plus Columns, Over-site Slab and Slab Column plus Base. From works visible on site at time of assessment, all structures had ground beams and foundations followed technical designs from MOES.  2. Superstructure works which were divided into DPC, Walling to wall plate, Columns plus ring beam, Gable ends and Openings (windows and doors fabrications). DPC was visible in all structures and Room Dimensions were as per design. There were RC lintels above the openings and RC ring beams as per the design.  3. Roofing which was divided into Roof Frame, Trusses, Covering and Ceiling, Fascia board and Gutters. Roof trusses in hollow sections were mounted on steel base plates as per designs. Roofing sheets were pre-coated and profiled as per design.  4. External works including landscaping and paving works had not yet started as per the schedule.  5. External works had also not yet started as per the schedule.  From these findings, Contractor followed MOES designs for all structures and stages of construction.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that monthly meetings were conducted on site for the project of Construction of the SEED School. All that was provided was a status report dated 30/06/2020 from the Clerk of Works to the CAO through the DEO. Also provided was a status report from the District Engineer to the CAO dated 20/07/2020 that among other things recommended that monthly site meetings be conducted starting August 2020.	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

There was no evidence that joint technical supervision meetings were held for all infrastructure projects executed at the critical stages.

All that was provided was a status report for the SEED School dated 30/06/2020 from the Clerk of Works to the CAO through the DEO. Also provided was a status report from the District Engineer to the CAO dated 20/07/2020 that among other things recommended that monthly site meetings be conducted starting August 2020.

**In all these reports, only the Engineer was involved in supervision and reporting. There was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO participated in supervision.**

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

A sample of 3 requests for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the payments to the Contractors were not made within recommended timeframe i.e.

Request for payment of Ugx 12,734,106 by M/s Otonoro Investments for Construction of 2 stance lined pit latrine for teachers at Renegen PS was made on the 3 April 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 20 April 2020. Payment certificate No 01 was prepared by the DE and signed off by DEO on the 20 April 2020. Payment was made 54 days (i.e. 27 May 2020 Receipt No. No 001) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor

Request for payment of Ugx 5,299,024 by M/s Iwonpei General Hardware Ltd for completion of a 3 classroom block at Kanair PS was made on the 9 April 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 18 May 2020. Payment certificate No 11 was prepared by the DE and signed by DEO on the 11 May 2020. Payment was made 60 days (i.e. 8 June 2020 EFT No 29839735) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor

Request for payment of Ugx 95,400,404 by M/s Miraculous Limited for construction of boy's dormitory in Kacheri SS was made on the 4 June 2020. The DEO forwarded the payment request on the 16 June 2020. Payment certificate No 2 was prepared by the DE and signed by DEO on the 16 June 2020. Payment was made 4 days (i.e. 8 June 2020 EFT No 29839738) after the request for payment was made by the Contractor

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The Education Department through the DEO submitted Detailed Work Plan for FY 2020/2021 on 15/06/2020. This was received by the PDU on **15/06/2020**.



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 score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG had procurement files complete with documents as per PPDA guidelines. Procurement files for the SEED School project contained the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a SEED SS in Panyangara Sub County. Ref. MOES/WRKS/19-20/00042 at a final contract value of UGX 1,944,615,522, had Evaluation report signed by committee on 20/11/2019, Work contract signed 22/02/2020 and Contracts Committee decision meeting minute Min.CC/04/04/012/2019 held on 04/12/2019.</li> </ul>	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, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework under education in Kotido DLG</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of education guidelines incorporating E&amp;S requirements in school by Environment Officer. And the education guidelines were not in place.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kotido DLG had in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents,</p> <p>Construction of two stance lined latrine for boys at Lokiding primary school had an ESMP of UGX: 50,000</p> <p>Construction of a two stance lined pit latrine for teachers at Rengen p/s was costed at UGX: 50,000</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was proof of land ownership for school construction projects as seen below;</p> <p>Land agreement between Parel Atanyang of Kacheri and Community of Kokuwam p/s of Kacheri subcounty ,signed by witnesses and L.C 1 chairperson Lapoli Aparbor on 20/01/2007</p> <p>Land agreement between Lopio Apanakopor,Lomuria Simon Peter of Kacheri and the community of Kalogyeli comp p/s ,signed by witnesses and L.C 1 Chairperson-Dokito Nangalom J.B on 1/11/2017</p> <p>Land agreement between Munyes Paul of Nakapelimoru and the community of Potongor community p/s of Nakapelimoru subcounty.Signed by witnesses and L.C1 chairperson on 12/11/2016</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no 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</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments.The certification forms were only prepared at project completion and these too were not attached to the payment vouchers at any stage.There was no provision for the EO and CDO to counter sign on the payment certificates.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) of Lokitalaebu HC III, Napumpum HC III, and Rengen HC III, there was an increase in OPD attendances of 378.6% (from 341 in 2018/19 FY to 1632 in 2019/20). And 15.8% increase in deliveries (from 31747 in 2018/19 FY to 36771 in 2019/20 FY). Basing on the fact that the total OPD increased by more than 20%, the district scores.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not Applicable. Assessment system for LLG is not developed</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 75%; score 2</li> <li>• 65 – 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65% ; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs was 92.2%.</p>	2

