



LGMSD 2021/22

Pallisa District

(Vote Code: 548)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	74%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	100%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	85%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	65%
Health Performance Measures	48%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	66%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	20%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were being utilized for the purpose intended. Examples of three projects were:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Administration Block Phase IV on page 35 of the AWP was reported on page 28 of the annual budget performance report. 2. Kaboloi-Agule road on page 95 of AWP was report on page 72 of the annual performance report. 3. Renovation of medicine store and X-Ray Department of Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of the AWP and on page 65 of the annual performance report. 	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	Awaiting LLG Assessment Results	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were completed at the end of FY 2021/2022</p> <p>They included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Administration Block Phase IV on page 35 of the AWP and was reported on page 28 of the annual budget performance report at 100% completion rate. 2. Kaboloi-Agule road on page 95 of AWP was report on page 72 of the annual performance report was completed at 100%. 3. Renovation of medicine store and X-Ray Department of Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of the AWP and on page 65 of the annual performance report was completed at 100%. 	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>It was established that all the DDEG projects implemented were within the implementation guidelines for instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Administration Block Phase IV on page 35 of the AWP was reported on page 28 of the annual budget performance report at shs. 74,837.397 2. Renovation of medicine store and X-Ray Department of Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of the AWP and on page 65 of the annual performance report 2021/2022. 3. Renovation of office of the district chairperson at shs 7,725,000 4. Construction of Pallisa S/C administration block with contract sum of Ugx 59,414,323 	2

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of office of the district chairperson with a contract sum Ugx 7,725,000,engineers estimates Ugx 7,715,253 ,Variations =Ugx 9,747,%Variations =0.13%. • Construction of administration block at Opwateta S/C with contract sum Ugx 74,837,397,engineers estimate Ugx 75,000,000,Variations =Ugx-162,603,% Variations =-0.22% • Construction of Pallisa S/C administration block with contract sum of Ugx 59,414,323,engineers estimates Ugx 60,000,000,Variations =Ugx -585,677,%Variation =-1% 	2
---	--	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that information on the position filled in the LLGs was not accurate as per minimum staffing standards in the 3 sampled LLGs; for instance, Puti Puti S/C staff list had 11 staff while the HRM staff list indicated 10, Pallisa T/C staff list had 31 workers and the HRM staff list indicated 31 and Kamuge S/C, the staff list had 10 staff while at the HRM staff list indicated 9.	0
4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Administration Block Phase IV on page 35 of the AWP was reported on page 28 of the annual budget performance report. 2. Kaboloi-Agule road on page 95 of AWP was report on page 72 of the annual performance report. 3. Renovation of medicine store and X-Ray Department of Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of the AWP and on page 65 of the annual performance report 	2

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence availed during the time of assessment.	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the district had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance for FY 2021/22. For instance, the analysis showed that for the month of October 2021, under administration, 3 staff out of 19 were on official leave and didn't attend. In the same month, Akello Priscilla the Clinical Officer attended for 22 days (100%), and Omolo Juma, HRO attended for 11 days (50%). Similarly, a report for the month of July 2021 revealed that Odelle Francis the PHRO attended for 8 days (38%), Kutaira Sanula the OA, attended for 21 days (100%), and with February 2022, 8 out of 19 staff under administration were on official leave and none of the staff was absent without approval, November 2021 results of the analysis showed that Okello Martin DCAO attended for 20 days (91%), Okia John, PAS attended for 17 days (77%) and only 2 people were on official leave.	2

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

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

FY: Score 1 or else 0

Evidence showed that HoDs were appraised by the CAO, Mr. Oola Donate Olam as per the following details;

1. Kirya Herbert, CFO was appraised on 29/6/2022

2. 2.Mukesi Robert, District Planner was appraised on 15/7/2022.

3. Ongwara Michael, District Engineer was appraised on 11/7/2022.

4. Mulekwa Godfrey District Health Officer was appraised on 29/6/2022

5. Ingurat Christine District Commercial Officer was appraised on 27/6/2022.

6. Samuka Muhamed District Natural Resource Officer was appraised on 14/7/2021.

7. Wamire Dawson, District Community Development Officer was appraised on 10/7/2022.

8. Nalapa Tasima Martha, the Ag. District Production Officer was appraised on 30/6/2022.

9. Lukembo Agnes Ag. District Education Officer was appraised on 20/6/2022.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

Evidence showed that the Rewards and Sanctions committee was constituted on 2/12/2021 by CAO with five (5) members appointed as detailed below;

- Mr. Okello Martin Ag. DCAO/Chairperson

- Dr. Mulekwa Godfrey (DHO) Member

- Mr. Odelle Francos (PHRO) Secretary

- Miss. Lukendo Agnes (Ag. DEO) Member.

- Onyait George (Senior Labour Officer) Member

The committee for instance held a meeting on 28th June, 2022 under Min No. 5/RSC/28/6/2022, where they handled the case of Musebula Muhamuudu, a headteacher of Kalapata P/S who had been absent from duty for a period of 3 months after the COVID lockdown.

On the same case under Min. No.6/RSC/28/6/2022 gave Musebula Muhamuudu to show cause for his continuous absenteeism from duty. In response, he narrated that during that period, he had travelled to Arua to attend to his sick Aunt and he also fell sick and was diagnosed with Pneumonia and lung cancer that was in early stages.

Under Min. No.7/RSC/28/6/2022, the committee concluded that Musebula Muhamuudu be pardoned however, he was told to write an apology letter to the CAO.

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence on the establishment of a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress during the time of assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The Local Government did not recruit staff for FY 2021/22 because the DSC committee was not fully constituted and their terms of office had expired.</p>	0
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>A sample of 10 reviewed list of the staff that retired during FY 2021/22 showed that some retired staff had accessed pension payroll in a period of more than two months and others had not accessed at the time of assessment as per the details provided here under;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kisambila Moses Stephen, Clinical Officer (IPPS no. 759388) retired on 19/8/2021 and accessed payroll in October 2022, 2. Acam Rose, Education Assistant II (IPPS no. 483754) retired on 9/10/2021 and accessed payroll in August 2022, 3. Richard Oullo Omagar, Assistant Agricultural Officer (IPPS no. 966754) retired on 4/4/2022 and accessed payroll in May, 2022, 4. Obuya Vincent, Deputy Headteacher (IPPS no. 477882) retired on 17/4/2022 and accessed payroll in May 2022, 5. Okot Bodo Richard, Principal Veterinary Officer (IPPS no. 865791) 	0

retired on 4/1/2022 and accessed payroll in May 2022,

6. John Seku, parish chief (IPPS no. 865724) retired on 12/1/2022 and hadn't accessed payroll at the time of assessment

7. Lugose Betty, a stenographer secretary (IPPS no. 835834) retired on 5/1/2022 and accessed payroll in March 2022.

8. Okoboi Joseph Innocent, Principal Agricultural Officer (IPPS no. 865674) retired on 3/1/2022 and accessed payroll in March, 2022,

9. Sumaka Juma, a driver (IPPS no. 835795) retired on 12/1/2022 and hadn't accessed payroll at the time of assessment.

Among the reasons for the delayed access was; a mismatch in dates of birth on the National IDs that delayed the verification exercise.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	For FY 2021/2022 DDEG transfers to the LLGs were executed in accordance with requirement of the budget as follows:
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	1stQrt was transferred on 28/7/2021 shs.473,042,806. 2ndQrt. transferred on 1/11/2021 shs.473,042,826 and 3rdQrt. on 1/01/2022 shs.473,042,826

10	0	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):	<p>The District did warranting/verification of DDEG transfers to LLGs as follows:</p> <p>1stQrt. released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and LG warranted on 27/7/2021 (after 10 working days).</p> <p>2ndQrt. released on 15/10/2021 and warranted on 22/10/2022 (after 6 working days).</p> <p>3rdQrt released on 5/01/2022 and warranted on 07/01/2022 (after 2 days).</p> <p>The District did not do warranting/verification of DDEG transfers to LLGs within 5 working days.</p>		
Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	10	0	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	<p>The District invoiced and communicated DDEG transfers to LLGs as follows:</p> <p>1stQrt funds released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and communicated to LLGs on 28/7/2021 (after 10 working days).</p> <p>2ndQrt released on 15/10/2021 and communicated on 4/11/2021 (after 14 working days).</p> <p>3rdQrt. released on 5/01/2022 and Communicated 11/01/2022 (after 5 working days).</p> <p>The District did not timely invoice and communicated the DDEG transfers to LLGs within 5 working days.</p>
Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 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 District conducted supervision or mentored LLGs on a quarterly basis. ;</p> <p>1stQrt. Report (not dated),</p> <p>2ndQrt on 11/01/2022,</p> <p>3rdQrt. on 30/3/2022 and</p> <p>4thQrt on 15/6/2022.</p>	2
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>Support supervision and mentoring was done on quarterly basis jointly by political wing and technical officers. The reports were produced as follow:</p> <p>1stQrt. report (not dated), 2ndQrt on 11/01/2022, 3rdQrt. on 30/3/2022 and 4thQrt on 15/6/2022. The reports were presented to the TPC discussion for example their meeting held on 5/01/2022 under Min. 44/5/Jan/2022discussed 1 Qrt report of the monitoring visit in which planner presented the projects monitored.</p>	2

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><i>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</i></p>	<p>The District which was on IFMS maintained an up-dated assets register covering Land, Furniture and Fittings, Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment, Machinery, Buildings, Roads and Bridges, Natural assets-Forest, Nature Assets-Minerals and Inventory- Stores.</p> <p>Each category had own details recorded for example Land had: Description, Asset category, Site/Plot No., Title Deed No., Plot Type, Current Status, Date of Acquisition, Purpose, Cost, Department, Section, physical Location, Date of Registration.</p>	2
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 District had in place a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 compiled and endorsed by members of the Board. A copy was submitted to the Accountant General on 24/8/2022. In the report asset management decisions were made e.g. a list of unserviceable items were recommended for disposal for being broken, grounded, not being in working position, in a very poor position, obsolete or worn out.</p>	1

12	2	<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>A sixteen members physical planning committee were appointed on 9/7/2020. During FY ended 30/6/2022 the committee held four meeting and their minutes were submitted to MoLHUD and acknowledged by stamping as follows: 1stQrt. Minutes were submitted on 30/9/2021, 2ndQrt Minutes on 10/01/2022, 3rdQrt Minutes on 11/3/2022 and 4thQrt on 30/6/2022.</p>
12	2	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District through District Planner, DNRO,DCDO, and Senior Planner, conducted desk appraisal for all projects.</p> <p>On the DDEG projects the committee noted the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of the Administration Block was indicated on page 52 of the DDP and on page 7 of the Guidelines under Administration. 2. Kaboloi-Agule road appealed on page 51 of the DDP and page 8 of the Guidelines under District Engineering Services. 3. Renovation of the medical store and X-Ray Department at Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of DDP and page 7-8 of the Guidelines under District Hospital and Primary Health Care. Finally the committee recommended funding the projects.

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>For each project, the environmental and social screening forms were filled and endorsed by Natural Resources officer and Community Development officer on behalf of the others. All the criteria for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design were ticked right and final recommended implementation of ESMP for the year.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Project profiles and costing were developed and presented to the TPC for discussion. In their meeting of 5/01/2022 under Min. 47//5/2022, TPC noted the highlights presented by the planner and observed that the profiles had taken into account environmental and social safety issues.</p>	1

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG had screened projects for the current FY 2022/2023

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Agurur village in Kibale sub-county was done on 4th /10/2022 activity was conducted by the DNRO and DCDO

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Aujabule village in Chelekura sub-county was done on 27th /10/2022 prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO.

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Dudi village in Oboliso sub-county was done on 20th /09/2022 prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Bungoko village in Puti Puti sub-county was done on 20th /09/2022 prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Agule village in Agule sub-county was done on 27th /10/2022 prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO

13	1	<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>A procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 was approved on 21st September 2022 by CAO Oola Donato Olam and it incorporated the following DDEG projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of administration block phase v at Ugx 374,000,000 on page 1 • Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at St. John Boliso P/S at Ugx 25,000,000 on page 1 • Design of roof for administration block phase v at Ugx 7,500,000 on page 1
13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No CC minutes of approved DDEG projects in the current FY</p>

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	A project implementation team for health projects appointed by CAO Oola Donato Olam on 18th January 2022 with the following ; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng Ogwara Michael (District Engineer) as Contract supervisor • Dr.Mulekwa Godfrey (DHO) as Contract manager • Samuka Muhammad (DNRO) as Environment officer • Wamire Dawson as DCDO • Okolimong Charles ADHO as Sanitation manager. • Onyait George as Labour officer. <p>The project team did not have a Clerk of works as manual requires.</p>	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of the staff house at Pallisa S/C was followed as per designs of the engineer with four office rooms and a council room for discussions ,600mm splash apron,28 gauge pre-painted galvanized iron sheets • Renovation of office of the district chairperson with a workplan of re painting the office room, with new curtain rods on the windows and equipping it with furniture these were done accordingly. 	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG provided conducted supervision by the technical officers of each infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works

1. The construction of administration block at Pallisa S/C supervision was prepared and endorsed by the DE, Environment Officer and CDO on 13th April 2022 with the following field findings; (i) G28 pre-painted iron sheets fixed on timber members as per specifications (ii) Ceiling works were done including painting (iii) 15mm thick plaster /render finished smoothly with a steel float and (iv) A weather guard cream painting done well with a black painting on the skirting and a recommendation therein to pay contractor according as per attached certificate.

2. A technical supervision report for the construction of 5 stance line pit latrine at the Pallisa General Hospital conducted by the Environment Officer, District Engineer and the DCDO and report was signed by all on 16th May 2022.