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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.	The DLG budget and spent health development grant in FY2019/20 on eligible activities i.e.  LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2019/20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 23 Building Construction - Staff Houses Ugx 35,154,000</li> </ul>	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	<p>A sample of 3 request for payments to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the DHO, CDO and Environment Officer did not sign the interim payment certificates before the LG made payments to Contractors</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 25,495,900 by M/s Alleluyah Enterprises Ltd for rehabilitation of staff house and pit latrine at Kamora HC 11 was made on the 17 June 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 19 June 2020. Payment certificate No 1 was prepared by De and signed by DHO on 19 June 2020. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT No. 30505855</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 3,461,500 by M/s Miraculous Limited for fencing of Kotido HC1V was made on the 11 May 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 11 May 2020. Payment certificate No 11 was prepared by DE and DHO on the 11 and 12 May 2020 respectively. Payment was made on the 8 June 2020 EFT No. 29839738</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 11,482,530 by M/s Zenith Civil and Water Engineering for work done on a twin staff house block at Kotido HC was made on the 10 March 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 14 June 2020. Payment certificate No 11 was prepared by DE and signed by DHO on the 14 June 2020. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT No. 30505838.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Three projects were sampled of those executed under health for FY 2019/2020. These were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001. Final contract value was UGX 81,753,434.</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of OPD Block at Lokiding Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00007. Final contract value was UGX 8,745,873.</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance Lined Latrine at Nakwakwa Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00006. Final contract value was UGX 3442,450.</li> </ol> <p><b>There were no Priced BOQs for projects executed under Health in FY 2019/2020 in the Engineering Unit. LG Engineer Estimate was not available. Variation was impossible to calculate.</b></p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no project of upgrading a HCII to HC III for FY 2019/2020 in Kotido DLG.</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"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has a total of 5 HCIII and no HC IV. Out the 95 staff as establishment in the 5 facilities, the LG has a total of 75 staff which makes 79% filling.</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>There was no project of upgrading a HCII to HC III for FY 2019/2020 in Kotido DLG.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The staff lists of Lokitelaebu HC III (13 health workers), Napumpum HC III (13 health workers), and Rengen HC III (15 health workers), indicate that the health workers are in place as indicated on the staff list provided by the Human Resource Office. Therefore information of health workers filled was accurate.</p>	2
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no health facilities upgraded or constructed in the district.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector. Nakapelimoru HC III, Kacheri HCIII, and Panyangara HC III submitted on the 28th March, 2019.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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>	<p>There was no evidence that 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>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>		
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>	<p>Out of 16 health facilities in the district, only 2 health facilities (Kanawat HCIII and Panyangara HC III) submitted performance improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports. However, there was no evidence of implementation of the facility improvement plans.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>		
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>	<p>Health Facility HMIS Reports 105 and 106 for the previous FY of Nakapelimoru HC III, Kanawat HC III and Rengen HC III, were all submitted timely (within the mandatory 7 days following the end of each month and a quarter). For instance; HMIS 106 reports for Rengen HC III, were submitted on 4th/9/2019, 5th/1/2020, 7th/4/2020, and 5th/7/2020 respectively.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>HMIS 106 reports for Kanawat HC III, were submitted on 7th/9/2019, 3th/1/2020, 5th/4/2020, and 6th/7/2020 respectively.</p>	
			<p>HMIS 106 reports for Nakapelimoru HC III, were submitted on 5th/9/2019, 3th/1/2020, 5th/4/2020, and 4th/7/2020 respectively</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>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>Health Facility record of submissions of RBF invoices show that 4th quarter submissions 3 sampled health facilities were submitted on the following dates; Kotido HC IV submitted on 31st/July/2020, Kacheri HC III and Rengen HC III submitted on 13th/July/2020.</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 implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From DHMT submissions of facility RBF invoices to MoH, 1st quarter was made on 13th/12/2019, 2nd quarter on 7th/4/2020, 3rd quarter on 12th/8/2020 and 4th quarter was made on 21st/10/2020.</li> <li>• All these were late submissions made through emails.</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide evidence that the Health Department submitted timely quarterly budget performance reports for FY2019/20 to the planner for consolidation</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 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 was evidence that all the weakest performing health facilities submitted approved performance improvement plans. And these facilities were, Napumpum HC III, Apalo Pus HC II, Apalo Pama HC II, Lokiding HCII, Kanawat HC III, and Lokitelaebu HC III.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of PIP implementation reports for the weakest 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</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The health department budgeted for 1,411,396,000= as wages for the 118 health workers. And 1,403,220,000= (99%) was spent on wages on 118 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</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>Total staffing currently deployed is 66.7% (118 staff) and the gap is a total of 59 staff.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed according to the staff lists and attendance book/register of Lokitelaebu HC III (13 health workers), Napumpum HC III (13 health workers), and Rengen HC III (15 health workers).</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</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>A circular from DHO/MMOH to health facility in-charges dated 14th/07/2020 was pinned on Lokitelaebu HC III, Napumpum HC III, and Rengen HC III notice boards indicating 5 redeployments of health workers.</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

There was evidence that DHO conducted annual performance appraisal of all health facility in charges against the agreed performance plans. Out of the 19 health facilities, 10 were sampled as follows;

1. Auma Christine of Lokitelaebu HCIII was appraised on 30/6/2020
2. Ojok Jiponi of Nakapelimoru HC III was appraised on 25/06/2020
3. Teko Francis of Apalopama HCII was appraised on 30/6/2020
4. Latigi Evaline in Kamor HC II was appraised on 15/6/2020
5. Lochoro Moses of Lokiding HCII was appraised 30/6/2020
6. Cherop Rogers of Lopio HCII was appraised on 22/6/2020
7. Logiel Robert of Napumpum HC II was appraised on 30/06/2020
8. Abdilahi Mohamad Lomwar of Rengen HCIII was appraised on 30/6/2020
9. Ojer John Michael of Apalopus HC II was appraised on 30/6/2020
10. Akongo Catherine of Rikitae HCII was appraised on 29/6/2020

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

There was evidence that In charges conducted annual performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans.

From the files of 10 health workers files sampled, it was evident that appraisals were carried out for the previous financial year as follows;

1. Akidi Stella an Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 29/06/2020
2. Ajok Joyce Look a Nursing Officer was appraised on 6/7/2020
3. Labeja Ensio a nursing assistant was appraised on 30/6/2020
4. Ongolekol David Michael an Enrolled nurse, was appraised on 30/6/2020
5. Ongom Benjamin an Askari was appraised on 22/6/2020
6. Akech Pasma a Porter was appraised on 22/6/2020
7. Ojangole Faustine a Laboratory technician was appraised on 6/6/2020
8. Amolo Rose Mary O a porter was appraised on 22/6/2020
9. Amunyo John David an Askari was appraised on 30/6/2020
10. Atitio Gloria Emily an Enrolled midwife was appraised on 30/6/2020

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that in the PIPs of 15th September 2020, the DHO included individuals and institutional plans for performance improvement based on appraisal reports, for instance, Dengel Mary an Enrolled Nurse was recommended for training as a result of insufficient knowledge in giving palliative care, and this was documented in PIP while a number of Health workers were recommended for ongoing coaching.

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 evidence that the LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance with the training plans. And there was no training plan in place.</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>There were no training reports in the training database availed to the assessor during the assessment period and this was because there were no trainings conducted during the FY according to the DHO.</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 evidence that the CAO confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th in the previous FY. A copy of the letter dated 3rd/09/2019 was on file. Even the copy for the current FY dated 05th/09/2020 was on file.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

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

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.

The DLG allocated 17 % of Primary Healthcare Non-Wage Recurrent Grant towards monitoring Healthcare LLS.

Page 22-4 Budget Estimates FY 2019/20

Primary Healthcare Non-Wage Recurrent Grant-Ugx140,537,000

- NGO Basic Healthcare Services (LLS) Ugx 0
- Basic Healthcare Services (HCIV-HCII-LLS) Ugx 140,537,000

Healthcare Services Monitoring and Inspection Ugx 23,676,000

% of Healthcare Services Monitoring and Inspection against Primary Healthcare Non-Wage Recurrent Grant

$23,676,000/140,537,000*100=16.85\%$

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

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

The DLG did not make timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the FY2019/20

PS/ST communication of expenditure limits facilitate warrant approvals.

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 9 July 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 2 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 8 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20 on the 28 April 2020

Warrants

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 27 July 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 15 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 15 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20

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 funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0

The DLG invoiced health facilities and communicated quarterly PHC NWR Grant transfers more than 5 working days in FY2019/20. .

Releases for the all Quarters FY2019/20 as per Cost Centre List (sample of 3 HCs)

APALOPAMA HC II

LOKITAELEBU HC III

NAKAPELIMORU HC III

Dates when sampled Health Centres bank accounts were credited

Q1 FY2019/20      27 Aug 2019

Q2 FY2019/20      3 Dec 2019

Q3 FY2019/20      6 Feb 2020

Q4 FY2019/20      8 May 2020

CAO Declaration to District Chairperson, RDC, Noticeboard

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 2 August 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 24 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 27 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20 on the 28 April 2020

Warrants

- Q1 FY2019/20 on the 27 July 2019
- Q2 FY2019/20 on the 15 October 2019
- Q3 FY2019/20 on the 15 January 2020
- Q4 FY2019/20 on the 17 April 2020

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

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

There was no 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 during the assessment period.