3. A technical supervision report for the renovation of Labour suit at Pallisa General Hospital, conducted by the DE, DDO and the Environment Officer on 17th June 2022.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A requisition for payment from M/s. Imas Engineering Company Ltd for construction of administration block at Pallisa S/C on 12th April 2022, a certificate prepared on 13th April 2022 and signed on 20th April 2022 at Ugx 51,660,251 and a payment voucher 0133 on 20th April 2022 of Ugx 54,379,212. 	1
		<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of office of the district chairperson with a requisition for payment made on 10th May 2022, payment certificate signed and approved on 10th May 2022 by the Snr.Asst.Eng.Officer,DNRO,District planner, District engineer ,DCDO and CIA of UGX 6,527,104 and a voucher 43847635 on 10th June 2022 of UGX 6,527,104.. 	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of office of the district chairperson with a works contract signed on 3rd May 2022 approved under minute number 31.0 PALI CC013/2021/2022 on 27th April 2022 and an evaluation report approved by contract committee on 30th March 2022. 	1
		<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Pallisa S/C administration block with a works contract signed on 20th January 2022,contract committee minute 4.0 PALI CC07/2021-2022 on 22nd December 2021 and an evaluation report on 14th December 2021. • Construction of Opwateta S/C administration block with a works contract signed on 19th January 2021,contract committee minute 5.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022 on 22nd December 2021 and an evaluation report on 20th December 2021. 	

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

There was evidence of designating Ms. Akello Priscilla -communications officer as the grievance/complaints focal point person. Through a letter dated 8th /04/2019 signed by the CAO.

The CAO further appointed the GRC member on 12/11/2021 whose members were;

Mr. Okello Martin - D/CAO chairperson GRC

Ms. Akello Priscilla -communications officer secretary GRC

Dr. Mulekwa Godfrey - DHO member

Ms. Lukando Agnes - DEO member

Wamiire Dawson - DCDO member

Ingurat Christine Harriet - DCO member

Eng. Ogwara Micheal - DE member

Samuka Muhamed - DNRO member

Dr. Okot Bodo - DPO member

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log which was opened on 18th /07/2021 with clear information and reference for on-ward action at the time of assessment some grievances were recorded from different sectors</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had public display the grievance redress mechanisms at the district the main administration block and had grievance redress mechanisms titled “Pallisa District LG grievance handling process”at the time of assessment.</p>	1

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that environmental, social and climate change had been integrated into the LGDP, Annual work plans and budgets. For example;

The approved budget for 2021/22 on pages 48-49, showed an approved budget for Natural resources management, environmental and social management whose budgeted activities included;

The river bank and wetland restoration UGX.9.689,000

Stakeholder environment training and sensitization UGX.4,845,000

Monitoring and Evaluation of environmental compliance UGX.8,075,000

Tree planting UGX.80,000,000

Work plan for 2020/21 on pages 112-117 of the LGPIII

The river bank and wetland restoration

Stakeholder environment training and sensitization

Monitoring and Evaluation of environmental compliance

Tree planting

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	There was evidence that the LG disseminated to LLGs enhanced DDEG guidelines as per meeting held at the LG headquarters dated 1st March 2022 and in attendance were the LLGs representatives and HoDs.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:	The LG had a project financed by DDEG other than health, education, water and irrigation, However, the LG did not incorporate the ESMP into the BoQ and contract document. For example; Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Kaboloi-Agule 5.6km road in Pallisa and Agule Town Council.	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 3 or else score 0		

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.	There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change at the LG	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	Score 3 or else score 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:	Land title for where the renovation of the X-ray in Pallisa general Hospital was implemented:	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	Score 1 or else score 0	Freehold volume TOR2 FOLIO 11 measuring 9.9553 hectares of land on plot 29-47 Agule road Pallisa Town Council issued on 12th February 2020.	
			The land title for where the construction of the district administration block phase-3 at the district headquarters freehold volume 620 Folio 17 measuring 1.362 hectares on plot 26-30 Gogonyo road Pallisa Town Council issued on 19/10/2009.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:	There was no evidence that the environment officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs on all implemented projects 2021/2022.	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	Score 1 or else score 0		

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 were also signed E&S compliance certificates and payment records prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates

at interim and final stages of projects, examples include

Construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kalaki primary school under procurement Ref.No: PALI548/WRKS/2021-2022/00090 the interim payment certificate was endorsed on 13th June 2022 by both the DCDO and the DNRO

Expansion works of the Labour suite/ward at Pallisa general Hospital in Pallisa Town Council under procurement Ref.No: PALI548/WRKS/2021-2022/00037 the interim payment certificate was endorsed on 17th June 2022 by both the DCDO and the DNRO

However the District Natural resource Officer (DNRO) endorsed the payment certificate instead of the Environment officer and CDO as guided in the assessment Manual.

Financial management

LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:

Score 2 or else score 0

The District made bank reconciliations up-to end of FY 2021/2022. Three sampled bank accounts were reconciled as on 30/6/2022 as follows:1. General Fund A/c at shs.14,849,040. 2. UWEP Recovery A/c at shs.12,726,050. 3. Ruwasa Community A/c at shs.4,972,449. However, as at the time of this assessment, the LG was not up-date with it's reconciliations because the MoFPED had not up loaded the balances due to the up-grade of IFMS underway.

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>For FY 2021/2022 the LG produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports as follows: 1Qrt report was produced on 28/10/2021, 2ndQrt report produced on 25/01/2022, 3rdQrt on 26/4/2022 and 4thQrt report was produced on 25/7/2022. The reports were addressed to CAO with copies to LC V Chairman, LG PAC, among others.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not provide information to Council Chairman and PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2021/2022.</p>	0

17

1

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:

Score 1 or else score 0

During the FY under review, internal audit reports were addressed to CAO and copied to the PAC which reviewed them in their meetings as follows:

1stQrt in a meeting of 27/10/2021 under Min. 06/October/2021.

2ndQrt in a meeting of 8/2/2022 Min. 06/February/2022. 3rd Qrt in a meeting of 28/7/2022 under Min. 06/July/2022. 4thQrt in a meeting of 17/8/2022 under Min. 06/August/2022.

For each quarter, PAC produced a report in which they addressed the internal audit findings and made recommendation to address the findings.

Local Revenues

18

0

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.

For FY 2021/2022, the District budgeted to collect local revenue shs.350,776,000 as noted on page 6 of the approved budget for the period. The actual collection was shs.261,119,990 as reported on page 41 of the Draft Final Accounts for the year ended 30/6/2022. This was a collection ratio of 74.4% (-25.6%). The ratio was below the one set in the manual.

The reasons for the poor performance were i.e. the economic lock down due to COVID-19 resulted into closure of market, the main source of local revenue. ii. The foot and mouth disease of cattle resulted into closure of cattle markets, a major source of revenue.

19

0

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)

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

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

• If more than 10 %: score 2.

• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.

• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

OSR collections for FY 2020/2021 was shs.456,906,852 as reported on page 39 of the audited final accounts for the period. During the following FY ended 30/6/2022, collection of OSR was shs.261,119,990. This was a decline of shs.196,786,862i.e 42.8% .

20

0

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

Sharable local revenue for the FY 2021/2022 was shs.162,986,539. During the year two transfers were made to the LLGs. In quarter 2 shs.27,449,315 and 4th quarter shs.23,508,406 totaling to shs.50,957,721 was the mandatory share remittance to the LLGs. This was 31.2%, much lower than the 65% provided in the law.

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>The procurement plan for FY 2021/2022, the awarded contracts and amounts had been up on procurement notice board and they reflected the following:</p> <p>The best evaluated bidders had also displayed on the board. For example: 1. Revenue collection from Daraja Landing Bay in Obulet S/C awarded to Opedun Simon Peter at shs.8,400,000.</p> <p>2. Supply of tree seedlings to the District Natural Resources awarded Mwamba Enterprises at shs.29,499,400.</p> <p>3. Construction of a 2 stance lined pit latrine at Akisim S/C HQs awarded Roofline Construction Co. Ltd. at shs.8,992,577.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG performance assessment results were posted on the District website w.w.w.pallisa.go.ug for public consumption. The team visited the site and noted the scores for example: Overall ranking 48th, Crosscutting measures 67%, Education Performance measures 80%, Health Performance measures 85%, Water and Environment Performance measures 61%.</p>	2

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>During FY 2021/2022 the District held six radio programmes and the discussants included RDC, LC V Chairman, CAO, Planner, DPO, SCDO, and Commercial Officer. The objectives of programme held 24/5/2022 were: i. to sensitize the communities about parish development model, ii. To inform the community about the progress in the implementation of the parish development model, iii. To change the communities' mindset on PDM and other government programs. iv. To address concerns that may arise in relation to PDM.</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 District made publically available information on the notice board as seen by the team. Schedules of tax rates seen showing e.g. sales in the market for a cow shs.10,000, fish 3,000, turkey shs.1,000, For collection procedures, the public was informed of contracting out the service by putting up contracted revenue collectors for various places such as markets, landing sites/bays, e.t.c. For procedures of appeal, tax payers were referred to the District gravencies committee and in the corridors right from the entrance to the main hall were arrows one could flow up to the right place.</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure

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

The District did not prepare the IGG report for FY 2021/2022 of the cases alleged fraud and corruption and their status. The reason given being that there were no issues during the period warranting to report to IGG.

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School Year 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total No. of Candidates registered was 4113 • Total absentees was 44 • Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (96+1091+1247) = 2434 • Pass rate = 2434×100 $(4113-44) = 59.8\%$ <p>School Year 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total No. of Candidates registered =6191 • Total absentees = 60 • Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (69+1661+1811) = 3541 • Pass rate = 3541×100, $(6191-60) = 57.7\%$ <p>The PLE pass rate declined by 2.1% (from 59.8% to 57.7%)</p>	0

1

3

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

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

School Year 2019

- Total No. of Candidates = 1867
- Absentees = 7
- Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (27+202+443) = 672
- Pass rate = $672 \times 100, (1867-7) = 36.1\%$

School Year 2020

- Total No. of Candidates = 2488
- Total absentees = 1
- Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (84+341+645) = 1070
- Pass rate = $1070 \times 100, (2488-1) = 43\%$

The UCE pass rate increased by 6.9% (from 36.1% to 43%)

2

0

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

Awaiting LLGs Assessment
Results

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 LG undertook projects which
were in adherence to the Grant
and sector guidelines which
included ;

According to the AWP, there was;

- The construction Pallisa Seed
School on page 82 of the AWP
- Classroom block renovation at
Opwateta P/S
- New 2-classroom block
construction at Kalaki P/S on page
88 of AWP
- Construction of 5-stance PIT
latrines at Primary Schools; Kalaki,
Limoto, Nyakoi and Katukei all on
page 88 of the AWP.

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

From the sampled project below,
there was evidence that the DEO,
DCDO and the District Natural
Resources Officer instead of the
Environment Officer verified and
certified works before payments
were effected as per the sampled
project below:

- The payment for the construction of a 2-classroom block at Kalaki P/S. The contractor M/s NAVO General Enterprises raised a requisition for UGX 30,000,000 on 20th June, 2022. The Assistant Engineering Officer certified the work and raised an interim certificate No. 1 of 20th June, 2022 which was further certified by the District Natural Resources Officer, the DCDO, the DEO, the District Internal Auditor, and the CAO on the same day.
- UGX 22,492,926 (the Net pay) was paid on 23rd June, 2022.

The LG had a substantively appointed Environment Officer who by established policies and the LGPA manual was supposed to certify the payment which was to the contrary.

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of 4-5stance pit latrines at Kalaki P/S, Limoto P/S, Nyakoi P/S and Katukei P/S ;Contract sum Ugx 84,455,904 and engineers estimates Ugx 88,000,000, Variations=Ugx-3,544,096, %Variations =-4% • The construction of 2 classroom block at Kalaki P/S .Contract sum Ugx65,851,104, Engineers estimates Ugx 66,000,000, Variations Ugx =-148,896, %Variations=-0.23% • The construction of Akodat seed secondary school, Contract sum Ugx 2,577,052,433, Engineers estimates Ugx 2,579,562,293, %Variations=Ugx -2,509,860, %Variations =-0.1%. 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>Evidences presented shows that however much the seed school was incorporated in the procurement plan for previous financial year 2021/2022; No works were implemented as it was still under procurement process at the time of assessment.</p>	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The LG Teacher's staff ceiling was 1810 and the UPE teachers in post were 1033 in 76UPE schools.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	1033×100 $1810 = 57\%$	
			This implied that the LG was below the minimum scorable compliance level as per the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG Consolidated Assets register 2020/2021 that captured assets (classrooms, latrines, 3-seater desks, laboratories and libraries and staff accommodation units) of 76 UPE and 9USE Schools was in place.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>This implies that 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format. Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was; Total schools that complied X 100</p> <p>Total (UPE & USE)</p> <p>85 X 100,</p> <p>85 = 100%</p>	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

From the three (3) visited Schools of Kalaki(urban), Komolo Akadot (peri urban) and Kasodo(rural), it was verified from the teacher's duty roster, the displayed teachers' list and the teacher's attendance books the actual presence of the teachers as per the deployment list at the DEO's office.

- At Kalaki P/S, the staff list that was posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 20 which was in tandem with the DEO's deployment list which too had 20 teachers.

- While at Komolo Akadot P/S, the staff list posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 15 which number was similar to that on the DEO's deployment list.

- At KasodoP/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 15 which number was similar to that on the DEO's deployment list.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Kalaki P/S had; 08 classrooms, 23 stances of latrines, 310 desks and 2 units of staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted the same assets statistics as was reported by the Consolidated Assets register at the DEO's office.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Komolo Akadot P/S had; 12 classrooms, 29 stances of pit latrines, 270 desks and 3 units of staff houses. A comparison with the field findings observed the same stock of assets.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that KasodobP/S had; 11 classrooms, 20 stances of pit latrines, 248 three-seater desks and 2 units staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets statistics was presented by the Headteacher.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence to show that the Headteachers of the 76 UPE Schools had compiled the Annual Budget Performance Reports and submitted a copy to the DEO. On review of the presented annual performance reports, the assessment noted that they never adhered to the set terms; i. e many were not signed by the Chairpersons SMCs, never contained; a reconciled cash flow statement, an annual budget and

Expenditure report and the preparation was not within the prescribed time frames, i. e by January, 30th.