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>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY. All issues captured in the DHMT meetings were implemented as documented in quarterly progressive reports for the four quarters. For instance, in the first quarter DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting, it was recommended that community dialogues with leaders be increased to promote uptake of HIV/TB services. In the second quarter DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting, it was reported that community dialogues with leaders had increased from 2 in the first quarter to 4 in the 2nd quarter of FY 2019/2020.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>• The attendance lists attached on all the four sets of Minutes of the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings indicate that the following categories of persons were represented; health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments such as WASH, Community Development, Education department.</p> <p>Q1-2nd/9/2019</p> <p>Q2-10th/12/2019</p> <p>Q3- 9th/3/2020</p> <p>Q4- 25th/6/2020</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>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG does not have any HC IV or general hospital. Therefore this does not apply.</p>	1



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG does not have a HSD. Therefore this does not apply.</li> </ul>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the support supervision books of Rengen HC III, Lokitelaebu HC III and Napumum HC III, the health department provided recommendations for specific corrective actions. However, there was no evidence that implementation of these recommendations were followed up during the previous FY.</li> </ul>	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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 sets of medicines and Health supplies management supervision reports indicated that guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies. This was also evidenced in the support supervision books at the health facilities.</li> </ul>	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>The DLG did not provide information in the budget FY2019/20 on health promotion and prevention activities to ascertain whether at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Approved Budget Estimates FY2019/20 Pages 21-24 did not provide information on health promotion and prevention activities.</p> <p>Annual Budget Performance Report FY2019/20</p> <p>Page 62. 1995 Children immunized in both 22 static and 125 outreach posts.</p>	

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly progress reports indicated that the following health promotion and disease prevention activities were implemented.</li> <li>• 1st quarter, strengthening Test and Treat guidelines for malaria in Kotido district.</li> <li>• 2nd quarter, community dialogues with leaders to promote uptake of HIV/TB services in the district.</li> <li>• 3rd quarter, support supervision</li> <li>• 4th quarter, strengthening PMTCT services in nine sites in the district.</li> </ul>	1
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports.</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 no evidence that the LG had an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide project appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the Health Sector were derived from the LG Development Plan; eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not provide field appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2019/20 under the Health Sector were appraised for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability, and customized designs to site conditions</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist</p> <p>Screening for construction of a five stance pit latrine at Nakwakwa Health centre II was done 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for renovation of a twin- staff house for medical staff at Kamor H/C II was done on 24/03/2020</p> <p>Screening for Construction of maternity ward at Rengen Health centre II was conducted on 02/09/2019</p> <p>The ESMPs for all health projects were prepared on 20/07/2019</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health Department through the DHO submitted the User Department Procurement Plan on 29/06/2020.This was received by the PDU on <b>30/06/2020</b>.</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 PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>For FY 2020/2021, Health Department had two projects incorporated in the procurement plan to be tendered. Health Department submitted LGPP Form 1 through the DHO with the projects, Construction of Staff House at Apalopama Health Centre II and Construction of OPD at Lokorok Health Centre II on <b>14/07/2020</b>.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The three sampled projects under health for FY 2019/2020 were approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001 at a final contract value of UGX 81,753,434, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04i/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of OPD Block at Lokiding Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00007 at a final contract value was UGX 8,745,873, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04u/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance Lined Latrine at Nakwakwa Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00006.Final contract value was UGX 3442,450, was approved under Min.KOTICC/04viii/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</li> </ol>	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>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>For the projects executed under Health for the FY 2019/2020, there was no evidence of proper establishment of PIT. All that was availed was letter from CAO dated 06/03/2020 appointing the District Engineer, DEO, Environment Officer &amp; SAS as members of the PIT. <b>Apart from the Environment Officer, roles of the other members on this team were not stated. Also, CDO and Labor Officer were not designated as members of the team.</b></p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>For the FY 2019/2020, there was no project of upgrading HC II to HC III in Kotido DLG.</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records of daily reports from the Clerk of Works consolidated as weekly reports to the District Engineer and copied to the DHO.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records of site meetings. No minutes were available.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>For the FY 2019/2020, there was no project of upgrading HC II to HC III in Kotido DLG.</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>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>A sample of 3 request for payments to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the DHO did not make timely recommendations for payments to Contractors for project investments in the sector.</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 25,495,900 by M/s Alleluyah Enterprises Ltd for rehabilitation of staff house and pit latrine at Kamora HC 11 was made on the 17 June 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 19 June 2020, 2 days after the Request for payment had been made by the Contractor. Payment certificate No 1 was prepared by De and signed by DHO on 19 June 2020, 2 days after the Request for payment had been made by the Contractor.. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT No. 30505855</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 3,461,500 by M/s Miraculous Limited for fencing of Kotido HC1V was made on the 11 May 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 11 May 2020 i.e. the same day as the request for payment was made by the Contractor. Payment certificate No 11 was prepared by DE on the 12 May 2020 and signed by the DHO on the 12 May 2020, a day after the request for payment was made by the Contractor. Payment was made on the 8 June 2020 EFT No. 29839738</p> <p>Request for payment of Ugx 11,482,530 by M/s Zenith Civil and Water Engineering for work done on a twin staff house block at Kotido HC was made on the 10 March 2020. The DHO forwarded the payment request on the 14 June 2020, 95 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor. Payment certificate No 11 was prepared by DE and signed by DHO on the 14 June 2020. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT No. 30505838.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>For the project executed under health the previous FY, there were complete procurement files as per PPDA guidelines as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of OPD Block Phase II at Apalopus Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00001 had the Evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, Work contract signed on 05/02/2019 and Contract decision minutes for Min.KOTICC/04i/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020.</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of OPD Block at Lokiding Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00007 had the Evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, Work contract signed on 05/02/2019 and Contract decision minutes Min.KOTICC/04u/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020.</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance Lined Latrine at Nakwakwa Health Centre II. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00006 had the Evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, Work contract signed on 05/02/2019 and Contract decision minutes Min.KOTICC/04viii/018/012/020 dated 18/12/2020.</li> </ol>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</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>Of the three sampled health facilities of ;Lokitelaebu HCIII, Rengen HCIII and Napumpum HCIII,there was no evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Lokiteleabu HCII had a placenta pit ,Regen HCIII had an incinerator and placenta pit, Napumpum HCIII had an incinerator and placenta pit.All the three health facilities segregate their waste in different bins.The money for paying the support staff( cleaners) is derived from the PHC budget.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kotido DLG conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management as per the sampled health facilities.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY</p> <p>Construction of a five stance pit latrine at Nakkwakwa H/C II had a costed ESM[P of UGX: 100,000</p> <p>Renovation of a twin staff house for medical staff at Kamor HCII had an ESMP costed at UGX: 100,000</p> <p>Renovation of a four stance lined pit latrine at Kamor HCII had a copsted ESMP of UGX: 100,000</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability at the time of this assessment.</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	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 Environment officer and CDO didnot conduct monthly support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence 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	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MWE MIS database does not show records on the water sources functionality for the current FY 20/21. However, according to the same Ministry MIS database for the previous FY 19/20, the percentage of functional sources stood at 74%.</p> <p>Kotido district has 5 sub-counties and a town council and each had a functionality rate as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rengen sub-county at 58%,</li> <li>o Kacheri sub-county at 65%,</li> <li>o Kotido sub-county at 90%,</li> <li>o Nakapelimoru sub-county at 86%,</li> <li>o Panyangara sub county at 86%,</li> <li>o Kotido town council at 77%.</li> </ul>	0
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MWE MIS database does not show records on the water and sanitation committees for the current FY 20/21.</p> <p>However, the percentage of facilities with functional Water and Sanitation Committees is 88% according to the Ministry MIS for the previous FY 19/20 i.e. 252 of 285 sources managed by WSCs have Water and Sanitation Committees that are functional.</p> <p>For example; from one of the sampled sources at Kotido Sub-County, Komaruk village, source number: DWD 69844, it comprised of 7 members, 4 women and 3 men and each household contributes 500 UGX per month per household.</p> <p>At the time of visit, the fees had not been requested for any O&amp;M work.</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> <p>a. Above 80% score 2</p> <p>b. 60 -80%: 1</p> <p>c. Below 60: 0</p> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The assessment system for LLG is yet to be developed</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> <p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p>	<p>The safe water coverage for Kotido district stands at 78%. The district has 5 sub counties and one town council as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rengen sub-county with safe water coverage at 74%,</li> <li>o Kacheri sub-county with safe water coverage at 74%,</li> <li>o Kotido sub-county with safe water coverage at 95%,</li> <li>o Kotido TC with safe water coverage at 95%</li> <li>o Nakapelimoru sub county with safe water coverage at 72%</li> <li>o Panyangara sub county with safe water coverage at 95%</li> </ul> <p>According to the annual Work plan/ budget approved and stamped by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Water and Environment on 13th August 2019 for the FY 2019/20, the total grant planned by Kotido District Water Office was 357,651,665 UGX for FY 2019/20 and four projects were planned and budgeted for under rural water development (299,604,273 UGX).</p> <p>The annual progress report Quarter 4 of the FY 19/20 signed and stamped by the CAO Kotido district on 15th July, 2020, indicated that four projects were implemented in the 6 sub-counties of; Kotido sub county, Panyangara sub county, Nakapelimoru sub county, Kacheri sub county, Rengen sub county, Kotido Municipality.</p> <p>Of these the sub counties with safe water coverage are: Nakapelimoru, Kacheri and Rengen.</p> <p>The planned implementations were as follows:</p>	2