The assessment reviewed records at the District and from the sampled Schools (Kalaki, Komolo Akadot and Kasodo), the assessment never found any copy of the annual Budget performance report in the format set by the MoES.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>The LG presented evidence of supporting Head teachers to prepare SIPs as a measure to address gaps identified by the inspection.</p> <p>On 25th October, 2022 vide minute No. 03/25/10/22, it was noted that Headteachers during the beginning of term III meeting were oriented on the preparation of the School Improvement Plans for example on addressing the noted inspection gap of lack of effective teaching . When the assessment visited Osupa Primary School, the Head teacher informed them that now the teachers were reporting a week before the official opening to allow them Scheme and make lesson plans which measures designed to ensure effective teaching .</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all the 76 UPE and 9 USE registered schools from the previous FY. OTIMS report was compiled and submitted on 26th October, 2022. The list of government aided primary schools (85) captured in Pallisa District Performance contract FY 2021/22 was consistent with the number of schools (98) in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2021/22</p> <p>The %age of schools was;</p> <p>$85 \times 100,$</p> <p>$85 = 100 \%$</p>	4

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 Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/2023 page 28 budget output 078102, the LG allocated UGX 8,216,118,000 as General staff salaries for Primary Education with 76 Schools having 1033 teachers in post.

4

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

b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,
Score 3 else score: 0

From the three visited Schools of Kalaki (herein as urban),Komolo Akadot (peri Urban) and Kasodo as rural Primary Schools, the names and number of teachers as displayed in the Headteachers' office tallied with what was on the deployment list at the DEO's office.

For example, as per the Deployment list; Kalaki had 20 teachers, Komolo Akadot had 15 and Kasodo had 15 teachers including the Headteachers. A school verification visit observed from the displayed lists in the offices of the Headteachers and the teacher's daily attendance book plus the displayed duty rosters, there was similar staff numbers and names as on the deployment list at the DEO's desk.

3

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The FY 2022/2023 was found posted on the LG Education notice board. The Headteachers at the visited schools of Kalaki, Komolo Akadot and Kasodo had also pinned up their respective staff lists on the walls in their respective offices.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Primary School's Headteacher's appraisal by the respective Senior Assistant Secretaries from the ten sampled schools. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Osako Stellethe Headteacher Kaboloi P/S in Pallisa S/C was appraised by SAS Hadijah Ibrahim on 12th November, 2021. • Mr. Olupot Johnson the Headteacher Omalutan P/S in Akisim S/C was appraised by SAS Baluka Agnes on 11th November, 2021. • Iretai Justinethe Headteacher Katukei P/S in Kaukura S/C was appraised by SAS Ecaat Joseph on 15th November, 2021. • Okia Robertthe Headteacher Kagwese P/S in Pallisa Town Council was appraised by Town Clerk on 4thDecember, 2021. • Akol Alex the Headteacher Kadesok P/S in Opwateta S/C was appraised by SAS Olupot Moses on 16thNovember, 2021. • Obuya Vincent the Headteacher Opadoi P/Sin Akisim S/C was appraised by SAS Baluka Agnes on 11th November, 2021. 	0

- Amuriat John Stephen the Headteacher Omuroka P/S in Kameke S/C was appraised by SAS Atenya Anthony on 16th December, 2021.
- Olinga Richard, the Headteacher Keuka P/S in Puti Puti S/C was appraised by SAS Mutzakhi Christine Otim on 15th November, 2021.
- Okurut Charles the Headteacher Kachango P/S in Gogonyo S/C was appraised by SAS Oporus Nicholas on 15th November, 2021.
- Acham Grace the Headteacher Ogoria in Boliso S/C was appraised by SAS Oidi Stephen on 15th November, 2021.
- Oriada Sam the Headteacher Okisiran P/S in Akisim S/C was appraised by SAS Baluka Agnes on 10th November, 2021.

8

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was no proof of the LG appraising Secondary School Head teachers presented at the time of the assessment

0

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 of appraising the Education department staff for their performance for FY 2020/21 as showed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DEO Ms. Lukenda Agnes was appraised by the CAO on 30th June, 2022. • Mr. Opedum John the Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised by the DEO on 30th June, 2022 • The Inspector of Schools, Mr. Opela Stephen was appraised by DEO 25th April, 2022. • Ms. Ojangole Jesca the Inspector of Schools was appraised by the DEO on 30th August, 2022 	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>The Education department training plan for FY 2021/2022 was in place dated duly signed by 15th July, 2021 and signed by the DEO. The plan spelt out clear targets/activities like skills development as item No. 1 planned for 3rd quarter targeting Head teachers and Deputy Head teachers.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9

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.

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.

The assessment noted from DEO, that the LG on 27th October, 2022 communicated to the Permanent Secretary MoES informing him that there was no error regarding the submitted school lists and enrollment data.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had included in writing the list of schools, their enrollment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) that contained 76 UPE Schools captured on pages 35 to 38 of the 8TH July, 2022 generated LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/2023.

9

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.

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

Pallisa District Education Department made allocations of UGX 74,366,000 for monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary captured as output 078401 on page 40 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2021/2022 generated on 5th June, 2020. This was in line with sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4,000,000 per LG

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did warranting/verification of school capitation grant transfers to schools as follows:</p> <p>1stQrt. released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and LG warranted on 27/7/2021 (after 10 working days).</p> <p>2ndQrt. released on 15/10/2021 and warranted on 22/10/2022 (after 6 working days).</p> <p>3rdQrt released on 5/01/2022 and warranted on 07/01/2022 (after 2 days).</p> <p>The District did not do warranting/verification of school capitation grant transfers to schools within 5 working days.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District invoiced and communicated School capitation grant transfers to Schools as follows:</p> <p>1stQrt funds released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and communicated to schools on 28/7/2021 (after 10 working days).</p> <p>2ndQrt released on 15/10/2021 and communicated on 4/11/2021 (after 14 working days).</p> <p>3rdQrt. released on 5/01/2022 and Communicated 11/01/2022 (after 5 working days).</p> <p>The District did not timely invoice and communicated the Capitation grant transfers to schools within 5 working days.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education</p>	<p>The LG a duly authenticated costed inspection plan for the FY</p>	2

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.

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

2021/2022. The costed inspection endorsed by the DIS, DEO and CAO on 1st July, 2021 with activities like inspection with a focus on lesson observation at a cost of UGX 651,000 was assessed.

The overall costed plan was at a tune of UGX 34,575,900 for inspecting all the 76 UPE and the 9 USE Schools plus private and community education institutions.

Similarly the Inspection plan for FY 2022/2023 endorsed by the DIS, DEO and CAO on 1st July, 2022 and costed at UGX 56,245,800 with activities like checking on the formation and functionality of the SMCs at a cost of UGX 30,340,000 was available at the time of the assessment.

The assessment noted that the LG held pre-inspection planning meetings during which they discussed the composition of the inspection team that comprised of the DIS, the inspector of Schools and Associate Assessors for example on 2nd August, 2021 under Minute No. 02/02/08/2021, the DIS thanked the inspectors for the previous inspection and presented the report and called upon to inform schools on the adherence to the COVID-19 SOPs and called upon for phycho-social support to help the learners recover from COVID-19 effects.

The other pre-inspection meetings were held on 27th May, 2022, 9th March, 2022 and 14th January, 2022.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the FY under review indicated that all the 76 UPE Schools were regularly inspected and monitored for example a report dated 1st December, 2021 indicated that all the 76 UPE and 9 USE schools had been inspected.</p> <p>Therefore, it was correct to infer that 100% UPE Schools were inspected during the FY under review.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was observed by the assessment team that inspection reports were discussed at both the school level and the LG level as indicated below;</p> <p>At the visited schools for example Kalaki Primary School, inspector Mr. Opera Steven on 15th November, 2021 discussed the inspection findings with the Headteacher as evidenced by the two parties owning the findings and recommendations through by signing the inspection feedback report dated 15th November, 2021.</p> <p>At LG level, on 25th October, 2022 vide minute No. 03/25/10/22 the meeting Education sector meeting discussed inspection findings and agreed that the inspectorate helps the Head teachers on developing SIPs to help on addressing the challenges highlighted by the inspections.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The DIS prepared and submitted all the inspection reports together with the Activity work plans and budgets to DES on the dates listed below;

1. Term III 2021 report dated 1st December, 2021 was submitted on 17th June, 2022.
2. Term I, 2022 report dated 6th May, 2022 was submitted on 17th June, 2022 and,
3. Term II, 2022 dated 16th September, 2022 was submitted on 7th September, 2022.

The submission of Pallisa LG inspection reports was further confirmed on the Matrix for submission of Inspection Work plans, Reports and Accountabilities to DES

At the visited schools for example Kalaki Primary School, inspector Mr. Opera Steven on 15th November, 2021 discussed the inspection findings with the Headteacher as evidenced by the two parties owning the findings and recommendations through by signing the inspection feedback report dated 15th November, 2021.

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>The council committee for Education and Health discussed matters of education service delivery as per the example below;</p> <p>On 25th February, 2022 vide Min. No. 02 discussed the slow pace of works at Olok Seed School. The meeting noted with concern the slow (at 80%) of works at Olok.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of mobilizing learners into Schools through the community engagements held by the LG and various stakeholders for example;</p> <p>During the annual general meeting held on 14th February, 2022 under minute No. 11/14/02/2020 (a), the Local Council area Councilor Moses Omwati reminded the parents of feeding their children so that they keep in schools for the afternoon lessons because rampant missing of afternoon lessons due to hunger had been observed.</p> <p>In the meeting held on 31st May, 2022, the Head teacher Kalaki Primary vide Minute No. 7/31/05/2022 informed the parents that UPE releases had come in and there was no reason for keeping children at homes.</p>	2

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Kalaki P/S (rated as urban school) had; 8 classrooms, 23 stances of latrines, 310 desks and 2 units of staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted that the same assets statistics accurately tallied with the one in the consolidated Assets register at the DEO's office.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Komolo Akadot P/S had; 12 classrooms, 29 stances of pit latrines, 270 desks and 3 units of staff houses. A comparison with the field findings noted perfect rhyming of the assets stocks.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Kasodo P/S had; 11 classrooms, 20 stances of pit latrines, 248 three-seater desks and 2 units staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets stock was presented by the Headteacher.

12	1	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>The desk appraisal for the construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Kalaki Primary School was carried by a team that comprised of the District Planner, District Engineer, District Education Officer, District Environment Officer and the DCDO on 30th March, 2021 and the project was derived from page 51 of the LGDP III.</p>
12	1	<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 LG conducted Environmental, Social and climate change Screening for all Education projects for the previous FY under review as indicated below;</p> <p>Screening for the construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kadesko Primary school in Kibale sub-county. Impacts and mitigation measures identified in the screening form and ESMP for example removal of debris on site, planting of grass and site levelling, prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,150,000 on 4th February 2022.</p> <p>Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Limoto primary school in Boliso-1 sub-county. Impacts and mitigation measures identified in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th</p>

February 2022.

Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Kalaki primary school in Pallisa Town Council. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommendations made in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th February 2022

Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Omatakojo primary school in Kibale sub-county. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommendations made in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th February 2022

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was no seed school incorporated in the current procurement plan .

1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence to prove that the Education sector projects implemented had been approved by the LG Contracts Committee and Solicitor General as per the examples below;;

1. Construction of Akodat seed school was approved by contract committee on 3rd March 2022 under minute number 4.0PALI CC012/2021-2022

2. Construction of 4-5stance pit latrines at Kalaki, Limoto, Nyakoi, Katukei Primary schools were approved on 22nd December 2021 under minute number 6.0PALI CC007/2021-2022

3. Construction of 2 classroom block at Kalaki P/S was approved on 24th May 2022 under minute number 4.0 PALI CC014/2021-2022

13	0	<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>On the 18th January 2022, CAO Oola Donato Olam appointed a project implementation team for education infrastructure projects with the following key members.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongwara Michael (Ag.District Engineer) as contract supervisor 2. Lukendo Agnes (DEO) as contract manager 3. Samuka Muhammad (DNRO) as environment officer 4. Wamire Dawson as DCDO 5. Okolimong Charles as Sanitation manager 6. Onyait George as Labour officer. <p>However the team did not have a clerk of works appointed.</p>
13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no comparison to make between the designs from ministry and actual implementation on ground because the LG did not have a seed school project in the previous financial year as required by the manual.</p>
13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG did not have a seed school project in the previous financial year.</p>

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*

A supervision report for construction of 4-5stances of lined pit latrines at Kalaki, Limoto, Nyakoi, Katukei Primary schools prepared on 24th May 2022 after a joint routine technical supervision by senior engineer, contractor and project managers with the following findings;

All preliminary activities were done as per specifications, Lined pit excavated at 3000mm deep, internally constructed finished smooth with steel float, 100mm thick concrete slab casted with and including 12mm thick diameter bars and gauge 10 wire mesh as per specifications, 150mm thick walling constructed up to 2400mm high curtain wall, a 12mm thick internal and external rendering works were ongoing and gauge 28 pre-painted iron sheets were fixed for all the 4 primary schools.