Rehabilitation of 11 boreholes;

- o 4 boreholes in Panyangara sub-county,
- o 3 boreholes in Nakapelimoru sub-county
- o 3 boreholes in Rengen sub county
- o 2 boreholes in Kacheri sub county

Deep borehole drilling (Hand pumped);

- o 2 boreholes in Kotido sub-county,
- o 1 borehole in Panyangara sub-county,
- o 1 borehole in Nakapelimoru sub county.

Design of piped water supply scheme in Kacheri sub county.

Renovation of the DWO block in Kotido Municipality-central division.

The total cost for these planned implementations came to a total of 272,650,964 UGX. i.e.

- o 40,150,000 UGX for the rehabilitation of 11 boreholes (Unit cost for rehabilitation per borehole was 3,650,000 UGX),
- o 122,500,000 UGX for deep borehole drilling of 4 boreholes (unit cost of the borehole 24,500,000 UGX)
- o 65,000,000 UGX for the design of piped water supply scheme
- o 45,000,964 UGX for the renovation of DWO block

Therefore, the target for the sub counties with safe water coverage below district average i.e. for Rengen, Kacheri and Nakapelimoru was: 118,700,000 UGX.

Therefore, the percentage that was budgeted for the sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average comes to 43%.

All (100%) of the budgeted water projects in the sub county with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY 2019/20 were implemented.

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

The four sampled projects implemented in  
Kotido District indicated variations as  
follows:

**Project 1: Drilling of 4 boreholes** in Kotido,  
Panyangara and Nakapelimoru sub  
counties

Eng.'s Estimate: 122,500,000 UGX

Contract price: 91,686,000UGX

Variation: -25.15%

Therefore, the variation of the contract price  
for this project is **not within** +/- 20%

**Project 2: Design of piped water supply  
scheme** in Kacheri sub county

Eng.'s Estimate: 65,000,000UGX

Contract price: 64,100,000UGX

Variation: -1.38%

Therefore, the variation of the contract price  
for this project is **within** +/- 20%

**Project 3: Renovation of the DWO block**

Eng.'s Estimate: 45,000,964UGX

Contract price: 63,872,140 UGX

Variation: 41.9%

Therefore, the variation of the contract price  
for this project is **not within** +/- 20%

**Project 4: Rehabilitation for 11 boreholes**  
in Rengen, Nakapelimoru, Kacheri and  
Panyangara sub counties.

Estimate: 40,150,000 UGX

Contract price: 43,326,792UGX.

Variation: 7.9%

Therefore, the variation of the contract price  
for this project is **within** +/- 20%.

Additionally, there was also rehabilitation of  
1 more borehole in Panyangara sub county  
and this borehole was rehabilitated on the  
same budgeted cost.

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>According to the AWP for the FY 2019/20 and the Annual Budget Performance report of FY 2019/20, all the planned 4 projects were implemented and completed by end the FY 2019/20.</p> <p>All the projects (100%) were completed by the end of the FY 2019/20 though the DWO has not yet issued out completion certificates to the contractors because the retention period is not yet complete.</p> <p>For example the District Water Officer planned to rehabilitate 11 boreholes, and by the end of the previous FY 2019/20, had rehabilitated and completed 12 boreholes in Panyanagara, Rengen, Nakapelimoru and Kacheri sub counties.</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was no increase in the percentage of functional water supply points in Kotido district as indicated by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) MIS reports.</p> <p>FY 2018/19: 74% of functional water source points was registered (361 No, Sources) and for FY 2019/20: 74% functional water source points was registered (361 No, Sources).</p> <p>This indicated no increase of the functional water source points between the two financial years.</p>	0
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was no marked increase in the % of functional Water and Sanitation Committees in Kotido district as indicated by the MIS reports of the MWE.</p> <p>For the FY 2018/19: functional water and sanitation committees were 252 in number</p> <p>For the FY 2019/20: functional water and sanitation committees were still 252 in number.</p> <p>This indicated no increase of functional water and sanitation committees between the two financial years.</p>	0

**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

From the DWO records, WSS projects implemented in FY 2019/20 were accurately reported in the annual quarter 4 progress report as they were implemented.

Water sources/points in the annual progress report in the different sub counties include;

o Panyangara sub-county: Kalosarisich, Lokekangityang, Naguleangidod and Moruanadou

o Kotido sub county: Komaruk-Kopus, Kanayette 11-Nayan

o Nakapelimoru sub-county: Naram, Lomogol Kalongolemuge dam and Kopusang

o Rengen sub-county: Old Kokorio, Lokitelarengan and Lokoringole

o Kacheri sub-county: Napio and Longemnakot

The progress reports recorded and also the field inspections revealed that water points;

Borehole DWD No: 69844 completed by ICON Projects Ltd in FY 19/20 in Komuruk village Kotido sub-county,

Borehole DWD No: 69855 completed by ICON Projects Ltd in FY 19/20 in Lomogol village in Nakapelimoru sub-county,

Borehole DWD No: 69850 completed by ICON Projects Ltd in FY 19/20 in Moruanadou village Panyangara sub-county.

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2

Based on evidence from the quarterly reports Q1 and Q2, Q3 and Q4 dated 10th December 2019, 18th February 2020, 10th April 2020 and 15th July 2020 respectively and Form 1 reports filled by the district through the sub county staffs, there was evidence of quarterly information on sub county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water and community involvement in water and sanitation activities.