No list of attendance for the joint supervision was however attached at the time of assessment.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence for payments for executed works as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A requisition for payment from Navo General Enterprises for construction of a 2 classroom block at Kalaki Primary School was made on 13th June 2022. Certificate 1 was approved and signed on 14th June 2022 for Ugx 36,211,522 by Asst Eng Officer, DNRO, District Engineer, District Education Officer, DCDO, Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Internal Auditor, voucher payment effected on 16th June 2022 under voucher number 43965229. • A second requisition for classroom block at Kalaki Primary school was made on 20th June 2022, the certificate was signed on 20th June 2022 of Ugx 22,492,926 by Asst Eng Officer, District Engineer, DNRO, DEO, DCDO, Chief Internal Auditor and CAO whose payment effected on 23rd June 2022 under voucher number 44511506 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>Submission of the sector procurement plan from PDU was done on 9th July 2021 as was approved by District Education Officer Ms. Lukendo Agnes.</p> <p>The submission was late.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The last financial year LG did not have any seed school project ,however there were other project procurement files as listed below;

- Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kalaki Primary School was approved by the contract committee on 24th May 2022 minute 4.0 PALI CC014/2021-2022,a works contract signed on 7th June 2022 and an evaluation report signed on 17th May 2022.
- Construction of 4-5stance line pit latrines at Kalaki ,Nyakoi ,Katukei and Limoto Primary schools with a works contract signed on 7th January 2022,an evaluation report approved by contracts committee on 20th December 2021 and approved for award on 22nd December 2021 minute 6.0 PALI CC007/2021/2022.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	3	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had a log for recording grievance which was in place and during the assessment the log was reviewed, it was noted that for the FY under review 2021/2022, there were grievances recorded under the education sector such as:</p> <p>Okitoi Stephen proprietor of Pallisa Community S.S. from Akadot village in Pallisa sub-county on 14th December, 2021 reported duplication of their school name by the upcoming Akadot Community Seed S.S.</p> <p>The matter was handled by Mr. Opedun John the DIS in the meeting held on 17th December 2021 where the seed school would be named Akadot seed S.S instead of Akadot Community Seed S.S.</p>
15	0	<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>The LG had no guidelines of environmental incorporation into schools to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green schools and energy and water conservation.</p>

16	0	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence for the costed ESMP incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents from the education sector reviewed BoQs such as:</p> <p>BoQs for the construction of 5-stance pit latrine at Limoto, Kalaki, Omatakojo and Kadesko primary schools under procurement Ref No. PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00004 and PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00090</p>
16	1	<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 title, land consent documents/letters availed for the education projects such as;</p> <p>Land title for Limoto primary School in Boliso-1 sub-county where there was construction of a 5-stance pit latrine.</p> <p>Freehold volume TOR12 FOLIO19 measuring 9.0740 hectares of land on block 1 plot 1075 issued on 26th November 2020 by the registrar of titles.</p>
16	0	<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 availed of monitoring reports of support supervision to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions for education sector projects implemented in the FY 2021/22 under review.</p>

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence of E&S certification approved and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO for the projects in education sector for instance;

The construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kalaki primary school under procurement Ref.No: PALI548/WRKS/2021-2022/00090 the interim payment certificate was endorsed on 13th June 2022 by both the DCDO and the DNRO

1.The construction of 1 block of a 5-stance pit latrine at Limoto primary school under procurement Ref.No: PALI548/WRKS/2021-2022/00004 the interim payment certificate was endorsed on 24th May 2022 by both the DCDO and the DNRO

However the District Natural resource Officer (DNRO) endorsed the payment certificate instead of the Environment officer and CDO as guided in the Manual

Health Performance Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score																
Local Government Service Delivery Results																				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>Total deliveries in the LG with focus on HCIIIs and IVs</p> <p>2020/21 total deliveries 13104</p> <p>2021/22 total deliveries 13505</p> <p>%ntage increase = $13,505 - 13,104 = 401$, $401/13104 * 100 = 3.1\%$</p> <p>Selected 3 out of 10HC IVs &IIIs, randomly. The selected three were:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2020/21</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gogonyo HCIII</td> <td>976</td> <td>1029</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>AkoboloiHCIII</td> <td>1033</td> <td>6852</td> <td>0.34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kamuge HCIII.</td> <td>9709</td> <td>8916</td> <td>2.25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The team analyzed the data found that the increase of 3.141% was less than 20%.</p>		2020/21	2021/22		Gogonyo HCIII	976	1029		AkoboloiHCIII	1033	6852	0.34	Kamuge HCIII.	9709	8916	2.25	0
	2020/21	2021/22																		
Gogonyo HCIII	976	1029																		
AkoboloiHCIII	1033	6852	0.34																	
Kamuge HCIII.	9709	8916	2.25																	

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.

The LG received district health sector development grant amounting to 345,605,331/= during the FY 2021/2022 and it was spend as follows:

Refurbishment of district stores at Palisa General hospital at shs. 94,191,510/=

Renovation of Kaboloi HCIII at shs. 84,930,863/=

Renovation of the X-Ray block at Pallisa general hospital in 73,123,700/=

Renovation of X ray at Palisa General hospital at shs. 54,237,658/=

The service cost, monitoring and supervision was of shs 12,245,300/=.

Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital shs. 22,000,000/=

Construction of a medical waste incinerator for Kaboloi HCIII shs. 4,876,280=

The LG therefore budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY 2021/2022 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines.

3

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHO, DE, Environment Officer and the CDO certified works for all Health projects implemented before actual payments for instance;

The renovation and extension of a labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital by Ms. Impressive Group of Companies Ltd. The interim payment certificate was dated 22nd June 2022 of shs. 42,771,021 was certified by the DHO, District Assist Engineering Officer, DNRO, PIA, CDO on 16th June 2022 and actual payment was effected on 29th June 2022.

3

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Renovation of a Labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital; Contract sum Ugx 47,895,880,engineers estimates Ugx 48,000,000. Variation=Ugx-14,120,%Variation=-0.03%

Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital, Contract sum= Ugx 21,787,075; Estimates engineer= Ugx 22, 000, 000, Variations =Ugx-212, 925, %Variations =-0.96%.

Construction of a medical waste incinerator for Kaboloi HCIII,Contract sum =Ugx4,876,280,Engineers estimates at Ugx 4,900,000,Variations=-23,720,%variations =-0.5%

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The LG did not have any health centre II upgrading to III during the FY 2021/2022.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Pallisa DLG recruited staff for all HC IIIs as per the staffing structure. The staff structure obtained from DHO indicated that the district had only HC IIIs and HC IIs and HC IIIs were required to have 19 health workers.</p> <p>The LG health sector staff establishment list had 230 approved health workers of which 207 were in the post which represented 90% recruitment.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The LG did not have any health centre II upgrading to III during the FY 2021/2022.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health workers were in their respective deployment facilities as per sampled Health Centers;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gogonyo HCIII had 17 as the the staff list dated August 2022 and all were in place as per verified staff duty roasters and attendance lists. 2. Kamuge HCIII had 20 health workers and all were working at the facility as indicated in the staff daily attendance registers 3. At Kaboloi HCIII there was 17 Health workers and all were present at the facility according to the duty roaster and attendance list verified. 	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 was no upgraded Health Facility from HC II to HC III during the FY 2021/2022.</p>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>0</p> <p>There was no evidence that Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans and budgets for previous FY 2021/2022 to the DHO presented to the Assessment Team for verification and this was also confirmed from the visited 3 Health Facilities of kamuge, Gogonyo and Koloboi HC III.</p>
---	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>0</p> <p>The LG did not avail evidence of annual Budget performance Reports from the 3 sampled Health Facilities.</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.

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

- Score 2 or else 0

The Health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans but did not incorporate performance issues identified by in monitoring and assessment reports examples of such quarterly monitoring reports included Kaboli HCIII, and Kamuge HCIII.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• score 2 or else score 0

The HMIS 105 reports for the sampled health facilities and reports were submitted as below:

Kamuge HCIII

6/8/2021, 2/9/2021 3/10/2021, 7/11/2021 ,7/12/2021, 6/1/2022,7/2/2022, 7/3/2022, 5/4/2022, 7/5/2022, 7/6/2022, 7/7/2022

Kaboloji HCIII

6/8/2021, 2/9/2021, 6/10/2021, 4/11/2021, 5/12/2021, 5/1/2022, 8/2/2022, 5/3/2022, 6/4/2022, 5/5/2022, 10/6/2022, 7/7/2022

Kamuge HCIII

7/8/2021, 7/9/2021, 7/2/2022 ,7/3/2022, 7/4/022, 7/5/2022, 7/6/2022, 7/7/2022,

The quarterly reports for FY 2021/2022 were submitted as below:

Kaboloji HCIII Q1 6/10/2021, Q2 4/1/2022, Q3 7/4/2022, Q4 6/7/2022

Kamuge HCIII

Q1 6/10/2021, Q2 7/1/2022 , Q3 8/4/2022, Q4 5/7/2022

Gogonyo HCIII reports not availed.

The LG did not avail all 100% (12) monthly and 4 quarterly reports for Assessment because Gogonyo HC III had no quarterly reports.

6

0

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

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

Due to changed in the guidelines from the MoH, the LG did not submit invoices for the 3 sampled Health Facilities.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

1

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.

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

The LG availed evidence that they verified ,compiled, and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF health facilities on time as below:

Q1	15/10/2021
Q2	12/1/2022
Q3	10/4/2022
Q4	10/7/2022

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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

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

The LG did not avail budget performance reports for review by the team

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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

h) Evidence that the LG has:
i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

No evidence that the LG developed and approved PIP for weak performing Health units of Mpongye, Kamuge, Kasodo and Gogonyo during the FY 2021/2022.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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

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

No evidence was availed showing implementation of report for weak performing health at the time of assessment.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Human Resource Management and Development

7

2

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

a) Evidence that the LG has:
i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

Total health workers in the LG was 438 out of an establishment 484.

Staffing $438/484*100 = 90.5\%$ and shs 7,860,637,600/= was allocated towards wages for the FY 2022/2023..

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG deployed health workers as per the guidelines for example in three sampled health units of Koboloi HCIII, Gogonyo HCIII and Kamuge HCIII the analysis was as below;

Kamuge HCIII had 20 health workers out 19 positions the percentage was 105%.

Gogonyo HCIII 17 health workers out of 19 = $17/19 \times 100 = 89\%$.

Koboloi HCIII 17 health workers out of 19 = $17/19 \times 100 = 89\%$.

The team observed that all the three health facilities sampled had a staffing of more than 75%.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

According to the current staff list obtained at the DHO's office dated August 202 and from the three sampled Health Facilities, it was established that all staff deployed were working in their respective Health Facilities as follows;

Kamuge HCIII had 20 health workers, Gogonyo HC III had 17 and Koboloi HCIII had 17 health workers.

The team of assessors established that the health workers deployed were working in health facilities where they were deployed as observed from the the list displayed on the facility Public notice boards, analysis of the names in duty rosters and attendance registers compared with the staff list at the DHOs office.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

From the three sampled Health Facilities, and from the evidenced Public notice boards at Gogonyo, Kaboloi and Kamuge and found staff lists for current FY 2022/2023 and the duty rosters displayed on public notice boards, it was established that the deployment list at the DHO's Officer were similar to those at the Facilities. Kamuge HCIII had 20 health workers, Gogonyo HC III had 17 and Koboloi HCIII had 17 health workers.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:
i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

From the 10 sampled files of Health facility In-charges, it was evident that six (6) in-charges were not appraised for FY 2021/22 and these were;

1. Mbulandeki Timothy, Clinical Officer of Kasodo HC III Ref. No. CR/D/12184;

2. Opakasi Anania Esangut enrolled nurse of Kaukura HC II Ref. No. CR/D/12204;

3. Okiror Moses, Nursing Officer of Kibale HC III Ref. No. CR/D/10756;

4. Ariko David, Clinical Officer of Olok HC II Ref. No. CR/D/11937,

5. Acum Agnes Nursing Officer of Kaboloi HC III Ref. No. CR/D/11632,

6. Mulira Amiri enrolled nurse of Mpongi HC III Ref. No. CR/D/12215.

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 Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers as per the 10 sampled officers;

1. Titin Hellen, Enrolled Midwife of Pallisa General Hospital was appraised by Kunya Mugabi Joseph, Nursing Officer on 5/2/2022;

2. Atini Martha, Enrolled Midwife of Obutete HC II appraised by Kongai Mary, Enrolled Nurse on 8/1/2022.

3. Akiror Scovia Lucy, Enrolled Midwife of Chelekura HC III was appraised by Okwaja Musa a Clinical Officer on 30/9/2021;

4. Kooli Elijah, Clinical Officer of Akisim HC III was appraised by Baluku Agnes, SAS on 2/11/2021.

5. Birungi Gorret, Enrolled Midwife of Pallisa general Hospital was appraised by Nzimuli Agnes, nursing officer on 30/9/2021.

6. Adongo Annet, Enrolled Midwife of Pallisa general Hospital was appraised by Nzimuli Agnes, nursing officer on 25/9/2021;

7. Kademere Anna Mary, enrolled midwife of Pallisa general Hospital was appraised by Nzimuli Agnes, nursing officer on 30/9/2021;

8. Obukala Martin, enrolled nurse of Chelekura HC III was appraised by Okwaja Musa, Clinical officer on 31/12/2021;

9. Achom Annet, enrolled midwife of Chelekura HC III was appraised by Okwaja Musa, Clinical officer on 31/12/2021;

10. Sabana Annet, Nursing Officer of Kamuge HC III was appraised by Ekisa Geoffrey, in-charge on 1/9/2021.

8

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

No evidence adduced that the LG took corrective actions on appraisal reports.

0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Training was said to have been done but there was no formal evidence availed during assessment</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No training data base availed during assessment time frame at the LG.</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>No evidence availed to the Assessment team</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to show that funds LG allocated 15% of the budget for monitoring service delivery. Its all lamped together as inland travel without disaggregation</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did warranting/verification of HSDG transfers to Health Facilities as follows: 1stQrt was released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and LG warranted on 27/7/2021 (after 10 working days). 2nd Qrt was released on 15/10/2021 and warranted on 22/10/2022 (after 6 working days). 3rd Qrt was released on 5/01/2022 and warranted on 07/01/2022 (after 2 days). The District did not do warranting/verification of HSDG transfers to Health Facilities within 5 working days.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District invoiced and communicated HSDG transfers to Health Facilities as follows:</p> <p>1stQrt funds released by MoFPED on 14/7/2021 and communicated to Health Facilities on 28/7/2021 (after 10 working days).</p> <p>2ndQrt released on 15/10/2021 and communicated on 4/11/2021 (after 14 working days).</p> <p>3rd Qrt. released on 5/01/2022 and communicated 11/01/2022 (after 5 working days).</p> <p>The District did not timely invoice and communicated the HSDG transfers to Health Facilities within 5 working days.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented to the PAT for verification on this indicator.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>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>The LG did not avail evidences at the time assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>No evidence was availed during the assessment</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG has no health center IV but instead there was a hospital</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>No evidence availed to show that that the DHT ensured HSD carried support supervision to lower facilities</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>.No evidence was availed during the assessment</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented to the PAT at the time of assessment</p>	0

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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>No evidence was availed at the time of assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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 availed at the time of assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

Investment Management

12	1	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Health Sector maintained an up-dated assets register covering Medical Equipment, Office Equipment, Furniture and Fittings, Freezers, among others, The register detailed the Nature of Assets, make, amount bought, among others.</p>
12	1	<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:</p> <p>(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District through District Planner, DNRO,DCDO, ADHO,and Senior Planner, conducted desk appraisal for all projects. For instance;The renovation of the medical store and X-Ray Department at Pallisa General Hospital on page 51 of DDP and page 7-8 of the Guidelines under District Hospital and Primary Health Care. Finally the committee recommended funding the projects.</p>

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0

For each project, the environmental and social screening forms were filled and endorsed by Natural Resources officer and Community Development officer on behalf of the others. All the criteria for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design were ticked right and final recommended implementation of ESMP for the year and among the projects indicated was for the renovation of the medical store and X-Ray Department at Pallisa General Hospital as indicated on page 22 of the field appraisal report.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence of screening to ascertain technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability and on site visits the assessment observed use of customized design as shown by the examples below;

Screening for the expansion construction works of labour suite ward at Pallisa General Hospital in Pallisa Town Council, impacts identified dust emission, debris and construction waste and mitigation measures site hoarding, backfilling and site levelling made in screening form and ESMP this was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

Screening for the construction of the OPD at Pallisa Town Council Rweta HC III in Pallisa Town Council identified impacts vegetation loss, waste generation, debris and dust emission and suggested mitigation measures limit vegetation clearance to site and plant paspalum and trees, hoard off the site made in screening form and ESMP this was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

Screening for the renovation of the X-Ray block at Pallisa general hospital in Pallisa Town Council, impacts identified waste generation, debris and mitigation measures limited clearance and backfilling made in screening form and ESMP this was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

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>A sector procurement plan submitted on 19th May 2022 by Dr. Mulekwa Godfrey with the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation and tiling of Gogonyo, Agule, Mpogi HCIII all at Ugx 152,645,843. <p>The plan was not timely submitted.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>No PPI form was submitted to PDU by the department within the 1st Quarter.</p>	0

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

- Renovation of x-ray block at Pallisa General Hospital was approved by the committee on 22nd December 2021 minute number 8.0PALI CC007/2021/2022.