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO MIS records in the form of MS Excel reports indicated updated records on quarterly basis for new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities. i.e. for the quarter 4 dated 15th July, 2020 signed and stamped by the CAO Kotido district on 15th July 2020, Rural water functionality was at 74%, rural safe water coverage (access) at 78%. For example;

o Rengen sub county functionality was at 58% with safe water coverage at 74% and a population of 27,912,

o Kacheri sub county functionality was at 65% with safe water coverage at 74% and a population of 26,512,

o Kotido sub county functionality was at 90% with a safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 9630,

o Nakapelimoru sub county functionality was at 43% with a safe water coverage at 72% and a population of 22,806,

o Panyangara sub county functionality was at 86% with a safe water coverage at 95% and a population of 20,307,

o Kotido TC functionality was at 77% with safe coverage at 95% and;

Upon studying the annual work plan for the current FY 2020/21, it was observed that the DWO used the information gathered from the previous financial year 2019/20 to plan for this FY 2020/21; e.g. more facilities were allocated for the sub-counties with safe water coverages below the district average, e.g. Deep borehole drilling i.e. 2 boreholes in Kacheri sub county and 1 borehole in Nakapelimoru sub county, construction of piped water system in Kacheri sub county and borehole rehabilitation i.e. 5 boreholes in Nakapelimoru sub county, 5 boreholes in Kacheri sub county and 5 boreholes in Rengen sub county.



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>At the time of assessment, performance of LLGs had not been assessed.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Water department budgeted for the water staff under the LG estimates vote 528; these are; the District water officer, the water engineer, the borehole technician. The Assistant district water officer for community mobilisation is under funding of MWE.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DNR department budgeted for the water staff under the LG estimates vote 528. These were the physical planner, the environment officer and the Senior Land management officer, a staff surveyor, a forestry officer, Senior environment officer and Assistant records officer.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided showing that the staff under water officer were appraised</p>	0

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

There was no evidence of a capacity needs assessment report, training plan and a training report.

### 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 Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the current FY 2020/21 dated 15th August 2020 signed on 15th August 2020 by the CAO Kotido district indicated that 3 projects in water development were planned namely;

**Project 1:** Deep borehole drilling (hand pump) of 6 boreholes;

o 2 boreholes in Kacheri sub county,

o 2 boreholes in Panyangara sub county and

o 1 borehole in Nakapelimoru sub county

o 1 borehole in Kotido sub county

**Project 2:** Rehabilitation of 15 boreholes;

o 4 boreholes in Kotido sub county and

o 5 boreholes in Nakapelimoru sub county

o 5 boreholes in Kacheri sub county

o 6 boreholes in Panyangara sub county

**Project 3:** Construction of piped water system (borehole pumped) in Kacheri sub county.

All the projects are in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average with exception of;

2 deep borehole drilling in Panyangara sub county and 1 deep borehole drilling in Kotido sub county,

4 borehole rehabilitations in Kotido sub county and 6 borehole rehabilitations in Panyangara sub county which have safe water coverage above the district average.

The sub counties safe water coverages at

the beginning of the financial year were as follows:

Rengen sub county functionality was at 58% with safe water coverage at 74%.

Kacheri sub county functionality was at 65% with safe water coverage at 74%.

Kotido sub county functionality was at 90% with a safe water coverage at 95%.

Nakapelimoru sub county functionality was at 43% with a safe water coverage at 72%

Panyangara sub county functionality was at 86% with a safe water coverage at 95%.

Kotido TC functionality was at 77% with safe coverage at 95%.

The annual budget for the current year FY 2020/21 was 558,694,416 UGX that was planned for water development. Project 1, 2, and 3 above together have a budget allocation of 507,974,662 UGX according to the District Annual Work Plan.

For the FY 2020/21, the budget allocation to sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average is as follows;

- o Deep borehole drilling of 6 boreholes in Kacheri, Panyangara, Kotido and Nakapelimoru sub counties at 147,000,000UGX (unit cost for borehole is 24,500,000 UGX) therefore, target for sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average gives 73,500,000 UGX i.e. excluding the 2 boreholes at Kotido and Panyangara sub counties.

- o Rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in Nakapelimoru, Kotido, Kacheri, Panyangara and Rengen sub counties at 82,636,712 UGX: (unit cost for borehole is 3,305,468 UGX); therefore, target for sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average gives a total of 49,582,020 UGX i.e. excluding the boreholes at Kotido and Panyangara sub counties.

3. Construction of piped water system (borehole pumped) in Kacheri sub county at 278,337,950 UGX.

The total allocation therefore of the budget to sub- counties below district safe water coverage is 401,419,970 UGX.

Therefore, the budget allocation for the current FY allocated to sub-counties below the district average coverage is 79.02%

8

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence of notices placed on district notice board indicating budget allocations per source for water projects for the current FY 2020/21 in the respective sub counties; i.e.

A notice dated 17th November 2020, indicated budget allocations of the current 2020/21 of the sanitation facilities per source for each sub county.

From the district Q1 software stamped by Permanent Secretary of Ministry of Water and Environment on 10th January, 2020, indicated that the advocacy meeting was held on 16th December 2020 at the district water office boardroom, and the during the sub county advocacy meeting the budget plan for 2020/21 was discussed.

However, there was no evidence of notices indicating budget allocations per sources for water projects at the sub counties except in Panyangara sub county.

0

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

In the previous FY 2019/20, the district planned rehabilitation of 11 boreholes, deep drilling of 4 boreholes, design of the piped water system and renovation of DWO block.

Reviewed evidence provided from the list of WSS facilities implemented last FY 2019/20, and monitoring reports for the FY 2019/20 for quarter 4 indicated that monitoring was carried out for all projects;

Q4 monitoring report dated 17th June 2020 showed that monitoring of 8 rehabilitated boreholes in Rengen, Kacheri, Panyangara and Nakapelimoru sub counties, 4 deep drilling boreholes and construction of the DWO block works was done.

Some of challenges identified during Q4 monitoring were; rains made accessibility to the sites difficult and the contractor delayed to start the work due to COVID 19 pandemic.

4

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

Reviewed evidence from the DWSCC meeting minutes records indicated that the DWO held the quarterly DWSCC Meetings as follows:

The evidence provided from DWSCC minutes Q3 and Q4 dated 22nd January 2020 and 25th June 2020 prepared and signed by the DWO showed that they met on these dates and key issues on regular monitoring of sanitation and hygiene activities were discussed.

Some of the issues raised included; in quarter 4; inadequate co-ordination and reporting of sector players and their activities and gaps of staffing in the water office. These pertinent issues were not followed up.

However, there was no evidence that the DWO conducted DWSSCC meeting in Q1 and Q2 since there was no evidence of DWSCC minutes in Q3.

0

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

Budget allocations for the current FY2020/21 for the LLGs with safe water coverage below district average were publicized on the district notice board.

However, there was no evidence of budget allocation notices for the FY 2020/21 for the LLGs with safe water coverage below district average.

0

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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:

- If funds were allocated score 3
- If not score 0

The AWP for the previous FY 2019/20 signed and stamped by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Water and Environment on 5th August 2019 indicated 37,245,412 UGX under the NWR.