- Renovation and extension of Labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital was approved on 1st March 2022 minute number 23.0PLAI CC10/2021/2022.

- Construction of medical waste incinerator for Kaboloi HCIII was approved on 1st March 2022 under minute number 30.0PALI CC010/2021/2022

- Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital was approved on 1st March 2022 under minute number 17.0 PALI CC010/2021/2022

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of:
(i) : score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

There was a project implementation team appointed by CAO Oola Donato Olam on 18th January 2022 for health projects and these included;

1. Eng Ongwara Michael(District Engineer) as the Contract supervisor

2. Dr.Mulekwa Godfrey (DHO) as Contract manager

3. Samuka Muhammad (DNRO) as Environment officer

4. Wamire Charles as DCDO

5. Onyait George as Senior Labour officer

The PIT did not have a clerk of works.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>The health infrastructure projects adhered to standards as indicated below;</p>
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation and extension of labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital was extended by 2000mm from the initial dimensional length, external walls were appropriately painted with a creamy weather guard paint coat and a black skirting, the steel casement external door was adjusted below with a thin metal sheet plate, however it was rusty, internally a new bath tab was replaced, provided with more space to accommodate about four mothers in a bay. • The construction of a 5 stance line pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital was in good state with a 600mm splash apron, 200mm thick block wall and 1600mm high screen wall, 5 lined ventilation pipes respectively crediting standard compliance.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

Evidence for consolidated site supervision reports prepared by the assistant engineering officer were as follow;

On 16th May 2022, a supervision report for construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital indicated the site was prepared, setting out and a pit excavation of 3000mm deep and 2900mm wide was achieved on hard formation, a blinding layer of 150mm thick cement sand mix 1:3:6, 20mm aggregates compacted to 95% maximum dry density, works were done up to walling of the super structure (150mm thick).

Challenge faced was the scarcity of materials within the vicinity of the project.

On 17th June 2022, a supervision report for construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital with the roof construction, doors, internal finishes and mechanical installation completed as per specifications,

On 17th June 2022, a supervision for renovation and extension of labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital indicated the following findings as complete; site leveling, substructure works, walling and framing, windows were fixed floor finished with terrazzo, approved dooby sink with accessories plus all external works including drainage channels for surface runoff of storm water.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have projects upgrading to HCIII</p>
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

1). There was evidence provided that the renovation and extension of a labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital was supervised by the technical team as per report dated 30th June 2022 and on 17th May 2022 the technical team led by the DE, CDO and the Environment Officer

2.The technical supervision team conducted supervision at the construction of the OPD at Pallisa Town Council as per report prepared and signed by the DE, DCDO and the Environment Officer on 8th February 2022.

3. The renovation of the X-Ray block at Pallisa General Hospital in Pallisa Town Council was supervised by the technical team on 8th February 2022 and was conducted by a team of technical staff who included the DNRO, District Engineer and the DCDO.

At all the three (3) sampled and visited Projects , the site instruction books and visitors books were presented and verified.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence for DHO as contract manager verifying for payments and ascertaining if they were within time frames is indicated below;

- Renovation and extension of a labour suite at Pallisa General Hospital with a requisition made on 16th June 2022 by Impressive group of companies Ltd, An interim certificate signed and approved on 22nd June 2022 of Ugx 42,771,021 by Asst Eng Officer, DNRO, District Engineer, Medical Superintendent officer, DCDO, CAO and Chief internal auditor

- Construction of a 5 stance line pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital had a requisition for payment made on 11th May 2022 by Navo General Enterprises, An interim certificate was signed and approved on 19th May 2022 by Asst Eng Officer, District Engineer, Medical superintendent, DNRO, DCDO, CAO and Chief Internal Auditor of Ugx 10,674,240.

- Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Pallisa General Hospital with a second requisition for payment made on 10th June 2022 by Navo General Enterprises, an interim certificate attached was approved on 22nd June 2022 by Asst Eng Officer, DNRO, DCDO, Medical Superintendent, CAO and District Internal Auditor of Ugx 8,781,618.

No payment vouchers were attached to these payments at the time of assessment.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

- Renovation of an X-ray block procurement file with a contract signed on 16th March 2022, approved by contracts committee on 1st March 2022 under minute 23.0 PALI CC010/2021/2022 with an evaluation report signed and approved on 4th February 2022.

- Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine procurement file had a contract signed on 16th March 2022, an evaluation report approved on 4th February 2022 and contract committee minute 17.0 PALI CC010/2021/2022 on 1st March 2022.

- Construction of a medical waste incinerator at Kaboloi HCIII was signed for on 31st March 2022, approved by contract committee on 1st March 2022 minute 30.0PALI CC010/2021/2022 and evaluation report signed by contracts committee on 3rd February 2022

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

There was a centralized grievances log at the LG opened on 18th August 2021 where grievances were recorded, investigated and responded to in the health sector and at the time of assessment, it was noted that the LG had no grievance recorded under the health sector for the FY 2021/22 under review.

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management titled “National guidelines for WASH in health care facilities”and had disseminated medial waste segregation charts in sampled health facilities such as;</p> <p>Gongonyo HCIII,Kaboloji HCIII and Kamuge HCIII</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>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health facilities had functional health care waste bins, placenta pits and waste pits.</p> <p>There was a company known as Green Label Services Ltd contracted by MoH with funding from USAID to collect healthcare waste at Health Centre IV and III that generate higher volumes of waste and there was evidence of waste collection forms dated 17th March 2022,14th April, 2022 and 16th May, 2022</p> <p>Other health units take the waste generated to Pallisa Hospital and Kamuge H/C III for collection.</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 of training records on medical waste management availed at the time of 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	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence of incorporation of the costed ESMP into the contract documents and BoQs for all the reviewed health projects' BoQs such as construction of an OPD at Pallisa Town Council HC III (Rweta) under procurement Ref No. PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00009, renovation and expansion of the Labour suite at Pallisa General hospital under procurement Ref No PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00037	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	<p>The LG had documentation on land acquisition status for where Health projects were implemented in the previous FY 2021/22 under review such as;</p> <p>Land title for where the expansion of the Labour suite/ward and renovation of the X-ray in Pallisa general Hospital were implemented,</p> <p>Freehold volume TOR2 FOLIO 11 measuring 9.9553 hectares of land on plot 29-47 Agule road Pallisa Town Council issued on 12th February 2020</p> <p>Land title for where the construction/completion of the OPD block at Pallisa Town Council (Rweta) HC III was implemented on freehold land volume TOR3 FOLIO 25 measuring 0.2820 hectares of land on plot 8 Kagoli road Pallisa Town Council issued on 17th March 2020.</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of	There was evidence of monitoring of the implemented health sector projects to ascertain compliance with the ESMPs and recommended corrective	0

Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	<p>measures but DNRO carried out the monitoring instead of the Environment Officer</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the renovation of the X-ray at Pallisa general Hospital in Pallisa Town Council, with recommendations made in the report such as planting grass, removal of debris from the site on the compound, site back filling and levelling prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 4th March, 2022 and 8th August 2022</p> <p>Monitoring report for construction/completion works of the OPD block at Pallisa Town Council (Rweta) HC III in Pallisa Town Council, with recommendations made in the report such as planting grass on the compound, site back filling and levelling prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 4th March 2022, 16th June 2022 and 8th August 2022</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the expansion works of the Labour suite/ward at Pallisa general Hospital in Pallisa Town Council, with recommendations made in the report such as planting grass, removal of debris from the site on the compound, site back filling and levelling prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 4th March, 2022 and 8th August 2022.</p> <p>However, the District Natural resource Officer (DNRO) endorsed the payment certificate instead of the Environment officer and CDO as guided in the Manual</p>
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence of E&S certification approved and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO for the projects in the Health sector.

Expansion works of the Labour suite/ward at Pallisa general Hospital in Pallisa Town Council under procurement Ref.No: PALI548/WRKS/2021-2022/00037 the interim payment certificate was endorsed on 17th June 2022 by both the DCDO and the DNRO

However the District Natural resource Officer (DNRO) endorsed the payment certificate instead of the Environment officer and CDO as guided in the Manual

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the Ministry MIS FY 2021/2022, the percentage of functional rural water sources was 97%.</p>	2
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the Ministry MIS FY 2021/2022, Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees was 81%.</p>	1

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

a. The LG average score
in the water and
environment LLGs
performance assessment
for the current. FY.

If LG average scores is

a. Above 80% score 2

b. 60 -80%: 1

c. Below 60: 0

(Only applicable when
LLG assessment starts)

LLGs were still under
verification

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The percentage of the budgeted water projects implemented in S/C with safe water coverage below the Pallisa DLG average which was 77.18% were,

Gogonyo S/C at 64.93% received 1 BH, Kamuge S/C at 64.74%, received 3 BHs, Putiti S/C at 72.9% received 1 BH & 1 protected spring,

Oboliso S/C at 49.24% received 1 BHs, kibale S/C at 74.24% received 1 BH & 1 Protected Spring, Agule S/C at 69% received 1 BH & a protected spring, Apopo S/C at 72% received 2 BHs & 1 protected spring, Kyerekura at 62% received 2 BHs.

Therefore out of the 22 water Point Projects implemented in the FY 2021/2022 ;16 were Implemented in S/C below the District average

Average

$$= 16/22 * 100 = 72.7\%$$

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

Engineers estimate was UGX 150,000,000 for the 6 borehole projects vizavi the awarded contract price according to the procurement file was UGX 146,562,000, thus $[(146,562,000 - 150,000,000) / 150,000,000] \times 100 = 0.03\%$ which was within the required range.

<p>2</p> <p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>2</p> <p>There was evidence that the LG all 22 WSS infrastructures implemented during the FY 2021/2022 were completed as reported in the APR 2021/2022 dated 1st September 2022 and from the AWP page Pg. 3, they included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Drilling and installation of the 17 Boreholes 2). Four (4) Protected Spring well 3). One (1) piped water scheme <p>According to the status report from DWO for quarter 4 submitted to the MWE on 03/08/2022, the percentage of projects completed were computed as follows; $22/22 * 100 = 100\%$.</p>
<p>3</p> <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>0</p> <p>There was no percentage increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/2021 was 97%</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2021/2022 = 97%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p>

3

0

New_Achievement of Standards:

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).

o If increase is more than 1% score 2

o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1

o If there is no increase : score 0.

There was no percentage increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.

Rural water facilities with functional water&sanitation committee in the FY 2020/2021 was 81%

Rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2021/2022 was 81%

Percentage change =0%

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

3

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The projects/facilities sampled included;

Nyaguo BH DWD 87473 in Ariet parish of Agule S/C funded by DWSCG completed on 19/05/2022

Aputoni BH DWD 50562 in Kaboloi Parish in Pallisa S/C funded by DWSCG completed on 25/04/2022

A protected spring in Obilenga chaboi village in Pasha parish of Agule S/C still funded by DWSCG

All the facilities were in place and of good water yield, they were well fenced and protected by the chairmen and the WUCs

Thus the three projects were in place as reported in the 4th qtr PBS report dated 29/08/2022

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

The DWO presented Q-1 report that was submitted on 23/10/2021, Information on functionality was found on Pg.1 to 15, and here It was found that there was negative attitude of the communities towards O&M fund collection, there was no facilitation from S/C to coordinate the WATSAN activities

Similarly Q-2 report was submitted on 23/10 /2021, information on functionality and management was found with in the attached software report attached, and this entailed, challenges of the WSCs, , the lack of sense of ownership by some communities of the water sources by the community and many other issues.

Q-3 & Q-4 reports were submitted On 14/04/2022 & 03/08/2022 respectively contained information on WSS committees of which some were no longer active and needed retraining, in addition to vandalization of the chlorine dispensers and many other aspects.

<p>5</p> <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>3</p> <p>There was evidence that the DWO updates the MIS data.</p> <p>PAT was presented with Pallisa District MIS data base that contained the Form 1 and Form 4 data collection templates of water sources by location & functionality.</p> <p>Latest updated sources among others included, Borehole DWD 70114 in Omalingai Village of Agule S/C, DWD 70116 in kadodio village of Agule S/C, DWD 81525 in Okalei Village in Opwateta S/C as per 10/10/2022.</p>
<p>5</p> <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 LIG 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>0</p> <p>LLGs were still under verification</p>

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The District Water Officer had budgeted UGX 74,000,000 for Civil engineer (Water) and Engineering Assistant Water as wage and this was reflected in the performance contract for 2022/2023.</p> <p>The posts of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization and Assistant Water Officer for sanitation and Hygiene were not budgeted for as they were filled on assignment.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Natural Resources Officer had budgeted UGX 96,000,000 for Forestry Officer: and Environment Officer and this was evident in the performance contract for 2022/2023.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Officer was not budgeted for because the position was not provided for as per the district approved staff establishment structure.</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>Evidence showed that District Water Office had one staff who had been appraised by the DWO.</p> <p>Orone Richard, the driver was appraised on 27th July, 2022.</p> <p>Other staffs were appraised by other supervisors from where they recruited for instance, Arikosi Stephen an office attendant was appraised by Okoret Francis, the Assistant Engineering officer on 27/7/2022.</p>	3

7

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

No evidence was availed to the PAT during the time assessment

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8

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 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 DWO allocated over 84.7% of the budget to sub counties below the district average which was 78.77% in the year 2022/2023

Allocation to S/C below LG included;

Agule S/C at 71.8% received 2BHs worth 48M,Telekura, Apopong, Gogonyo, Akisimu, Kameke, Kawukula, S/C at 62%, 62.1%,71.09%,78.55%, 58%, 76.55% received 1BH each worth 24M respectively, Oboliso at 49.77% received 1BH plus 1 pipes water system worth UGX 267,907,732, Obutet S/C at 72.07% received 2BHs worth 48M.

Therefore out of the Total budget of UGX 627,907,732 for the new water sources, percentage allocation to sub counties below the district average = $(531,907,732/627,907,732)*100 = 84.7\%$

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 that the DWO communicated to the LLGS their respective allocations for the current FY 2022/2023 according to the public notice board allocation for the current year 2022/2023 which was pinned up on the district notice board on 19/07/2022.

Allocations included; Gogonyo S/C received 1BH, Budabula parish of Puti-Puti received 2BH, Dudi Village of Oboliso parish of Oboliso S/C received 1BH worth 24M among others.

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 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

There was evidence that the DWO monitored WSS facilities.

A general monitoring report for FY 2021/2022 was presented that entailed a summary of the field assessment conducted on the functionality of various water sources in the LG in Q-01, It was found that functional BHs were 559, 139 protected Spring, 144 Shallow wells.

16/12/21 in Quarter 2. A general Inspection report on water sources to be rehabilitated across the LG was done, Findings included; Most communities had their contributions collected, most springs needed protection to avoid sharing with animals, most BHs were functional.

On 24/03/2022, Under this quarter, findings included, hydrogeological report on water sources was compiled, it was found that accessibility was fair, selected areas were of high water potential, other successive monitoring reports on various dates were also availed on 5/04/2022, 30/04/2022, 12/05/2022 successively for successive monitoring was broken down to supervise water resources that was carried out in various S/Cs.

A list of all water sources in the district was presented to me and it was concluded that more than 95% of the sources were being monitored as per the planned schedule.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>There was proof that only two (2) DWSCC meetings were conducted instead of the 4 required under guidelines.</p> <p>The 2 meetings were conducted in Q2, & Q4 on 30/11/2021 & 25/05/2022 respectively with key issues discussed being, stopping sand mining near water sources, Water User committee Inactiveness, to refix the broken channels and poor garbage collection were discussed.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGS their respective allocations for the current FY 2022/2023 according to the Public notice board allocation for the current year 2022/2023 which was pinned up on the district notice board on 19/07/2022.</p> <p>Allocations included. Gogonyo S/C received 1BH, Budabula parish of Puti-Puti received 2BH, Dudi Village of Oboliso parish of Oboliso S/C received 1BH worth 24M among others</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The DWO allocated UGX 33,826,800M equivalent to 42.2% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget to mobilization activities out of the total budget of UGX 80,103,538 towards community mobilization activities according to pg. 2 of 3 of the Approved AWP</p>	3

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.

There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles as seen in the following WSCS training reports.

Reports on training of water and Sanitation committees held from 1st to 11th of October, 2021 in Bukoda community of Puti-Puti S/C, Bukede community of Kaukura S/C, Oboliso community of Oboliso S/C, Bugolya Community of Oloki S/C where there was reformation of WSCs and fresh trainings, Here issues to do with regular maintenance of water sources , Committees to monitor sanitation of the sources, record keeping were emphasized. The reports were signed by William Kalenya the CDO and Okurut Francis the Assistant water officer.

Investment Management

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:

Score 4 or else 0

The DWO presented an up to date Asset register as per 10/08/2022 where all water sources were stipulated by their location, nature of the waters source point, functionality and other relevant Information.

The latest BH updates as per June 2022 by the District register were, A BH DWD 50563 located in Bugolya village of Oloki S/C, another BH DWD 50561 located in Bukoda of Puti-puti S/C, a BH DWD 81525 located in okalei village of Opwatetai S/C

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

There was no evidence that the WSS projects for the current FY had underwent desk review as reported by the district planner by the assessment time.

However, the projects were derived from the DDP III into the AWP for the FY 2022/23. On page 51 of the DDP III, the LG planned to construct latrines in RGCs in a span of 5 years, also the LG planned the drilling and rehabilitation boreholes coupled with the construction of the piped water systems.

The AWP FY 2022/2023 page 8 indicated construction of 15BHs and 1 piped water scheme in Various S/Cs that included Agule, Apopong, kibale and a piped scheme in Oboliso s/c.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented a community application files for the current FY with current application forms/letters.</p> <p>Some of the application files found in the file included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request of a BH source on 1/10/2021 in Otira LC!, Agule Parish of Agule S/C signed by Jamal Nepsol the LC1 Chairman • Request of a BH on 23/05/2021 in Agur LC1, Agur Parish of kibale S/C by Omut Ben the LC1 chairman • Request of a BH source in Kateki-kakai Village in Olok Parish of Olok S/C signed by Elwanamicheal the Sub county chief on 3/01/2022 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that field based appraisals were conducted to check on the technical, Environmental aspects and designs by the time of assessment</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There were costed ESMPs for all the water projects in the previous FY however, the ESMPs were not incorporated into the BoQs , examples include;</p> <p>Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Bukoda village in Puti Puti sub-county impacts waste generation erosion from the loose over burden soil and mitigation measures were</p>	0

addressed example levelling of the site, digging a larger soak pit to trap waste water screening form and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 7th December, 2021.

Screening for the drilling and installation of the deep borehole at Aputon-1 village in Pallisa sub- county. The impacts like waste generation erosion from the loose over burden soil and mitigation measures were addressed example levelling of the site, dig a larger soak pit to trap waste water in the screening report and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 10th December, 2021.

Screening for the construction of a 3-stance pit latrine at Nyasala rural growth centre/trading centre in Chelekura sub-county identified impacts include; vegetation clearance, surface and ground water contamination, waste generation in the screening report and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 9th April 2022.

Screening for the construction of a 3-stance pit latrine at Nyagwo rural growth centre/trading centre in Agule sub-county identified impacts include; vegetation clearance, surface and ground water contamination, waste generation in the screening report and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 9th April 2022.

12	2	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The water infrastructure projects were incorporated as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borehole sitting,drilling,pump testing,water quality testing,casting and installation of 6 boreholes lot 1 at Ugx 150,000,000 page 2 • Borehole sitting ,drilling, pump testing, water quality testing, casting, and installation of 6 boreholes lot 2 at Ugx 150,000,000 page 2 • Construction of 3 VIP lined pit latrines of 3 stances at rural urban growth centers at Ugx 45,000,000 page 2 • Rehabilitation and protection of spring wells in the district at Ugx 39,000,000 page 2
		<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		
.				
12	2	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borehole sitting, drilling, pump testing, water quality testing, casting and installation of 6 boreholes lot 1 approved on 22nd December 2021 minute 10.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022. • Borehole sitting, drilling, pump testing, water quality testing, casting and installation of 6 boreholes lot 2 approved on 22nd December 2021 minute 11.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022. • Rehabilitation and protection of spring wells in the district on 22nd December 2021 minute 13.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022.
		<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		
.				

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines
Score 2:

There was an appointment letter of Opedum Mannington(District Water Officer) as the contract manager for water projects including boreholes sitting and drilling lot 1 and lot 2 on 10th January 2022by CAO Oola Donato Olam.

The project implementation team in this case did not meet the requirements of the manual

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2

There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO as indicated below;

1. Nyaguo BH DWD 87473 in Ariet parish of Agule S/C funded by DWSCG and

2. Aputoni BH DWD 50562 in Kaboloi Parish in Pallisa S/C funded by DWSCG.

The boreholes had good water yield, borehole recharge catchment area was well fenced, well operating hand pump and properly constructed apron 100mm by 100mm as prescribed by the design with a neat cement screed at the base.

3. A protected spring in Obilenga-chaboi village in Pasha parish of Agule S/C still funded by DWSCG.

The protected spring was in place, with stone pitching on the side embankments, the well floor was concreted as per prescription and grass planted on top of the natural spring floor and complete.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2

There was evidence of supervision reports prepared by the water department for the following projects;

- A supervision report for protection of 8 spring wells prepared on 20th April 2022 which indicated objectives to certify water source allocations i.e. villages, sub counties, and counties agreed upon. Ensuring that all measures and procedures described in the BOQs were followed and confirm water source functionality and all these objectives were met accordingly.

- A supervision report for 6 boreholes drilling was prepared on 6th June 2022 and the following boreholes were functional and adhered to the standard procedures; Bukoda, Bugoya, Aputon, Najeniti, Aitatitoi boreholes.

Procurement and Contract

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

There was evidence that the District Water Officer verified works and initiated payments for contractors as indicated below;

- Protection of spring wells with a requisition for payment from Bakirigwoko and brothers on the 4th April 2022, an interim certificate was therein signed and approved on 5th May 2022 of Ugx 23,226,914 by the CAO, Chief Internal Auditor, District Natural Resource Officer, District Engineer and District Water Officer. The payment voucher reflected on 17th May 2022.

- Boreholes sitting, drilling and installation of 6 boreholes lot 1 had a requisition for payment made on 1st June 2022 by Absolom and Brothers Ltd. Payment certificate signed and approved on 10th June 2022 of Ugx 94,892,685 by District Water officer, Chief Internal Auditor and CAO ,effecting a voucher 44511440 for Ugx 89,199,124 on 23rd June 2022.

- Borehole sitting, drilling and installation of 6 boreholes lot 2 had a requisition for payment made on 26th April 2022 by Icon projects ltd,the certificate was signed and approved on 12th May 2022 by District Water Officer of Ugx 137,874,070 effecting a voucher payment number 43304356 on 16th May 2022.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence of water infrastructure procurement files as listed below;

1. Borehole sitting ,drilling and installation of 6 boreholes lot 1 with a works contract signed on 7th January 2022 ,approved by contracts committee on 22nd December 2021 minute 10.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022 and an evaluation report signed on 16th December 2021.

2. Borehole sitting, drilling and installation of 6 boreholes lot 2 with a works contract signed on 27th January 2022,approved by contracts committee on 22nd December 2021 minute 11.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022 and an evaluation report approved on 9th December 2021.

3. Protection of springs wells in the district were approved for on 22nd December 2021 minute 10.0 PALI CC007/2021-2022,a works contract signed on 19th January 2022 and an evaluation report on 17th December 2021.

Environment and Social Requirements

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

Maximum 3 points this performance measure

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

Score 3, If not score 0

The LG had a grievance redress committee and grievance log where grievances were recorded for further investigation and response. The LG had recorded some grievances from the water sector project implementation such as,

Mr. Elwana Michael from Olok community reported on 3rd January about poor a location of water in the villages of Osekelio, Oibokoton, Ngalwe central, Kateki and Odwarat that have poor weter coverage with a high population the DWO with water mobilisation had a meeting on 15th May, 2022 and resolution of allocating the area boreholes in the next FY 2022/23

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of guidelines by the LG at the time of assessment evidenced by the meeting minutes held on 15th May, 2022 for the social Mobilization review meeting sanitation guidelines and disseminated guidelines titled “framework guidelines for water source protection volume-3 for protecting water sources for point water supply system” the minutes were attached and signed by the Opedun Hanington social mobilizer water department in attendance were CDOs from sub-counties of;</p> <p>Opio Allan from Akisim S/C</p> <p>Apio Judith from Kibale S/C</p> <p>Lipoto Ivan from Pallisa S/C</p> <p>Okoboi Ignatius from Gogonyo S/C</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of E&S screening forms for all the water projects implemented in the previous FY. However, there was no incorporation of the ESMPs costs into the BoQs for all the water projects. as per the example below;</p> <p>Screening for the drilling and installation of 6 deep borehole under procurement Ref No PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00009 by M/S Icon Projects Ltd.</p> <p>Screening for the drilling and installation of 6 deep borehole under procurement Ref. No. PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00008 by M/S MSR Technologies (U) Ltd.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of all the MoUs where the water sources were implemented as per the examples below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An MoU dated 15/5/2022 between Otai Franco and Pallisa DLG for the establishment of a borehole at Aputon-1 in Pallisa S/C witnessed by the LC-1 Mr. Irara Misi 2. An MoU dated 19/12/2021 between Okol Charles from Kapala-B village in Apopong S/C and Pallisa DLG for the establishment of a borehole at Kapala-B village in Apopong S/C and Pallisa witnessed by the LC-1 Mr. Anguria Simon Peter. 3. An MoU dated 11th/10/2021 between Wakula Patrick from Bukoda village in Puti-Puti sub-county and Pallisa DLG for the establishment of a borehole at Bukoda village in Puti-Puti sub-county witnessed 	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of signed E&S compliance certification forms by the Environment Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor.</p> <p>Screening for the drilling and installation of 6 deep boreholes under procurement Ref. No. PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00008 by M/S MSR Technologies (U) Ltd.</p> <p>Screening for the drilling and installation of 6 deep boreholes under procurement Ref No PALI548/WRKS/21-22/00009 by M/S Icon Projects Ltd.</p>	0

15

0

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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

There was no evidence availed
of monitoring reports for all the
water projects to ascertain
compliance with ESMPs.