Of this 33,360,872 UGX (**87%**) was allocated to facilitate community mobilization activities e.g.

o DWSSCC meetings costed 4,044,000 UGX

o Mandatory public notices costed 400,000 UGX

o Extension staff meetings costed at 2,002,000 UGX

o Travel inland and communications costed 2,720,000 UGX

o O & M Vehicles costed 4,600,000 UGX

o O & M motorcycles costed 400,000 UGX

o Fuel and lubricants costed 2,040,007 UGX

o O & M office equipment costed 500,000

o Office utilities costed 1,505,028 UGX

o Construction supervision visits to resilience water projects costed 2,500,000 UGX

o Inspection of water points after construction costed 387,000 UGX

o Regular data collection and analysis costed 1,122,000 UGX

o Bank charges costed 1,200,000 UGX

o Planning and advocacy meetings at district costed 2,417,000UGX

o Planning and advocacy meetings at sub-county costed 970,500UGX

o Sensitize communities to fulfil critical requirements costed 1,555,000 UGX

o Establishing water user committees costed 940,000 UGX

o Training WUC costed 940,000 UGX

o Post construction support to (WUCs) software steps costed 2,020,337UGX

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>From the District software report dated 5th June 2020, there was evidence that the DWO and CDO trained the WSCs on their roles in O&amp;M of WSS facilities.</p> <p>From the field inspections, Irar Loumolo a care taker on the WUC in Komaruk village in Kotido sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&amp;M and as a committee, they collect 500 UGX from each household per month as contribution to O&amp;M.</p> <p>Lochum Lotilem a member on the WUC in Moruanadou village Panyangara sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&amp;M and as a committee, they collect 1000 UGX from each household as contribution to O&amp;M.</p> <p>Ayomei a member on the WUC in Lomogol village Nakapelimoru sub county was interviewed and clearly noted that they were trained on their roles on O&amp;M and as a committee, they contribute in kind from each household as contribution to O&amp;M.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

**Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no up to date assets register.</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>b. Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG did not desk appraisal reports that showed that prioritized investments for FY2020/21 were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines.</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>There was no evidence of community applications for the FY 2020/21</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>The DLG did not provide project field appraisal reports for prioritized investments to confirm whether they were appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, customized designs for WSS projects for FY2020/21</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 evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction;</p> <p>Screening for drilling ,pump testing and casting of borehole at Kanyatte II was done on 12/02/2020. the ESMP was prepared and costed at UGX:100,000 on 20/07/2019</p> <p>Screening for drilling,pump testing and casting of bore hole at Komurukopus was done on 12/02/2020.The ESMP was prepared and costed at UGX: 100,000 on 20/07/2020</p> <p>Screenig for construction of a water borne toilet at works department was done on 16/04/2020.The ESMP was prepared and costed at UGX: 500,000 on 20/07/2020</p>	2



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

a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

The LG approved Procurement Plan for 2020/2021 prepared by the PDU on 20/10/2020 and received by PPDA on 29/10/2020 had the following water infrastructure investments;

I) Siting, Drilling, Pump Testing, Casting & Installation of 6 hand pump with proven cattle troughs boreholes in selected Sub Counties budgeted at UGX 147,000,000 under DWSCG.

II) Completion of Water Supply Scheme in Napeikar-Losakucha Parish – Kacheri Sub County budgeted at UGX 278,337,500 under DWSCG.

III) Design of Mini Piped Water System in Napeikar-Kacheri Sub County budgeted at UGX 19,540,000 under DWSCG.

IV) Rehabilitation of 25 Boreholes in select Sub Counties budgeted at UGX 82,636,712 under DWSCG.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>Three projects executed under water for the previous FY were sampled. These were approved by the contracts committee as follows;</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>1. Drilling of Four Boreholes. Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00003 approved under Min.KOTICC/04i/014/01/2020 on 14/01/2020 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</p>	
			<p>2. Renovation of Water Office. Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00015 approved under Min.KOTICC/04x/018/012/2019 on 18/12/2019 before commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</p>	
			<p>3. Rehabilitation of 12 Hand Pump Boreholes. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00014 approved under Min.KOTICC/04iii/06/05/2020 on 06/05/2020 after commencement of works on 05/02/2020.</p>	
			<p><b>The project Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00014 was approved on 06/05/2020 after commencement of works on 05/02/2020.All the other projects were approved before commencement of works.</b></p>	

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 of proper establishment of the PIT. All that was provided were letters from CAO dated 21/04/2020 appointing Assistant Water Officer as the Project Manager for the project Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00003, DWO as Project Manager for the project Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00015, the Borehole Maintenance Technician Mr. Lokiru Paul Loojo as the Project Manager for the project Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00014 and the District Engineer as Project Supervisor for all construction works.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p><b>All other members of the PIT were not appointed.</b></p>	

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 technical drawing of the borehole signed and stamped by the DWO on 25th November 2019 were standard with the scale of 1: 1.</p> <p>From the field inspections of the three boreholes in Panyamangara, Kotido and Nakapelimoru sub Counties, it was evidenced that the boreholes were constructed as per the technical designs including the drain, the apron, the spout and the handpump were all seen.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS projects.</p> <p>All that was availed was progress report for the rehabilitation of 12 Boreholes in Kotido District from the Project Manager to the District Engineer through the DWO. <b>Only the Assistant Water Officer participated in preparing this report, there was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO participated in supervising the project.</b></p> <p><b>No reports were provided for all other projects.</b></p>	0

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

A sample of request for payment to suppliers/contractors in FY2019/20 showed that the DWO did not make timely payments to Contractors.

Request for payment of Ugx 38,992,392 was made by M/s Cimton Investments Limited on the 13 May 2020 for rehabilitation of 12 boreholes. The DWO forwarded payment request 33 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 15 June 2020). The DE and DWO signed payment certificate no 1, on the 15 and 17 June 2020 respectively. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT No 30505831, 43 days after the Contractor requested for payments

Request for payment of Ugx 30,111,000 was made by M/s Iwonpei Genral Hardware Ltd on the 30 March 2020 for renovation of water office block. The DWO forwarded payment request 38 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 7 May 2020). The DE prepared and DWO signed payment certificate no 1 on the 11 May 2020. Payment was made on the 25 June 2020 EFT 30505843, 86 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor.

Request for payment of Ugx 64,100,000 was made by M/s Terracon Technical Works (UG) Ltd on the 15 May 2020 for design of piped water supply system at Rikitae RGC. The DWO forwarded payment request 13 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor (i.e. 28 May 2020). The DE and DWO signed payment certificate no 1, on the 1 June 2020 and 27 May 2020. Payment made on the 25 June 2020 EFT 30505830, 41 days after the request for payment was made by the Contractor.

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>Procurement files for the projects executed in the previous FY were available in the PDU as per PPDA guidelines as follows;</p> <p>1. Drilling of Four Boreholes. Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00003 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, a works contract dated 05/02/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.KOTICC/04i/014/01/2020 dated 14/01/2020.</p> <p>1. Renovation of Water Office. Ref. KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00015 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, a works contract dated 05/02/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.KOTICC/04x/018/012/2019 dated 18/12/2019.</p> <p>2. Rehabilitation of 12 Hand Pump Boreholes. Ref.KOTI528/WRKS/19-20/00014 had an evaluation report signed by the evaluation committee on 13/12/2019, a works contract dated 05/02/2020 and records of contracts committee meeting Min.KOTICC/04iii/06/05/2020 dated 06/05/2020.</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>There was no 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>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; 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	Of the three sampled water sources of Komaruk, Moroumadau and Lomogol, there was no evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were 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	There was evidence of land agreements letters provided for the two projects implemented in FY 2019/20 i.e.  o Land agreement signed between Namuya and LC1 Lokutan John for the Kamaruk borehole in Kotido sub county.  o Land agreement signed between Lowany Lukwa and LC1 Arion Lokodou for the Kanayete borehole in Kotido sub county.	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 was no evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environment Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	The Environment Officer and CDO didnot undertake monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and didnot provide monthly reports:	0

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

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities</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>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities</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>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG staffing structure has a total of 30 Extension workers for LLGs, but there was a total of 12 Extension workers shared among the 5 sub counties making a percentage of 43% staffing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awilli Anna Gracea Vet officer appointed under Min. No. 19/DSC/KTD/2018/01 dated 31/1/2018</li> <li>2. Ogwang Emmanuel Okol a vet. Officer appointed under Min. No. 18/DSC/KTD/2017/02 dated 28/4/2017</li> <li>3. Obin Benard Eriya appointed under Min. No. 17/DSC/KTD/2016/28 dated 24/5/2016</li> </ol>	0