Score 2, If not score 0

Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else</p>	<p>It was established that the LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>However, MOWE established two irrigation schemes between 2018-2020 which irrigate 30 acres in Bolliso I & II in Limoto sub-county based on the report dated 30/1/2022p1-3.</p> <p>Also, the LG had additional irrigated land of 20 Acres from MSI equipment installed during 2020/2021 from Agricultural extension Grant-MAAIF as per the report dated 30/1/2022 p1-3.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>There was no irrigated land from MSI grant beneficiaries to calculate the increase in acreages of newly irrigated for the last two FYs.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG did not receive the MSI grant last FY.</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>Not applicable. Pallisa DLG rolled out MSI program this FY.</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>Not applicable. Pallisa DLG rolled out MSI program this FY.</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"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>Not applicable. Pallisa DLG rolled out the MSI program this FY.</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"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>The assessment team reviewed appointment letters, staff lists dated 3/11/2022, and 13/9/2022 p1-2, and staff structure for LLGs for extension workers on 29/11/2022. It was established that 28 (34.1%) of LLGS extension workers out of 84 were recruited.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Not applicable. Pallisa DLG rolled out the MSI program this FY.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Not applicable. Pallisa DLG rolled out the MSI program this FY.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5

2

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

The assessment team sampled and visited three LLGs of Pallisa TC, Boliso I, and Putiputi sub-counties on 28/11/2022.

Maximum score 4

The assessment team reviewed and compared staff lists dated 3/11/2022, and 13/9/2022 p1-2, on 28/11/2022 and ascertained that the position of extension workers filled was accurate as per the staff list at the LLGs. The extension workers were working in each LLGS as follows

i. Nalumansi Gertrude Okot, (AO) Omoding Charles (AAHO) had filled the positions of extension workers in Boliso I Sub-county,

ii. Dr. Ouke Bernard Odongo and Mugoda Indimulodiwere filled the positions of (VO) and (AO) respectively in Pallisa TC.

iii. While Ainapakin Joshua (AAHO) took the position of extension worker in Putiputi Sub-county.

5

0

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. Pallisa DLG rolled out the MSI program this FY.

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>Not applicable. The LG was rolled on to the MSI program this FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>MSI program started this FY in Pallisa district and MIS reports was not available.</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>The MSI program started this FY in the Pallisa district and quarterly reports were not available.</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>The LG had evidence of an approved performance improvement plan as per the report dated 4/10/2022 on pages 1 through 6. The LG identified the lowest performing LLGs of Puti puti sub-county where Ainapakin Joshua, an AAHO works. The LG developed the LLGS for training in Artificial Insemination (AI) and a letter of study leave letter dated 28/7/2022 was provided as a piece of evidence.</p>	1
---	---	---	---	---

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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG implemented PIP and had a copy certificate of completion awarded in AI on 06/10/2021 from the Institute of Animal Production, Enttebe, and as per the report for resumption of duty on 28/10/ 2021.</p>	1
---	---	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the approved budget performance report dated 26/5/2022 (in the district vote 919), UGX 897,040,000 was allocated to 28 extension workers in the current FY.</p>	1
---	---	--	---	---

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

The assessment team sampled and visited three LLGs of Pallisa TC, Boliso I, and Puti-puti sub-counties on 28/11/2022.

The assessment team reviewed attendance books and staff lists (dated 3/11/2022, and 13/9/2022 p1-2) and established the extension workers were working in these LLGs deployed.

Dr. Ouke Bernard Odongo (VO) and MugodaIndimulodiwere working in Pallisa TC,

Omoding Charles (AAHO) and Nalumansi Gertrude Okot (AO) were in the Boliso I sub-county, and

Ainapakin Joshua (AAHO) in Puti-puti sub county.

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team sampled and visited three LLGs of Pallisa TC, Boliso I, and Puti-puti sub-counties on 28/11/2022.</p> <p>I observed the extension workers sign the attendance books and established</p> <p>Dr. Ouke Bernard Odongo (VO) and MugodaIndimulodi were working in Pallisa TC,</p> <p>Omoding Charles (AAHO) and Nalumansi Gertrude Okot (AO) were working in the Boliso I sub-county and Ainapakin Joshua (AAHO) in Puti-puti sub-county.</p>	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>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team sampled and visited three LLGs of Pallisa TC, Boliso I, and Puti-puti sub-counties on 28/11/2022.</p> <p>I established staff lists displayed on the noticeboards of respectively SAS in accordance with CAO's circular to LLGs dated 13/9/2022.</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all</p>	<p>The assessment team reviewed the personal appraisal files of extension workers and evidence showed that the following</p>	1

Workers

Maximum score 4

Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0

were appraised;

1. Musubika Rose Mary, (AFO) of Kasodo Sub-county was appraised by Kalabe Siraje the SAS on 9/7/2022.

2. Omio Stephen Emon, (AO) of Kasodo Sub-county was appraised by Elwana Micheal the SAS on 30/6/2022.

3. Akileng Lillian, (AAHO) of Akisim Sub-county was appraised by Baluki Agnes the SAS on 4/7/2022.

4. Pedere George, (AAHO) of Kasodo Sub-county was appraised by Kulabe Siraje the SAS on 30/6/2022.

5. Nalumansi Gertrude Okot, (AO) of Boliso I Sub-county was appraised by Oidi Stephen the SAS on 30/6/2022.

6. Emenatai Stephen (AAO) of Opwatetat Sub-county was appraised by Ecaat Joseph the SAS on 22/6/2022.

7. Omasukei Peter Ambrose, (AAO) of Kasodo Sub-county was appraised by Kulabe Siraje the SAS on 30/6/2022.

8. Kedi Peter Nixion (AAO) of Chelekura Sub-county was appraised by Olupot Moses the SAS on 27/6/2022.

9. Mugoda Indimulodi (AO) of Pallisa TC was appraised by Asio Maureen Teddy Senior Assistant Town Clerk on

27/6/2022.

10. Osako Maxwell, (AAO) of Agule Sub-county was appraised by Ochom Emmanuel the Ag. SAS on 29/7/2022.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of corrective action taken on agreed performance plans.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to PAT at the time of Assessment	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	There was no evidence availed to PAT at the time of Assessment.	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>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>During FY 2021/2022, the MSI program was not rolled out in Pallisa DLG.</p> <p>Hence, the district had not budgeted for the capital development of MSI equipment and complementary services in the budget performance contracts of 2021/2022 as required.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG was expecting to receive UGX 334,136,150 this FY 2022/2023 towards the establishment of 5 MSI equipment demonstrations. The district had allocated 30% (UGX100,241,000) for MSI demonstrations, about UGX 133,654,460 representing 40% for farmer's awareness creation. While 30% was catered for awareness creation of Local leaders and DTPC as per MAAIF guidelines dated 28/4/2022 pages 1 to 9.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 MSI program started this FY in the LG and the district had no evidence of co-funding incorporated in the performance contracts.</p> <p>According to MAAIF guidelines dated 28/4/2022 pages (1-9), no co-funding was needed for MSI demonstrations.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The MSI program started this FY in the LG and the district had no evidence of the use of co-funding.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had no evidence of meetings of DPO and DTPC to disseminate the use of co-funding because the MSI program had just been rolled out in the district.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</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>	<p>There was no evident of monthly monitoring of installed MSI equipment presented to the assessment team.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>		

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of field monitoring and supervision of installed MSI equipment presented to the assessment team.</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>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of supervision reports and minutes of field meetings to ascertain that hands-on support was provided to LLG extension workers during complementary services.</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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The program of MSI started this FY in the district.</p>	0
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of farmer's mobilization as per the report dated 201/10/2021 p(1-4) on solar irrigation at Kibale, Pallisa TC, Kameke, gogongo, Puti-puti sub-counties.</p>	2

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of training for staff and political leaders in the district to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	0
	Maximum score 4			

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The LG had registers of MSI equipment according to the report dated 20/1/2022, P(1-3). The MSI equipment was installed in Boliso I and Boliso II in Boliso Sub-county by MOWE irrigation.	2
	Maximum score 8			

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had an updated database of applications since the LG had just been rolled out in the DLG.	0
	Maximum score 8			

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

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p>	<p>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>There was no evidence of approved farmers publicized on district and LLGs noticeboards at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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>At the time of assessment, the MSI equipment's were not yet incorporated into the annual approved procurement Plan for FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 18</p>			

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</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>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</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>f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</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>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable. The LG had just rolled out the MSI program in the district this FY.</p>	0

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

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	0	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no display of mechanism of addressing MSI grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework at the production department notice board and the LLG notice boards at the time assessment</p>
14	0	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had no log for grievances at the time of assessment there were no grievances recorded under the irrigation projects</p> <p>Since the projects were not executed</p>
14	0	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no any grievance investigated at the LG because there was no implementation of any irrigation project</p>

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no response to the aggrieved parties at the LG because there was no implementation of any irrigation project</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no grievances reported at the LG because there was no implementation of any irrigation project</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG had not disseminated MSI guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste Containers.</p> <p>There were no MoUs signed between farmers and the LG since there were no projects implemented</p>	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	There were no projects implemented at the LG at the time of assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation by the time of assessment, there was no project to monitor	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	The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation t the time of assessment and there was no project to certify for compliance	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	The LG did not implement any project in micro- scale irrigation t the time of assessment and there was no project to certify for compliance	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The position of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled by Opendun Hannington appointed on 3rd April 2021 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 22/2021.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization was filled on secondment by the CAO. Mr. Okwakol Aggrey Paul was assigned duties of Assistant Water officer for mobilization by CAO Mr. Kuruhiira Godfrey M.A through a letter dated 16th January 2018.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Engineering Officer was substantively filled by Okurut Francis appointed on 3rd March 2021 as was directed by Minute No. 24/2021(1) of 22 February 2021	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The position of Natural Resources Officer was not provided for on the approved and customized staff structure for Paliisa DLG.	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Omasai Abram appointed on 6th June 2018 as was directed by Min No. 49/2018 of 5th June 2018.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Forestry Officer was substantively filled by Odelle John Patrick who was appointed on 3rd March 2021 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 19/2021 of 19th February 2021.</p>	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for water projects for previous FY but the screening was carried out by the District Natural Resource officer instead of the Environment Officer for instance,</p> <p>The screening of a project on drilling and installation of a borehole at Bukoda village in Puti Puti sub-county indicated impacts on waste generation erosion from the loose over burden soil and mitigation measures that were addressed for example levelling of the site, dig larger soak pit to trap waste water screening form and ESMP was prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 7th December, 2021.</p>	10
---	--	---	---	-----------

The screening of a project on drilling and installation of deep borehole at Obekete village in Apopong sub-county. Identified impacts included, waste generation of erosion from the loose over burden soil and mitigation measures were considered and addressed for example, levelling of the site, dig larger soak pit to trap waste water as reported in the screening report and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 7th December, 2021.

The screening for the drilling and installation of deep borehole at Aputon-1 village in Pallisa sub-county. The impacts included the waste generation erosion from the loose over burden soil and mitigation measures were addressed for example levelling of the site, dig larger soak pit to trap waste water in the screening report and ESMP prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 10th December, 2021.

The screening for the construction project of a 3-stance pit latrine at Nyagwo rural growth centre/trading center in Agule sub-county identified impacts that included; vegetation clearance, surface and ground water contamination, waste generation indicated in

the screening report and ESMP was prepared and endorsed by DNRO and the DCDO on 9th April 2022.

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.	The water projects in the LG did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019, schedule 4, part 2 section(3a) which are small projects that require screening and have minimal impacts. Mitigation measures of the impacts for water projects were identified in the screening report and 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 the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	A drilling permit of number KAM20/DP-03266/2021/RR issued to M/S MSR Technologies (U) Ltd on 12th July, 2021 by the Director of Water development Eng. Joseph Oriono Eyatu. Permit granted was valid for one year. A drilling permit of number KAM14/DP-00983/2021/RR issued to M/S Icon Projects Ltd on 17th June, 2021 by the Director of Water development Eng. Joseph Oriono Eyatu. Permit granted was valid for one year.	10

Health Minimum
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of DHO was substantively filled by Mulekwa Godfrey appointed on 5th January 2012 as was directed by the DSC Minute No. 99/2011 (i) of 06th December 2011.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The position of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal Child Health and Nursing was substantively filled by Ms. Iyogil Teddy who was appointed on 20th August 2018 as was directed by DSC Min No. 78/2018 of 17th August 2018	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health was substantively filled by Mr. Okolomong Charles Dickens appointed on 10th January 2014 as was directed by DSC Min No. 79/2013(1) of 20th December 2013.	10

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Environment Health Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Ikwaras Bernard appointed on 10th June 2019 as directed by Min No. 39/2019 of 27th June 2019.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Mulira Siraji appointed on 4th February 2011, as was directed by Minute No. 88/2010 (iii) of 30th November 2010</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The position of Biostatistician was substantively filled by Mr. Okia Lazarus who was appointed on 6th June 2018 as was directed by DSC Min. 47/2018 of 1st June 2018.</p>	10

1

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

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

The position of District Cold Chain Technician was substantively filled by Mr. Opaade Elijah who was appointed on 15th August 2022 as was directed by DSC under Min. 13/2022 (b) of 10th August 2022.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1

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

h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1

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

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

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1

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

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

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 Pallisa DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health projects implemented during the previous FY 2021/2022 for instance;

1. Screening for the expansion construction works of labour suite ward at Pallisa General Hospital in Pallisa Town Council, impacts identified were dust emission, debris and construction waste and mitigation measures, site hoarding, backfilling and site leveling were mentioned on the screening form. The ESMP was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

2. Screening for the construction of the OPD at Pallisa Town Council Rweta HC III in Pallisa Town Council identified impacts included, vegetation loss, waste generation, debris and dust emission and suggested mitigation measures were limit vegetation clearance to site and plant passpalum and trees, hoard off the site made in screening form and ESMP this was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

3. The screening for the renovation of the X-Ray block at Pallisa general hospital in Pallisa Town Council, had impacts identified which included waste generation, debris and mitigation measures noted were limited clearance and backfilling as indicated on the screening form. The ESMP was prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and the DCDO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1,450,000

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.

There was no requirement for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for the health sector projects implemented in the FY 2021/22 under review this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019, schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section(e) which were small projects that require screening and have minimal impacts.

The environmental and social impacts were identified and mitigation measures proposed in the E&S screening reports and the ESMPs.