4. Ogwang Constantine an Assis. Animal husbandry officer appointed under Min. No. 07/2004 dated 21/1/2004

5. Ocheng Bradford an Assis. Agricultural officer appointed under Min. No. 07/2004 dated 21/1/2004

6. Achilan Bradford Angola An Assist. Animal husbandry officer appointed under Min. No.21/2004 dated 1/9/2004

7. Longoli Joseph a Vet officer appointed under Min. No.17/DSC/KTD/2016/26 dated 24/5/2016

8. Toola Dan an Agricultural officer appointed under Min. No.17/DSC/KTD/2016/31 dated 24/5/2016

9. Okello Godfrey Ewol an Agricultural officer appointed under Min. No.18DSC/KTD/2017/3 dated 28/4/2017

10. Dodoi Janet OLoluk an Assistant Animal Husbandry officer appointed under Min. No.18/DSC/KTD/2018/04 dated 31/1/2018

11. Illukol Dennis Assistant Animal husbandry officer appointed under Min. No.18/DSC/KTD/2018/03 dated 31/1/2018

12. Longol Anthony Assistant animal Husbandry officer appointed under Min. No.18/DSC/KTD/2018/02 dated/ 31/1/2018

13. Ajok Janet an assistant animal husbandry officer appointed under Min. No.7/2004 dated 21/1/2004

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 because the LG does not have micro scale irrigation projects yet	<b>0</b>
	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 because the LG does not have micro scale irrigation projects yet	<b>0</b>
	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	According to the staffing list obtained from the HRM division, there was evidence that positions	<b>2</b>
	Maximum score 4			
			of extension workers filled is accurate in the sub counties visited.	
			In Rengen Sub County, the position of AO was filled by Illukol Denis, while the Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was filled by Dodoi Janet Lokuk	
			In Panyangara SC, the AO post was filled by Ocen Tonny Mark while the AAHO was Ajok Janet	
			In Nakaperimoru SC, the AO is Okello Godfrey Ewol while the Veterinary officer is Ogwang Emmanuel Okol	

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, the LG does not have micro scare irrigation projects yet	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, LLG assessment has not yet started</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable, LLG assessment has not yet started	0
---	--	--	--	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG under Vote 528 budgeted for a total of 86,781,000 as wage for extension workers.	1
---	--	---	---	---

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	There was evidence that extension workers were working where they are deployed for instance at Panyangara SC, there were two extension staff confirmed to be working there (Ajok Janet the AAHO and Ocen Tonny Mark an Agricultural Officer)	1
---	--	---	--	---

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	There was evidence that extension workers were working where they are deployed for instance at Panyangara SC, there were two extension staff confirmed to be working there (Ajok Janet the AAHO and Ocen Tonny Mark an Agricultural Officer)	2
---	--	---	--	---

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>All LLGs had displayed staff lists on the noticeboards including the extension workers</p>	2
<p>Maximum score 6</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the above LLG extension workers were appraised in the FY 2019/2020 for instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awilli Anna Gracea Vet officer was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> <li>2. Ogwang Emmanuel Okol a vet. Officer was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> <li>3. Ogwang Constantine an Assis. Animal husbandry was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> <li>4. Ocheng Bradford an Assis. Agricultural officer was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> <li>5. Achilan Bradford Angola An Assist. Animal husbandry officer was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> <li>6. Longoli Joseph a Vet officer was appraised on 26/6/2020</li> </ol>	1
<p>Maximum score 4</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that in the PIPs of 15th September 2020, the production department recommended for attachment and mentorship in surgical proficiency for the animal husbandry officers while some were recommended for further training to upgrade their skills and submitted to the training committee.</p>	1
<p>Maximum score 4</p>				

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of training activities conducted. No training reports were provided as evidence of the same	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was presented that training activities were carried out and documented	0

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	The DLG did not receive micro scale irrigation grant and therefore did not plan for any activities under Micro- Scale Irrigation projects.	0

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

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG	0

## Investment Management



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-scale Irrigation not applicable in the LG</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	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 was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	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 Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	The DLG did not receive Micro Irrigation Grant, therefore did not have micro irrigation activities	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	0
----	--	--	---	---

### Environment and Social Requirements

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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	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. There was no micro scale irrigation in Kotido DLG .	0
----	--	---	---	---

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

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The post of Civil Engineer is substantively by Logole Paul Bertrand who was appointed under Minute No. 19/DSC/KTD/2017(01) dated 28/4/2017	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Assistant Water officer for mobilization is substantively filled by Oyugi Nancy Grace who was appointed under Min. No. 05/DSC/KTD/SEP/2020 (66) dated 2/10/2020	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Borehole Maintenance Technician is substantively filled by Lokiru Paul who was recruited under Min No. 7/2004 dated 21/1/2004	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	The position of Natural Resources Officer is not in the District approved structure of 30/8/2017 (Ref.ARC/135/306/01)	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Environment Officer is substantively filled by Kiyonga Joseph who was appointed under Min. No 10/2004 dated 9/3/2004	10

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of Forestry officer is substantively filled by Olal Joel who was appointed under Min. No. 18/DSC/KTD/2017 (07) dated 28/4/2017	10
---	--	--	---	----

### Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out;  Screening for drilling ,pump testing and casting of two boreholes at Kanayette II and at Kamonkopus was conducted on 12/02/2020  Screening for drilling,pump testing and casting of two boreholes at Rikitae and Lomogol was done on 14/02/2020  Screening for construction of a water borne toilet at works department was conducted on 16/04/2020	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	No projects under water qualified undertaking an Environment and Social Impact Assessment after as per the recommendations of the ESMPs	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Drilling permit was issued to ICON projects LTD ,DP06983/DW/2019 by the Director of Water Development on 23/07/2019	10



No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:  a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The post of DHO is substantively filled by Achar Cerino who was appointed under Minute 18/DSC/KTD/2017 (05) DATED 28/4/2017	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The post of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing is substantively filled by Achia Deborah 05/DSC/KTD/2017(11) dated 2/10/2020	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.  Applicable to Districts only.  Maximum score is 70	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector is substantively filled by Annyu Jennifer who was appointed under Min. No. 42/2007 dated 28/9/2007	10

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator is substantively filled Achuma Tonny who was appointed under 09/2009 dated 17/7/2009</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The position of Biostatistician is substantively filled by Owiny Jim Ronald who was appointed under Min No. 42/2007 dated 28/9/2007</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Cold Chain Technician is substantively filled by Mwenyi Noah who was appointed under Min. No. 18/DSC/KTD/2019(A) 03 dated 3/5/2019</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for Health infrastructure projects;

Screening for construction of a five stance pit latrine was conducted on 18/02/2020

Screening for renovation of a twin staff house for medical staff at Kamor HCII was conducted on 24/03/2020

Screening for renovation of a four stance lined latrine at Kamor Health centre II was conducted on 24/03/2020

The ESMPs were prepared and costed on 20/07/2019

15

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

No project under Health qualified undertaking an ESIA after screening and preparing ESMPs.

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of DEO is not substantively filled and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from the CG</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The post of Inspector of School is substantively filled by Otim Carl Marx who was appointed under Min. No. 49/DSC/KTD/2018(205) dated 24/7/2018 however, the Inspector of schools position is vacant and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from the MOES</p>	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p><i>The Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was conducted for all Education projects for the previous FY as thus;</p> <p>Screening for construction of a two stance lined latrine for teachers at Rengen primary school was conducted on 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for construction of a four stance lined latrine for boys at Lokiding p/s was conducted on 20/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for Construction of a boys' dormitory at Kacheri SSS was conducted on 16/12/2019</p> <p>The Environment and Social management Plans for all projects were prepared and costed on 20/07/2019</p>	15

2

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

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

Environment and social screening and costed ESMPs was done and prepared for all projects under Education ,none of the project qualified undertaking an Environment and Social Impact Assessment.

15

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The district has a substantively appointed CFO Akello Hilda who was recruited under Min. No. 47/2007 dated 10/12/2007	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Planner is not substantively appointed and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer is not substantively filled and there was no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of DNRO is substantively filled by Oming George William who was appointed under Min. No. 35/2006 dated 28/9/2007	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of District Production officer is not substantively filled and there was no evidence to show that the district requested for secondment staff from the CG.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	The post of District Community Development Officer is not substantively filled and there was no evidence to show that the district requested for secondment staff from the CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer,  score 3 or else 0	The post of District Commercial Officer is not substantively filled and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	The post of senior Procurement officer is substantively filled by Ojuka Dennie who was appointed under Min. No. 18/DSC/KTD/217/(01) dated 28/4/2017	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	The post of procurement officer is substantively filled by Awidi Lilian Noel who was appointed under Min. 51/2007 dated 22/12/2007	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The post of PHRO is substantively filled by Natyang Cecelia who was appointed under Min. No. 22/DSC/KTD/2015(01) dated 27/5/2015	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The post of SEO is substantively filled by Lokiru Christine who was appointed under Min. No. 17/DSC/KTD/2016/52 dated 24/5/2016	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of SMLO is substantively filled by Draleru Harriet who was appointed under Min. No. 17/DSC/KTD/2016(51) dated 24/5/2016	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The post Senior Accountant is substantively filled by Oyoo Sammy Simpson who was appointed under Min. 09/2009 dated 17/7/2009	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The post of Senior Internal Auditor is substantively filled by 22/DSC/KTD/2015(25) dated 27/5/2015	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The PHRO for DSC is vacant and there is no evidence that the LG requested for secondment of staff from CG	0
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:  a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0	There is a total of 5 functional sub counties with only substantively recruited SASs as follows;  1. Akello Hellen in Kotido Sub County (52/2007 dated 22/12/2007)  2. Otim Denis Diaz in Rengen Sub County (49/2007 dated 22/12/2007)  3. Aleper Christine Nagira in Panyangara Sub County (04/2011 dated 18/4/2011)  4. Lokol Rebecca in Nakaperimor Sub county (17/DSC/KTD/2016(01) DATED 24/5/2016)  5. Ariko Maxwell in Kacheri Sub County (04/2011 dated 18/4/2011)	5



2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>In the 5 sub counties, there are 5 substantively appointed CDOs as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lepera David who was appointed under Min. No. 17/DSC/KTD/2016 (57) dated 24/5/2016</li> <li>2. Acheng Josephine who was appointed under Min. No.17/DSC/KTD/2016(58) dated 24/5/2016</li> <li>3. Moding David who was appointed under Min. No.49/DSC/KTD/2018(419) dated 24/7/2018</li> <li>4. Negaga Irene who was appointed under Min. No.49/DSC/KTD/2018(436) dated 24/7/2018</li> <li>5. Baari Francis who was appointed under Min. No.17/DSC/KTD/2016(59) dated 24/5/2016</li> </ol>	5
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District has a total of 5 substantively appointed SAAs and AAs for each LLGs as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acheng Albina Lokiru who was appointed under Min. No. 19/DSC/KTD/2019 dated 3/5/2019</li> <li>2. Okori Francis who was appointed under Min. No.17/DSC/KTD/2016(19) dated 2/5/2016</li> <li>3. Aching Kinby who was appointed under Min. No. 05/2010 dated 23/7/2010</li> <li>4. Awidi graceline Okello who was appointed under Min. No. 36/2005 dated 14/9/2005</li> <li>5. Achan Mary Stella who was appointed under Min. No. 35/2007 dated 27/3/2007</li> </ol>	5

**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 DLG only warranted 99% of the budget allocated to the department of Natural Resources.

Working

Release/Warrants\*100=

247,032,729/250,782,729\*100=  
98.50%

Source:

Page 10 Draft Accounts FY 2019/20 received by the Accountant General's Office on the 17 September 2020

Natural resources Budget Ugx  
250,782,729

Warrants Ugx  
247,032,729

0

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

The DLG only warranted 53% of the budget allocated to the Community Based Services department.

Working

Release/Warrants\*100=

287,465,549/546,357,554\*100=  
52.61%

Source:

Page XX Draft Accounts FY 2019/20

Community Based Services Budget Ugx 546,357,554

Warrants Ugx 287,465,549

0

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Kotido DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening as observed below;</p> <p>Screening for Construction of a five stance pit latrine at Nakwakwa was done on 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for Construction of Kachri subcounty admnistration block was done on 24/03/2020</p> <p>Screening for fencing of Rengen subcounty cattle market was conducted on 18/02/2020</p> <p>Screening for Completion of fencing and gate at Nakapelimoru was done on 24/03/2020</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0</p>	<p>All projects that were screened and had their ESMPs developed didnot qualify undergoing an Environment and social Impact Assessment.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Kotido DLG had costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);</p> <p>Construction of Kacheri admnistration block had acosted ESMP of UGX:300,000</p> <p>Fencing of Rengen subcounty cattle market had a costed ESMP of UGX:100,000</p> <p>Renovation of two pit latrines at Rengen subcounty headquarters had a costed ESMP of UGX:50,000</p> <p>Completion of fencing and gate at Nakapelimoru subcounty headquarters had a costed ESMP of UGX:80,000</p>	4

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Audit of financial statements for FY 2019/20 by OAG is still ongoing. Results of the audit will be assessed in January 2021.</p>	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>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Review of responses of the DLG to PS/ST at the District Headquarters showed that the DLG submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General recommendations after the 29 February 2020.</p> <p>Ref:CR/252/3 Responses to report of the Internal Auditor General for the year ended June 2019 submitted to the PS/ST on the 23 December 2019</p> <p>Responses to unresolved issues in the internal Auditor General Report and Auditor General Report for the period ending June 2019 submitted to the PS/ST on the 29 June 2020.</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Annual Performance Contract for the DLG for FY 2020/21 was generated in PBS on the 02 June 2020 11:38 1 (Source: budget.go.ug). List of LG submissions provided by MoFPED also showed that the DLG submitted this document on the 8 June 2020, before the 31 August 2020.</p>	4
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>maximum score 4 or else 0</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>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>Review of list of LG submissions provided by MoFPED showed that DLG submitted Annual Performance Report FY 2019/20 to MoFPED on the 3 October 2020, after the 31 August 2020 deadline. All quarterly budget performance reports for FY2019/20 were rejected by MoFPED and re submissions accepted on the 3 October 2020.</p>	0

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 DLG submitted all the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for FY2019/20 after the 31 August 2020. i.e.

Report submission dated shared by MoFPED

Q1 BPR FY 2019/20 resubmitted to MoFPED on the 3 October 2020

Q2 BPR FY 2019/20 resubmitted to MoFPED on the 3 October 2020

Q3 BPR FY 2019/20 resubmitted to MoFPED on the 3 October 2020

Q4 BPR FY 2019/20 resubmitted to MoFPED on the 3 October 2020