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG had a substantively appointed DEO by the name of Ms. Lukenda Agnes the DEO was substantively appointed on 3rd September 2021 2018 as was directed by DSC minute No.59/2021 of 1st September 2021.	30
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Mr. Opedum John the Senior Inspector of Schools (DIS) was substantively appointed on 4th October, 2021 was directed by the DSC Min. No. 77/2021 of 7th October 2021. Mr. Opela Stephen the Inspector of Schools was substantively appointed on 20th August 2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 75/2018 (i) of 17th August 2018 Ms. Ojangole Jesca the Inspector of Schools was substantively appointed on 20th August 2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 75/2018 (iii) of 17th August 2018	40
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that Pallisa DLG conducted Environment, Social and Climate Change screening for the Education projects implemented in the previous Financial Year	15

and Climate Change
screening/Environment
Social Impact
Assessments (ESIAs)

The Maximum score is
30

2021/2022 and the screening forms were duly endorsed by the District Natural Resource Officer and the Community Development Officer for instance;

1. The screening for the construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kadesko Primary school in Kibale sub-county. The Impacts and mitigation measures were identified in the screening form and included in ESMP for example, removal of debris on site, planting of grass and site levelling, prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,150,000 on 4th February 2022.

2. Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Limoto primary school in Boliso-1 sub-county. Impacts and mitigation measures identified in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th February 2022.

3. Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Kalaki primary school in Pallisa Town Council. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommendations made in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th February 2022.

4. Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance drainable latrine at Omatakojo

primary school in Kibale sub-county. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommendations made in the screening form for example removal of debris on site backfilling and levelling of the site prepared and endorsed by the DNRO and DCDO with a costed ESMP of UGX 1,200,000 on 4th February 2022.

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.

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019, schedule 4, part 2 section 4 sub-section (d) which were small projects that required screening and have minimal impacts. The impacts for projects were identified during the screening process and the mitigation measures proposed in the ESMPs.

15

The Maximum score is 30

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Kirya Herbert Saijja appointed on 20th December, 2012 as was directed by Pallisa DSC under Minute No 32/2012(a) of 5th December, 2012.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Planer was substantively filled by Mukesi Robert appointed on 6th June 2018 as was directed by Minute No. 44/2018 of 30th May 2018.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer was substantively filled by Eng. Ongwara Micheal appointed on 10th May 2021 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 49/2021 of 20th May 2021.	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of District Natural Resources Officer was substantively filled by Samuka Muhammed appointed on 4th February, 2011 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 100/2010 of 23 December, 2010.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of District Production Officer was not substantively filled.</p> <p>M/s. Nalapa Martha Tasima was the Ag. DPO substantively appointed Principal Entomologist on 3rd September, 2021 under Minute No. 58/2021 (3)(a) of 1st September 2021.</p> <p>She was assigned extra duties of DPO as per the CAO's letter dated 5/5/2022</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Wamire Dawson appointed on 11th March 2013 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 08/2013(1) of 18th February 2013.</p>	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of District Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Ingurat Christine Harriet who was appointed on 4th October 2019 under DSC Minute No. 45/2019 (iii) of the letter 18th September 2019.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Oponguru Apollo appointed on 8th April, 2015 as was directed by DSC Minute No.02/2015 of 25/March 2015.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Okello Daniel appointed on 7th June 2018 as was directed by DSC Minute No.53/2018 of 15th June 2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The post of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled by Odelle Francis appointed on 4th April 2013 as was directed by DSC Minute No.28/2013 (1) of 27th March 2013.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Kaiire Kitawu Wilberforce appointed on 6th June, 2018 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 50/2018 of 5th June 2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Senior Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Akia Jane Winfred appointed on 2nd June, 2017 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 17/2017 of 30th May, 2017.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Bomu Paul appointed on 18th October, 2005 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 161/2005.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Kiirya Sam Samuel appointed on 2nd June 2017 as was directed by DSC Minute No. 20/2017 of 2nd June 2017.</p>	2

1

2

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.

n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0

The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Kateu Charles appointed on 23rd July 2020 under DSC Min. No. 12/2020 of 26th June 2020.

2

5

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG
Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

Pallisa District Local Government had 14 LLGs as per the approved staff establishment structure including 13 sub-counties and 1 Town Council.

It was evident all the 14 LLGs had positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries and Town Clerk substantively filled as indicated below;

1. Naizuli Hadijah Ibrahim, the SAS of Pallisa sub county was appointed on 13/7/2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No.64/2018 (a) (iv) of 12th July/2018.

2. Kulabe Siraji, the SAS of Kasodo Sub County was appointed on 20/7/2009 as was directed by DSC Min. No.43/2009 (i) (b) of 7th May, 2009.

3. Atenia Anthony, the SAS of Kameke sub county was appointed on 13/7/2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No.64/2018 (c) of 12th July, 2018.

4. Olupot Moses, the SAS of Chelekura sub county was appointed on 6/6/2017 as was directed by DSC Min. No.21/2017(b) of 5/June, 2017.

5. Orone Julius Ambrose, the

SAS of Obutet Sub County was appointed on 13/7/2021 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.64/2018(b) (vi) of 12th /July 2018.

6. Opurusi Nicholas, the SAS of Gogonyo Sub County was appointed on 13/7/2018 as was directed by DSC Min
No.64/2018(b) (v) of 12th July, 2018.

7. Aisu Jude Martin, the SAS of Kibale Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2008 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.19/2008(iii) of 17/09/2008.

8. Okurut Samson, the SAS of Kamuge Sub County was appointed on 6/6/2017 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.21/2017(c) 5th June, 2017.

9. Elwana Michael, the SAS of Agule Sub County was appointed on 13/7/2018 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.64/2018 (a) (iii) of 12th July 2018.

10. Mutzakhi Christine Otim, the SAS of Puti-Puti Sub County was appointed on 24/2/2009 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.03/2009 (ii).

11. Ecaat Joseph, the SAS of Opwateta Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2006 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.20/2008(ii) of 17/09/2008.

12. Baluku Agnes, the SAS of Akisim Sub County was appointed on 13/7/2018 as was directed by DSC Min.
No.64/2008(a) (i) of 12th July 2018.

13. Batumule Issa Zaidi, the Senior Assistant Town Clerk of Pallisa Town Council was appointed on 1/7/2013 as was

directed by DSC Min.
No.45/2013 of 20th May-14th
June 2013.

14. Asio Maureen Teddy, the
SAS of Olok Sub County was
appointed on 22/10/2008 as was
directed by DSC Min.
No.20/2008(ii) of 17/09/2008.

2

0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Pallisa District Local
Government had 14 LLGs as
per the approved staff
establishment structure
including 13 sub-counties and 1
Town Council.

It was evident only nine (9) out
of 14 LLGs had positions of
Community Development
Officers substantively filled as
indicated below;

1. Ichom Juliet, the CDO of
Kamuge Sub County was
appointed on 3/3/2021 as was
directed by DSC Min No.
10/2021(5) of 18thFebruary,
2021.

2. Nyomera Halima, the CDO of
Kasodo Sub County was
appointed on 13/6/2018 as was
directed by DSC Min No.
54/2018(3) of 7th, 8th, 11th 12th
June, 2018.

3. Opio Allan, the CDO of Akisim
Sub County was appointed on
13/6/2018 as was directed by
DSC Min No. 54/2018(4) of 7th,
8th, 11th and 12th June, 2018.

4. Kantono Martha, the CDO of
Puti-Puti Sub County was
appointed on 3/3/2021 as was
directed by DSC Min No.
10/2021(4) of 18th February,
2021.

5. Sisye Hassan, the CDO of
Obutet Sub County was

appointed on 18/3/2021 as was directed by DSC Min No. 35/2021(1) of 26th February, 2021.

6. Opio Simon, the CDO of Chelekura Sub County was appointed on 13/6/2018 as was directed by DSC Min No. 54/2018(1) of 7th, 8th, 11th and 12th June, 2018.

7. Kalegere Lillian, the CDO of Agule Sub County was appointed on 24/6/2013 as was directed by DSC Min No. 43/2013(4) of June 2013.

8. Apio Judith, the CDO of Kibale Sub County was appointed on 3/3/2021 as was directed by DSC Min No. 10/2021(2) of 18th, February, 2021.

9. Okwakol Aggrey, the Senior CDO of Pallisa Town Council was appointed on 23/12/2020 as was directed by DSC Min No. 23/2020 of 26th Novemeber, 2020.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Pallisa District Local Government had 14 LLGs as per the approved staff etblishment structure including 13 sub counties and 1 Town Council.

It was evident all the 14 LLGs had positions of Senior Accounts Assistant were substantively filled as indicated below;

1. Okim Stephen, the SAA of Akisim Sub County was appointed on 15/2/2016 as directed by DSC Min. No.93/2016(1) of 11th February, 2016.

5

2. Bumba Patrick, the SAA of Olok Sub County was appointed on 14/6/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.59/2018(4) of 13th June, 2018.

3. Apedun Faith, the SAA of Pallisa Sub County was appointed on 14/6/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.59/2018(5) of 13th June, 2018.

4. Adengelel Godfrey Okia, the SAA of Kibale Sub County was appointed on 10/10/2006 as directed by DSC Min. No.134/2006) of 19/9/2006.

5. Odelle Juliet, the SAA of Kasodo Sub County was appointed on 4/6/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.59/2018(2) of 13th June, 2018.

6. Epajja Patrick, the SAA of Kamuge Sub County was appointed on 7/6/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.52/2018(3) of 5th June, 2018.

7. Malinga David, the SAA of Gogonyo Sub County was appointed on 15/2/2016 as directed by DSC Min. No.93/2016(4) of 11th February, 2016.

8. Kedi Leonard, the SAA of Opwateta Sub County was appointed on 14/2/2020 as directed by DSC Min. No.05/2020(i) of 7th February, 2020.

9. Omocho Vincent, the SAA of Agule Sub County was appointed on 26/10/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.22/2022(a) (1) (ii) of 20th October, 2022.

10. Kirya Joseph, the SAA of

Kameke Sub County was appointed on 1/8/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.73/2018(2) of 31st July, 2018.

11. Amagoro Esther Monica, the SAA of Obutete Sub County was appointed on 26/10/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.22/2022(a) (2) (ii) of 20th October, 2022.

12. Anguriya Julius, the SAA of Pallisa Town Council was appointed on 26/10/2022 as directed by DSC Min. No.22/2022(a) (3) (ii) of 20th October, 2022.

13. Akello Amina, the SAA of Puti- Puti Sub County was appointed on 7/6/2018 as directed by DSC Min. No.52/2018(2) (1) (2) of 5th June, 2018.

14. Sagati Judith, the SAA of Chelekura Sub County was appointed on 10/10/2006 as directed by DSC Min. No.107/2006 of 29/8/2006.

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.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Natural Resources department in the previous FY 2021/2022, the amount warranted was UGX. 274,317,825 and the department received 100% of the received UGX. 274,317,825, the department spent UGX.226, 575,109 and the UGX. 47,742,716 was revoked to the treasury as on page 20 of the financial statement ended 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 signed by the CAO on 23rd August 2022.	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0		
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Community Based Services department in the previous FY, the amount warranted was UGX. 378,295,873 and the department received 100% of the received UGX. 378,295,873, the department spent UGX.332, 394,911 and the UGX. 45,900,962 was revoked to the treasury as on page 20 of the financial statement ended 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 signed by the CAO on 23rd August 2022.	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence to show that LG carried out Environmental, social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works for all the projects implemented using the DDEG but the screening was carried out by the DNRO instead of the Environment officer. Screening form for the construction of the 5-stance pit latrine at Kalaki Primary School	4
	Maximum score is 12			

in Pallisa Town Council, the impacts identified and proposed mitigation measures in the screening form and ESMP such as proper waste management at the site, back-filling and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 4th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX. 1,200,000.

Screening form for the renovation of the X-ray block at Pallisa general hospital in Pallisa Town Council, the impacts identified and proposed mitigation measures in the screening form such as proper waste management, levelling of the site and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 8th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.950,000.

Screening form for the road works maintenance of Kaboloi-Agule 5.6km road, the impacts identified; accidents, traffic flow interruption, dust emission and blockage of the access roads to the main road and proposed mitigation measures; signage erection and traffic controllers, water sprinkling in trading centres in the screening form such as prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 15th February 2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX.1, 150,000.

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

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),
score 4 or 0

All the above mentioned DDEG financed projects did not require ESIA's in reference to the National Environment Act 2019, schedule 4 part 2 which consisted of projects with simple environment and social measures and the minimal level of impacts and require screening.

The impacts could be mitigated or avoided through appropriate and timely implementation of recommended mitigation measures and by strictly following the requirements and guidance in the ESMPs.

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

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0

There was evidence of costed ESMPs for all the projects implemented using the DDEG in the previous FY 2021/2022 but the DNRO conducted prepared instead of the Environment Officer for instance.

Costed ESMP of 1,200,000 for the construction of the 5-stance pit latrine at Kalaki Primary School in Pallisa Town Council, the impacts identified and proposed mitigation measures in the screening form and ESMP such as proper waste management at the site, back-filling and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 4th February 2022.

Costed ESMP of UGX. 950, 000 for the renovation of the X-ray block at Pallisa general hospital in Pallisa Town Council, the impacts identified and proposed mitigation measures in the screening form such as proper waste management, leveling of the site and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 8th February 2022.

Costed ESMP of UGX.1,150,000 for the road works maintenance of Kaboloi-Agule 5.6km road, the impacts identified; accidents, traffic flow interruption, dust emission and blockage of the access roads to the main road and proposed mitigation measures; signage erection and traffic controllers, water sprinkling in trading centers in the screening form such as prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and DNRO on 15th February 2022.

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>There was evidence that Pallisa DLG obtained Un-qualified audit opinion from the statutory audit conducted by the Office of the Auditor General for the previous FY 2021/2022.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District provided information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2020/2021 via PBS on 20/4/2022. Similar information on the Auditor General's findings for the same period on the same date. Both submissions were after the end of February the dead line set in the PFMA s.11 2g hence the District was not compliant.</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 District submitted the Annual Performance Contract via PBS to the MoFPED on 31/7/2022. Since this date was before August, 31st, the LG was compliant with this requirement.</p>	4

8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 was submitted through PBS to MoFPED on 01/9/2022. This date was after August 31, a date set as the dead line in the Manual. For this reason the District was not compliant.	0
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The District submitted via PBS to MoFPED the quarterly budget performance reports for FY 2021/2022 as follows: 1stQrt report was submitted on 26/11/2021, 2ndQrt. on 14/3/2022, 3rdQrt. on 10/5/2022 and 4thQrt report submitted on 01/9/2022. Since all the four report where not in by August 31st, the LG was not compliant with the requirement.	0
	Maximum score is 4	score 4 or else 0.		